

GERMANY
plots with the
KREMLIN

GERMANY

plots

with the

KREMLIN

HENRY SCHUMAN • NEW YORK



by T. H. TETENS

*Copyright, 1953, by Henry Schuman, Inc.
Manufactured in the United States of America
by H. Wolff*

Thanks are due to The Macmillan Company
for permission to quote from John Foster Dulles, *War or Peace*

Contents

PART ONE

- I Target U.S.A. • 3
- II Listen America • 10
- III The End of an Illusion • 25
- IV Was it Planned that Way? • 32
- V Pattern of History • 46
- VI German *Realpolitik* in the U.S.A. • 55
- VII The Geopolitical Brain-Trust • 68

PART TWO

- VIII The German Problem of 1944 • 83
- IX America's Problem of 1954 • 90

- X A Frankenstein Monster Again? • 104
 XI "Uncle Sam Must Pay the Bill . . ." • 118
 XII "Ohne Mich" • 128
 XIII The Island and the Sailboat • 137

PART THREE

- XIV Dr. Adenauer and German
Realpolitik • 145
 XV Setting the Trap • 156
 XVI Our German Appeasement Policy • 181
 XVII At the Crossroads • 197

APPENDICES

- German Documents • 209
 Excerpts from the Pro-Adenauer Press • 245
 American Documents • 259
 Documents on Russo-German Relations • 273
 Index • 282

An Open Letter to President Eisenhower

MR. PRESIDENT:

In this book—*Germany Plots With The Kremlin*—I have assembled documents exposing the ominous situation which has developed out of our German policy. This policy is leading our people into a trap which has been carefully prepared by German planners. The very freedom and independence of America is at stake, as revealed by these documents.

While the free world is busy organizing its strength in the struggle against the Soviet bloc, Germany's geo-political master minds have quietly sharpened the weapons from their time-tested arsenal of *Realpolitik*. They have mapped out a bold plan aimed at undoing our military victories. They hope to achieve this goal by a treacherous sellout of Europe to Moscow, a scheme

that would entail economic and political disaster for the United States.

As a political analyst who has spent a lifetime in fighting Germany's bid for world conquest in two world wars, I see the old plot emerging again in the words and deeds of the new Germany. The Bonn Republic, under Dr. Adenauer, pursues the same pattern which was applied so successfully under the Weimar Republic. Again the German leaders profess their attachment to the West in order to extract from the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Once we have enabled Germany to recapture her pre-war military strength she will again offer it to Moscow as her contribution to the common front against the West.

We have not learned our lessons from the past. Twice within a generation we went to war in order to stop German aggression. Each time we gained military victory, only to throw it away by making Germany strong again as a "bulwark against the East". That policy has always backfired against its architects. This was proven in 1922 at Rapallo, and in 1939 in the Moscow-Berlin Pact.

After World War I, the United States put Germany back on her feet with generous political concessions and huge loans. But shortly thereafter the German industrialists, politicians and generals turned toward Moscow and made their economic, political and military deals against the West.

If the Germans have their way it will happen again. If events take that course, then the United States will indeed be faced with the greatest disaster in her history. All of our planning since 1945 will have turned out to be the preparation which hastens our economic and political suicide.

Mr. President, there is no one alive today who is more aware of the importance of the German problem than yourself. Eight years ago you saw the consequences of their actions at first hand. There is not the slightest proof that their behavior and political outlook have changed or that they can be considered a reliable

ally. On the contrary, events in Germany prove that the old Nazis, the Pan-Germans and the militarists move into positions of command again. Through American-sponsored elections, they have reconstituted their parliamentary strength.

The Bonn government is blackmailing the Western powers to obtain the freedom of the last few hundred war criminals. With ever increasing frequency, monster rallies are staged where thousands of rabble-rousing Nazis and former officers demonstrate their contempt for America. Large sections of the German population support these Nazi-like outbursts. At a recent mass meeting of Hitler's Waffen SS, you, Mr. President, were labelled the real war criminal and branded with the favorite German epithet: "Schweinehund".

American officials, led astray by wishful thinking, have tried to paint Germany as a country infused with the spirit of democracy. However, the documents published in this book tell a different story. They prove from the plotters' own mouths how Germany plans to "put the United States against the wall".

There is no doubt in my mind that our fallacious policies have accelerated rather than decreased the building up of a new potential German-Russo coalition. To those who see the danger but hope to buy it off with additional billion dollar injections, the documents in this book prove that with each injection Germany's attraction for Moscow will grow as her potentialities are enhanced. This will make a deal more profitable for both of the former partners of the Berlin-Moscow Axis.

It is strange but nonetheless true that while all of our major changes in foreign policy have been debated in Congress and in public forums, the paramount question of Germany and the vital changes in our post-war policy have never had the close scrutiny either in the Congress or in public debate which this number one American problem demands.

Germany Plots With The Kremlin has been written to place our Government—the American people—on guard. If this book

opens the much-needed debate on our German policy, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

Mr. President, after reading this book, you will agree that there must be a *change*. We must re-examine our German policy in order to regain our freedom of action in Europe, and to preserve our moral leadership in the free world.

With this thought in mind, and as a warning to the nation, I bring this book with its documentation to your special attention.

Respectfully yours,

T. H. TETENS

Cooperstown, N. Y.,

February, 1953.

[PART ONE]

"No case can be made for the belief that the Western Germans are really on our side against Russia, that they will work for us and fight for us, and that those who aided and worked for Hitler can be trusted as allies because they hate and fear the Russians. That is an illusion, and nothing more. By devising and cherishing it, we have at worst begun to build up an ally for Russia. . . ."

DELBERT CLARK
*Former Berlin Correspondent
of the New York Times.*

"There is a wing of the German industrialists, and some of the officers, who believe an alliance with Russia and agrarian eastern Europe against the West (is more promising). In any case the concept seems uniform that Germany play off East against West and ally itself with one against the other in the interests of German dominance in Europe."

HOWARD K. SMITH
*Chief European Correspondent
for CBS*

[1]

Target . . . U.S.A.

DURING THE NIGHT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1939, THE TELEPHONE rang in the White House. The sleepy voice of the operator answered the call. It was Ambassador Bullitt in Paris urgently insisting that his call be put through to the President. After the night operator received the approval of the President's private secretary, Marguerite Le Hand, the ringing bedside telephone awakened Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It was a dramatic moment when Ambassador Bullitt notified the President that he had just received a telephone report from Warsaw that German troops were marching into Poland and that German bombs were raining down on the Polish capital. To President Roosevelt, who had tried everything possible to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War, Bullitt's message

came as a shock. He was only able to answer with a sigh "God help us all . . ."

The events of September 1, 1939, had such an impact on public opinion throughout the world that people everywhere had the uneasy feeling that this was "the beginning of the end." *

Today, we know that the roaring thunder of war that rocked the world in the early hours of September 1, 1939, was only the aftermath of the lightning that had struck eight days previously. It was on August 24, 1939, that the world was stunned by the announcement of the Nazi Government that it had signed a pact with Moscow. What occurred thereafter may be found in the mute evidence of destroyed towns and in the heaps of human wreckage which made German-occupied Europe a vast tomb.

Yet, the Berlin-Moscow Pact was not a sudden shift in policy on the part of the Germans or the Russians. For months, in the strictest secrecy, negotiations had been conducted between the Hitler Government and the Kremlin. The final agreement was the culmination of these negotiations which gave Hitler the assurances that he could launch his assaults against Poland and the West without facing great risk. This Pact was prepared by Ribbentrop's diplomats and Haushofer's geo-politicians. Today these same forces are entrenched in the various departments of the Bonn Government, particularly in Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Office. They are the planners, the men who think in terms of generations and continents and who have never been inhibited by moral considerations. What do they now have in store for the West?

In this book we will prove with irrefutable evidence that Dr. Adenauer's policy is following a "grandiose concept" of making Germany an independent world power again. It will be shown that before the end of the Second World War the Nazi High Command drafted a "Master Plan" under which German postwar policy was directed—first to exploit the lenient policy

* See Alsop and Kintner: *American White Paper*, who reported in their book the scene described above.

of the West and later to follow a long-term policy of close cooperation with the East. We will show how the basic policy of fooling and betraying the West has gradually developed and how it is presently carried out by the Ribbentrop diplomats and the geo-political planners who now serve Dr. Adenauer. Furthermore, we will show how the Nazi masterminds, long before the German collapse, had established a well-financed headquarters in Madrid and how another group of German diplomats went underground after the collapse and continued to operate a skeleton foreign office in Stuttgart, effectively camouflaged under the phony name of "Evangelic Relief Organization." This Ribbentrop outfit was later taken over by Dr. Adenauer as his new Foreign Office.

Recent events have lifted the veil from Bonn's foreign policy. Statements in the pro-Adenauer press reveal the true nature of Bonn's basic concept of foreign affairs, whose aims are, as documents will show, identical with the principles which were laid down by the Ribbentrop diplomats and the geo-political planners many years ago. We will show how Dr. Adenauer's foreign policy is based on the same first commandment of the old German Foreign Office code which says that it is the supreme objective of the art of diplomacy to conceal as much as possible its real intentions.

It has been difficult, in a sense, to unmask Dr. Adenauer's foreign policies, because, like the iceberg, two-thirds of the planning is below the surface. Yet, the world caught a glimpse of how the Bonn diplomacy works on the occasion of the Soviet Note of March 10, 1952, addressed to the Three Western Powers and suggesting a new solution for the German problem. The Russians—who, for almost seven years, pretended to defend the principles of the Potsdam agreement—made a 180 degree turn-about by offering German unification on the basis of free elections, a new German Wehrmacht, fully rearmed, the decontrolling of Germany's industrial war potential, and the return of former Nazis and Wehrmacht officers to public life. It is no

exaggeration to say that the Soviet Note had an electrifying effect on the German people regardless of class or political persuasion. The Soviet Note was the German dream come true. It opened up new perspectives for Germany's ambitions to establish a Fourth Reich, free from the controls of the Allies.

At first, Dr. Adenauer brushed the Soviet Note aside as inconsequential, but when he encountered growing opposition even among his most faithful party followers, Dr. Adenauer was forced to lift slightly the veil that hides the strategy of German diplomacy. Unquestionably, the Chancellor did not think the time was ripe for candor but the opposition had forced his hand. It was his task to "explain" the basic principles of the Bonn Government's foreign policy without making embarrassing disclosures.

It should be pointed out that the "explanation" of Bonn's foreign policy came not only from the lips of Adenauer, but from inspired stories and leaks which appeared in the pro-Adenauer press.

In leading German newspapers, it was stated that Dr. Adenauer's policy "runs on two tracks." There is first the European concept—a short-term policy which aims at the creation of a united Europe, or to use the expression of one German editorial "to fulfil the goal for which Germans were dreaming for decades." In confidential talks with some members of the Federal Parliament, Dr. Adenauer declared that negotiations with the Russians would have to wait until Germany had regained a strong and dominant position in European affairs. He assured his listeners that Russia's conciliatory attitude was most helpful to Germany's aspirations and that other Russian offers were to be expected in which even greater concessions would be made to Germany, especially on the territorial question of the Oder-Neisse Line. The Chancellor hinted in his talks that the Soviet Note had created the heated atmosphere of an auction room where two eager opponents outbid each other. Therefore, he assured his listeners that the rejection of the first Soviet Note

would not prevent an agreement with the Russians at a more favorable moment. The essence of Dr. Adenauer's views was outlined on April 3, 1952, in one of Germany's leading newspapers, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, which is often employed as the mouthpiece of the Bonn Foreign Office. In a front page editorial this newspaper stated:

"The Chancellor follows a tremendous bold plan: First rearmament, followed later on by talks with the Russians in order to persuade them to remove their armies behind the Bug River. For this goal the Chancellor has been working tenaciously for some time. And because he sticks to his timetable, he is presently opposed to the Russian Note."

Dr. Adenauer's "tremendous bold plan" was prepared by the Ribbentrop diplomats as a time-bomb which one day will blast asunder everything U.S. foreign policy has built up since 1945. The German Chancellor's plan is based on the calculation that the U.S.A. is now so deeply committed to her European defense pledge that she will readily sacrifice dozens of billions of dollars in the strengthening and the rearming of a German-dominated Europe. After this is accomplished, Dr. Adenauer's grandiose concept envisions negotiations with Russia with the prospect of getting substantial territorial concessions from the Kremlin in Eastern Europe for which Germany in return will break away, with the whole of Western Europe, from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In the pro-Adenauer press, including the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Christ und Welt*, the *Deutsche Zeitung* of Stuttgart, editorials have been written assuring the Russians that Dr. Adenauer's policy aims to create the security necessary for both the Germans and the Russians, and that this can only be brought about after Germany had become a third power factor which could employ its influence in such a way as to deter the United States "from starting a preventive war." Thus, while, in the short run, the Bonn Government aims to create a United

Europe, it hopes ultimately to reach a solid understanding with the Soviets at the expense of the United States.

It is true, of course, that in the person of Dr. Adenauer, the West has been led to believe that the Bonn Government is deeply devoted to the furtherance of the common welfare of the West. But these estimates of Dr. Adenauer and his diplomacy are based on superficial evidence and ignore the fact that Dr. Adenauer was in the past a fanatical believer in the pan-German gospel that the Fatherland should rule Europe and the world. It is, therefore, no accident that the Ribbentrop diplomats and the Haushofer geo-politicians should be his chief advisors. They are prepared to create the Third Power Bloc under German domination through the financial help of the United States, and then turn around and make their final bargain with Moscow.

Trained in the school of Realpolitik, Dr. Adenauer is not one who acts like a bull in a china shop. Even before he became Chancellor, he admonished his German compatriots: "We must move very cautiously. We ought not to give the impression either in Germany or in the United States that we shall collaborate in any way with the Russians."

The reaction of the German strategists to the Soviet Note of March 10, 1952, however, exposes their true designs. German geo-political journals speak of it as "the highest trump card in the hands of the Chancellor" which will enable him to mow down the resistance of France against Germany's concept of a united Europe. The pro-Adenauer press interpreted the Russian Note as a tremendous asset in speeding up the timetable for the creation of a European army under German domination.

It has been stated by experts again and again that Moscow has all the trump cards in her hands for making luring offers to the Bonn Republic. Little effort has been made by Western diplomats to penetrate the clandestine negotiations between Bonn and Moscow. From statements in the German press we can only conclude that Bonn's final diplomatic objective is a far-reaching agreement with Moscow.

Two years of secret negotiations between Berlin and Moscow preceded the Rapallo Treaty of April 16, 1922, which had the effect of a "diplomatic bomb-shell" in the Western world. In this connection, it should be noted that this treaty was concluded by a leader of German "liberalism," Dr. Walter Rathenau. Fifteen years later, when Western statesmen believed they had bought "peace in our time" at Munich, the Germans and the Russians again entered in secret negotiations which culminated in August, 1939, in the Berlin-Moscow Pact.

The lightning that flashed throughout the world when Berlin joined hands with Moscow in 1939 is striking again and the ultimate target of the Germans is the U.S.A.

Listen America

AT THE END OF WORLD WAR II, THE UNITED STATES HAD reached a point of unsurpassed power and influence throughout the world. Yet, by 1950, our historic victories in Asia had been turned into devastating defeats. Must we face similar disaster in Europe? There are important voices among the Germans who seem to be cocksure of the answer. "The Americans have lost the peace, the cold war and their entire future, but they are not yet aware of it."

Five years ago we were content to assess the situation in China on the basis of superficial evidence. We are now in a similar position as regards Germany where the growing crisis is shrouded by an optimism divorced from reality. It is not too late to act intelligently and with farsightedness. Indeed, with timely coun-

ter-measures, we may be able to avert a new catastrophe before it falls upon us with paralyzing impact. But this will depend to a great degree on our success in comprehending the portentous signs in Europe. It is toward this end that we shall focus attention in these pages on the gathering storm.

On the basis of abundant evidence, it will be proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that Germany—through her most influential political and economic groups—is moving toward the Soviet bloc vis-à-vis the West.

We shall show that this is not a momentary trend but rather the outcome of a conscious and cunning plan which had been prepared before the end of the Second World War.

Whether or not this comes as a surprise to our policy shapers in Washington is of no relevance—we have to take this development as a fact. Our policy planners had blueprinted a postwar world wherein a re-invigorated Germany would cooperate as a trustworthy ally and serve as a "bulwark against the East." If the documents here presented hold any weight, it means that our planning has been built on false premises, and the United States foreign policy is heading toward a blind alley.

Decisive elements in all political grouping and parties from the Communists to Adenauer's camp followers are thinking in terms of close Russo-German cooperation. In this connection, an official publication of the State Department * pointed correctly to the fact that since Napoleon's time "there has been much in common between the upper military and social class in Germany and in Russia." The State Department document then emphasizes the close cooperation of Germany's Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, with old Tsarist Russia, and it adds:

"Now that Russia has a new ruling class as dictatorial as the old aristocracy, some of the old feeling of kinship is still to be found among extreme conservatives in Germany, from the Junkers to the ex-Nazis."

* *Confuse and Control—Soviet Techniques in Germany*, Washington, 1951.

The document goes on to say that "the East German Government is using large numbers of Nazi and Junker officers in its militarized policy," and that "there is some feeling among the aristocrats that they might make terms with the Soviet aristocracy and because of their experience and ability might become indispensable and powerful members of the Soviet ruling class."

After presenting this gloomy picture, the State Department concludes:

"The tendency for the extreme right to play with treason must be listed as a definite weak point in the democratic cause."

Our State Department fears "treason" in Germany. To such charges, the Germans will only laugh. Does anyone believe that the Germans feel loyalty-bound towards the United States? The Germans, whether they follow Herr Pieck, Dr. Schumacher or Chancellor Adenauer, place Germany's supreme interests above everything.

However disunited these political leaders may be, they are one in the belief that the Fatherland must never again become a battlefield. Thus the doctrine of "neutralism," which aims to avert a new war on German soil, has found wide support among Germans in all walks of life—Protestants, Catholics, workers and professionals, ex-army officers and youth.

Dr. Adenauer's approach to the problem of German Realpolitik is a more subtle and far-reaching one, as will be seen from statements made by the German Chancellor and the pro-Adenauer press. A careful study of the available documentation must lead to the conclusion that the German aim is the creation of a Third Power Bloc, based on the following principle: "Let the United States first press for a European Federation and let the American taxpayers provide the billions of dollars required for German rearmament. After a German-dominated Europe is established, we shall have the opportunity for a far better bargain with the Russians. Moscow will pay a high price if we pledge

ourselves to break with the United States. Then the moment will come when Germany can again play an independent role in the world power politics."

It is a fact that most Americans have never listened to the real voice of Germany. We quote below a few of those voices selected out of a wealth of evidence:

1944 "We do not have to fear that the conditions for peace will be similar to those which we would have imposed—for our enemies will always be divided and disunited. We must even strive to sow the seeds of future dissension in the next peace treaty . . . No defeat is final. Defeats are simply lessons to be learned in preparation for the next and greater attack."

(General von Stuelpnagel in 1944.)

"There is a way out for Germany from total defeat . . . Germany can change this situation of defeat decisively and at once by lining up with the only real power on the Eurasian continent, with Russia . . . Germany, even in defeat, can give many things to Russia: the open way to Hamburg and the Rhine, trained general staff officers, technicians, skilled workers, soldiers, warships, tanks, bombers and the most modern weapons of destruction . . . Germany can bring about the final destruction of the French-British barrier, the liquidation of the British Empire and the end of West European colonial rule. This would mean the establishment of German domination over Africa. . . ."

(From an editorial written by the leading Social Democratic theoretician, Friedrich Stampfer, appearing in the December 1944 issue of the publication Neue Volkszeitung, New York.)

1945 "The partition of Germany will be considered in the Soviet Union, too, as only temporary and unbearable to us. While Yalta gives Russia only a limited influence in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, which will be even more and more

contested in the future, the influence of the Soviet Union in all of Europe can be made possible only through cooperation with Germany . . . A colossal bloc of world-dominating greatness, economic power, energy and numbers of population would be created from ocean to ocean. Not only would the danger of future wars for generations be eliminated from Europe but also from the double continent of Eurasia . . . Thus, would be formed an alliance between the young Socialist forces against the old rotten entrenched powers of the West."

(From the document "The Overcoming of the Catastrophe," issued in April 1945 and initiated by Field Marshal Keitel and Grand Admiral Doenitz.)

- 1947 "We Germans do not want to sell ourselves to either side, not for the Potemkin promises of Marshall Zhukov nor the CARE packages of America . . . Germany wants to establish good relations with the Soviet Union. However, we cannot allow this goal to be reached by letting the rest of the world become an enemy of Germany. We are not anti-Russian, but we are pro-German."

(Social Democratic Leader Dr. Schumacher, in a speech: New York Times, June 2, 1947.)

- 1948 "The Germans know that their hour will come . . . They are full of faith that they will see the day of resurrection . . . They will take their destiny in their own hands, whether together with others is a question that can be discussed, but only as equals . . . The Germans can wait; only together with them can Europe come back on her feet, and from such a strong Europe we have to expect everything."

"The tremendous expansive force of economic power in the United States constitutes not only a threat to the whole of Europe but also creates fear in Russia . . . Europe,

under German leadership, has to mobilize all her spiritual and cultural forces to defend her position and heritage."

(From the January and November 1948 issues of the geo-political monthly Der Weg, Buenos Aires.)

- 1949 ". . . We Germans do not want to have anything to do with the West—with the Yankees, with their capitalistic exploitation and their political arrogance . . . We Prussians have always been closely associated with the Russians; we Germans returned gladly to the tradition of Bismarck . . . We are actually predestined for an alliance with Moscow . . . Socialist Germany and Communist Russia together are invincible and thus our alliance secures the peace of the world."

(From the "Open Letter to Stalin," published by the former Nazi and Black Front leader Bruno Fricke, in the anti-Communist Buerger Zeitung of Chicago, November 17, 1949.)

- 1950 "The Americans fondly hope that we will one day repay with our blood all the benefits we received from them. They want us to sign a pact whereby we, as mercenaries and vassals, shall back American power politics . . . However long we may continue to milk the Americans of millions of dollars, there must come the inevitable moment when we shall have to make it crystal clear to them that we are not willing to join the fight against Russia for American interests. There probably is no danger that we shall become hated by the Yankees, because they are businessmen and understand very well that we will act only in accordance with our own interests. . . . The fact that the Americans would now like us to join them in the defense of Europe and to become their ally will thereby enhance our bargaining power with the Russians. The Americans have lost the peace, the cold war and their entire future, but they are not as yet aware of it."

(From a circular letter issued in September 1950 by the German Geo-political Center in Madrid.)

" . . . A federated Europe will become a Third Force in the world, not as strong as Russia or the United States, but powerful enough to intervene successfully—in a decisive moment—to safeguard the peace . . . Germany has again become a factor with whom others will have to reckon in international affairs . . . There is also a long-range economic goal: the colonization of Africa . . . If we Europeans colonize Africa, we create at the same time a supplier of raw materials for Europe which will be of the greatest importance."

(Article by Dr. Konrad Adenauer in the Rheinischer Merkur, May 20, 1950.)

1951 "In order to arrive at a settlement with the East, there is only one avenue open: the unification of Europe. It is the only possibility for a peaceful settlement. None of us are interested in forcing the solution by war—for that would be the end for all of us. If Europe becomes strong and Stalin has no need to worry any longer that she will be used as a jumping-off place for an attack against the East, then the moment will have come when Stalin will no longer deem it necessary to continue the occupation of the Eastern Zone."

(Count von Rechenberg, in the session of the Federal Parliament in Bonn on October 17, 1951.)

"There is danger that the Americans will one day launch a preventive war against the Soviets . . . Those who would like to prevent such a war must see to it that Europe becomes strong enough to act as an arbitrator . . . Only when Europe possesses its own strong military arm, can it make its voice heard effectively . . . No one has more to gain through unification of Europe than the Germans who are the most numerous and most dynamic among the nations west of the U.S.S.R. . . . The West German Republic can best be compared with a sailboat cruising towards two islands far on the horizon and, in order to withstand strong-blowing winds, it sets its course alternatively to the left and to the

right. Will the day then not arrive when we must make a decision on which island to land? Maybe, but it is not certain. Perhaps one of the islands will be washed away by the waves before we reach it . . ."

(From an editorial on German foreign policy in the pro-Adenauer newspaper Christ und Welt of November 1, 1951.)

"Only under political pressure would Moscow show readiness to return those Eastern territories which Russia has already incorporated into her orbit. It would be necessary that we first create a united, healthy, and strong Western Europe in whose name the following offer to the Kremlin could then be made: Continental Europe would break away from the Atlantic Pact if the Soviets agree to withdraw their forces behind the Pripet-Marshes and release not only the Eastern zone of Germany, but the whole of Eastern Europe into the European Union. A United Europe, standing on its own feet and possessing its own powerful army, could begin with the development of its colonial empire in Africa. Such a Europe, whatever the ties might be with America, could afford to carry out such an independent policy because it will have the strength of a third power."

(Editorial from the front page of Christ und Welt, Stuttgart, December 27, 1951.)

1952 "Never before has the world political situation been so favorable for Germany as it is today . . . It is not for nothing that both power blocs concentrate their efforts on Germany in order to dominate it politically and economically. Therein lies our chance and our obligation. Our economy has to be kept independent from both sides . . . This is the way that leads towards sovereignty and equality which finally will eliminate all those clauses which were imposed upon us as a result of the lost war . . . While integration with the West restricts our industry to markets where we are subjected to a cut-throat competition, the Eastern bloc offers

us markets where countless millions are hungry for our industrial goods. Here (in the East) is Germany's market. . . . Thirty years ago, on April 16, 1922, there were courageous men who, in Rapallo, through direct Russo-German negotiations brought a great turning point in Germany's post-war policy . . . The situation in present day Germany should exhort our leading statesmen to show courage . . . courage towards a Rapallo Policy."

(From the editorial "Courage Towards a Rapallo" of the weekly Der Fortschritt, Essen, May 16, 1952.)

"What Can Russia Win If She Plays Her Trump Card? . . . In order to jump out from her present isolation she can, exactly as the Rapallo Treaty did 30 years ago, place Germany as a protecting buffer between the East and the West. From the politico-economic point of view, she could repeat the old game for world power position by concluding long-term agreements with German industry and by renewing her trade with Germany. Thus, Russia might re-open the door to the world market."

(Editorial in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, March 15, 1952.)

"If we Germans would come to feel that the other powers, openly or tacitly, try to hinder German equality and reunification, the (Western) treaties would quickly turn out to have been built on quicksand . . . The fact that we are tied up with the NATO pact does not make it impossible for Europe, as soon as it is strong enough and the international situation has changed, to become one day independent from every side ('nach allen Seiten unabhaengig')."

(Editorial in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, June 5, 1952.)

Here is the real voice of Germany and we must listen to it. In the past, whenever critics have pointed to the growing danger of a reunited Reich siding with the East, two answers were

usually given by American officials responsible for our German policy:

- A) We know that such a danger exists, but we completely trust Dr. Adenauer in that he will keep Germany on our side.
- B) Just because we have to face such a precarious situation in Germany, we must do our utmost to keep Germany within the Western orbit; and for that reason we have to pay the Germans a high price.

This book will show, on the basis of facts, the total fallacy of such reasoning. However, there is a third argument which can often be heard and with which we will deal here once and for all.

It has been customary over the past fifty years to brand serious students of German policy as "alarmists" when they called attention to the brutally frank writings of militarists and pan-Germans which revealed Germany's plans for aggression and conquest. So-called responsible Germans would try to gloss over these writings with the usual refrain: "But you cannot ascribe irresponsible writings of an individual, be it a high-ranking military man, a university professor or a politician, as the officially adopted policy of the German Government. There are so many crackpots in public life, and we certainly do not have the power to keep them quiet."

American authorities have in recent years frequently emphasized this point of view in criticizing American correspondents for having supposedly stressed the "negative side" of the German picture, and forgetting to underscore the "positive" achievements of the Adenauer administration.

There is undoubtedly a tendency among U.S. officials to close the eyes before mounting danger, but does not the record of history speak for itself?

In 1912 when General Bernhardt published his stirring book *Germany and the Next War*, the German Foreign Office was

eager to convince a bewildered world that the thoughts expressed by Bernhardt were in no way identical with Germany's official foreign policy. Two years later, the world experienced German "Schrecklichkeit" precisely as outlined by General Bernhardt.

After Hitler came to power, a German geo-politician, Professor Ewald Banse, published a book (*Raum und Volk im Weltkrieg*) in which were laid bare Germany's plans for conquest in Europe. Professor Banse's book interpreted in more scholarly language the blueprint of another "crackpot" who had ten years previously, in *Mein Kampf*, expounded the thesis that Germany had first to defeat the West in order to have a free hand for the "Drang nach Osten."

When foreign diplomats became disturbed over the publication of Herr Professor Banse's book, the Foreign Minister von Neurath was right at hand to assuage their feelings with assurances that such "irresponsible" writings had nothing in common with the peaceful intentions of the responsible leadership of the Third Reich.

A few years later the "responsible" German Government executed the very plans that their many "irresponsible" writers had blue-printed in previous years.

Today the World faces the same diabolical combination of "responsible" leadership and "irresponsible" blue-printers in Germany. Yet, ought it not to be easier for us, after we were burned twice, to see the facts behind the flimsy drapery? Is it not a fact that many of those political experts who worked under von Ribbentrop, under Goebbels, and in General Karl Haushofer's geo-political staff are operating again for the revival of German World power? Is it not a fact that many of these "irresponsible" planners and political propagandists under Hitler are today in key positions, either in Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Office or in the editorial rooms of such leading German publications as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Die Zeit*, *Christ und Welt* and the *Deutsche Zeitung*?

Unfortunately, the American public is, to a large extent, to-

tally unaware of what is going on in Germany. What is even more disturbing is the fact that our leading diplomatic officials seem to be afflicted with blind spots when they are supposed to judge German affairs objectively and intelligently.

This was clearly demonstrated on June 12, 1952, in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Contractual Agreement with Germany. On that day, Mr. McCloy, then High Commissioner in Germany, appeared before the Senate Committee in order to ask for a speedy ratification of the Contractual Agreement, which serves as a substitute for a peace treaty with Germany. One of the Senators enquired about the political trend in Germany and whether it was not necessary to be on guard against unpleasant developments. The following exchange of questions and answers on a specific issue is taken from the stenographic minutes:

SENATOR GREEN: I see German newspapers from time to time that are sent to me marked, and there is one question that I would like to draw your attention to for your comments. It comes from the *Christ und Welt*. That is an Adenauer paper, is it not?

MR. MC CLOY: Yes.

SENATOR GREEN: And it is dated last December 27, (1951) and there are the following quotations—it refers to making in the name of a United Europe the following offer to the Kremlin:

"Continental Europe would break from the Atlantic Pact if the Soviets agree to withdraw their forces behind the Pripet Marshes and release not only the Eastern Zone of Germany but the whole of Eastern Europe into the European Union.

"A Western Europe, standing on its own feet, and possessing its own powerful

army, can begin with a development of its colonial empire in Africa. Such a Europe, whatever the ties might be with America, could afford to carry out such an independent policy because it will have the strength of a third power."

Now, that being a newspaper that supports the present (Adenauer) administration, I wonder what your comment might be as to the extent of such ideas?

MR. MC CLOY: I do not think that is—in the first place, that is not the Chancellor's attitude. I do not think that is supported by his party. It is not his party newspaper. It has a very small circulation, and I do not know where that—did that appear in an editorial of that paper?

SENATOR GREEN: Yes; call it an editorial, an article.

MR. MC CLOY: Well, you can see all sorts of expressions, viewpoints in Germany. I simply say that is not today the trend of German thinking. I think the trend of German thinking today wants to associate itself with the West, wants to associate itself particularly with the United States, and is not disposed to go off on a frolic of its own in another aggressive adventure.

As we can see from the record, Mr. McCloy parried Senator Green's question, by stating that this particular newspaper had no significance in German political affairs and that it did not represent the trend of German thinking or the attitude of Chancellor Adenauer.

In every respect, Mr. McCloy was ill-informed on the standing and importance of *Christ und Welt*. Furthermore, his statements on the trend of German political thinking do not correspond to the facts. We will show in the forthcoming chapters

that *Christ und Welt* is one of the leading political journals in Western Germany, a paper of wide circulation and, what is more important, quoted frequently by representative German newspapers, such as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. In addition, the articles of *Christ und Welt* are often reprinted in the German-language press in the United States and in Latin America.

One of the founders of *Christ und Welt*, Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier, is the leading representative of the Protestant faction in Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union and he serves as Deputy Chairman in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Bonn Parliament.

Among the editors of *Christ und Welt* are such well-known political figures as Dr. Klaus Mehnert and Dr. Giselher Wirsing. Dr. Mehnert served as a top-notch geo-politician and Russian expert under the guiding hand of General Dr. Karl Haushofer. Dr. Giselher Wirsing was one of the top-ranking journalists under Dr. Goebbels and served during the war as special adviser on international affairs under von Ribbentrop. To classify a political journal with such an array of geo-political experts and journalists as unimportant, shows either a surprising lack of information or could be regarded as a deliberate attempt to withhold from Congress and the American people vital facts concerning the current trends in Germany.

In any case, the excerpts which Senator Green quoted from *Christ und Welt* constitute only an infinitesimal part of similar material which has been gathered from leading pro-Adenauer newspapers in recent months. It all points to a well-organized drive to exploit as much as possible American aid, with a view toward reaching a final agreement with the Russians. What Germany's political planners suggest today is just a repetition of the old trick with which Hitler outsmarted the Western Powers in August 1939.

There is a wealth of material providing irrefutable proof that Dr. Adenauer's whole timetable in dealing with the Western Powers has been carefully prepared by those "irresponsible"

Haushofer-Ribbentrop disciples who, from Madrid and Buenos Aires, regularly give directives to their former Nazi colleagues in the Bonn Foreign Office and in the leading German papers.

There is still time to put a stop to this sinister German conspiracy—if America will listen. If not, the day will come when a “responsible” German Government will once again execute the blueprints cooked up by the “irresponsible” geo-political “crackpots.”

[3]

The End of an Illusion

THE MYTH THAT GERMANY COULD SERVE AS A “BULWARK against the East” is bursting. We have pumped billions of dollars into Western Germany in order to rescue the former enemy from the consequences of defeat. We based our policy on the assumption that we could transform the West German Republic into a trustworthy American ally.

This notion received its inspiration from the German propaganda mill. As military defeat approached, the Germans began to harp on the threadbare theme that they could best be depended upon to stand fast against the Soviet challenge. Their labors were not in vain because our planners and strategists fell for the bait.

Hypnotized by the German siren song, Washington policy shapers became convinced that the German people would show gratitude for the benefits they had received from the U.S. It was assumed that the Germans would repent for their past crimes and that they would cooperate sincerely with the U.S. With this in mind, the Pentagon began to plan for the rebuilding of Germany's military power to balance Soviet strength in Europe. Our policy planners hoped to guide Germany toward democracy and convert her into a faithful ally. This was precisely what the Germans wanted us to believe.

Today it is admitted in Washington that our program of democratization and re-education in Germany has failed. Even High Commissioner John McCloy, a leading proponent of the "bulwark" theory, has expressed alarm over the increasing Neo-Nazi propaganda and the revival of German nationalism. On December 10, 1951, in a speech before U.S. Occupation officials, Mr. McCloy admitted that our policy in Germany is running a great risk. Mr. McCloy confessed that at times he could not suppress a "feeling of uncertainty" when he pondered Germany's future.

In regard to German remilitarization, the world will be confronted with more uncertainties and greater headaches as soon as the new Frankenstein monster will come to life.

The belief of our strategists that Germany would show gratitude for America's generous relief action and for the costly reconstruction of her economy, has proven to be an illusion. Thus the *U.S. News and World Report* of September 14, 1951, noted: "The fact that the U.S. alone has spent nearly nine billion dollars in Western Germany is ignored or minimized. The tendency is to take these billions for granted."

Another fallacy held by Washington is that a remilitarized Germany could still be controlled by the United States. In discussing German remilitarization, the *U.S. News*, in its issue of January 18, 1952, stated that "a strong Western Germany is on the horizon." The editors emphasized the fact that the French

army "is not likely to play the big role counted on by the U.S.A.," but that

"Germany will again be a big power in Western Europe and, instead of Western Europe bossing Germany, it may be the other way round. This is not the way the U.S. planned it but it is the way things are going."

Here it is openly admitted that something has gone wrong. The question whether it was planned that way will be answered in the next chapter. Yet it is sufficient to mention the fact that Washington planners decided right at the end of World War II to maintain a strong Germany which, in the hour of need, would place its power at the service of the West.

Thus after having convinced our policy shapers of their indispensability and reliability, the Germans were in a position to plan future strategy. Knowing exactly how we would act in a given situation, Germany's postwar tactics and propaganda could now anticipate U.S. moves. In this manner the Germans could exert a decisive influence through their diplomacy of blackmail.

From German documents, we know today how the Germans had plotted the breakup of the Grand Wartime Alliance as a means for a quick comeback. When the Germans observed that we were enmeshed in the entanglements of the cold war, they became confident of their final triumph. Believing that time was on their side, the Germans were now resolved to "sit it out" and exploit the growing tension to their advantage.

In the meantime it has begun to dawn on our policy shapers that our position in Germany is not only precarious but that we are rapidly losing control of the situation. In a report from Bonn, Stewart Alsop stated, on October 12, 1951, that we have no "stick" in Germany:

"The demonstrable fact is that something has gone very wrong with Allied plans for a West German defense force. Consider the facts. It is more than a year now since Secretary

of State Dean G. Acheson, pushed and chivvied by the Pentagon, and against the advice of able United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy, demanded immediate German rearmament. At that time, the Pentagon planners, suffering from the delusion that the militant German nation would spring to arms at the word of command, were talking of an important German military contribution in a matter of months. . . . In the view of some very able men here, it is time to have a good hard look at what has gone wrong . . . What seems to have gone principally wrong is that the Pentagon planners, fascinated like a rabbit by a snake by the thought of future German divisions, have fixed a rigid but entirely unrealistic timetable for German rearmament. Thus the Western administrators here, including the extremely able Commissioner McCloy, have been robbed of the flexibility required in negotiation."

In his report, Stewart Alsop emphasizes the fact that "because German politicians are convinced that the West must have a German defense contribution at any cost, the Allied negotiators had no stick." The Pentagon planned program had placed the Allies "in the position of doing the begging" which, on the other hand, has "immensely stimulated the sort of irrationality" displayed by such fanatical nationalists as Dr. Schumacher of the Social Democratic Party, the leaders of the German Rightist Parties, belonging to the Adenauer Government, and the Neo-Nazi groups.

The fact is that Dr. Adenauer, due to Germany's strong bargaining position, can put the "squeeze" on us in order to extort one concession after another. And time is working in Germany's favor. This became sufficiently clear when Dr. Adenauer and the Bundestag announced as conditions for a German defense contribution, first: the settlement of the Saar dispute to German satisfaction; second: a place of equality in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; third: the release of all war criminals; fourth: full sovereignty for the West German Republic.

While the Germans are glad to obtain the means for the defense of their own soil and, in addition, the guarantee of assistance by the Atlantic Community in case of Soviet aggression, they have taken the haughty position of "Ohne Mich"—"without me." Thus we find ourselves in the ironic position where the Germans can say: "Ohne Mich," but we cannot say to them: "Without us." The Germans, said Walter Lippmann, in his column of January 29, 1952, are in no hurry to sign up; "They are measuring our eagerness to have them sign, and with considerable skill and astuteness, they are raising their terms to accord with our eagerness." As Walter Lippmann correctly pointed out, they have heard over the years how necessary German troops are for the defense of Europe, and it would be quite unnatural if they would not use their diplomatic bargaining power to the utmost:

"I do not see how or why we should blame the Germans for making the most of our official misunderstanding and miscalculation in Germany. It is not they but we who adopted the unprecedented and fanciful notion that a nation forced to surrender unconditionally—and subjected to immense destruction and humiliation—could within two or three years be turned into a loyal, active and docile ally. Once we announced that the free world could not be defended without the Germans, then the Germans were in the driver's seat."

Walter Lippmann has not been alone in seeing through the wishful thinking of our policy planners. Others, including former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, James P. Warburg, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, William Shirer, Delbert Clark, Drew Middleton, have been noting and recording since 1945 the evidences of Washington's wrong approach to the German problem. These men have understood clearly two facts of the German character. One is that, in German eyes, victors who spend money on the vanquished are dreamers ripe for destruction, with whom no self-respecting warrior nation wishes to ally

herself. The second is that, no matter how weak Germany herself may be, fear of Russia is the most effective weapon to be employed in dealing with the West. The Germans are old hands in such tactics.

Our military planners were converted to the idea of building Germany as a bulwark against the East because there was no proper guidance from the State Department. The military planners in the Pentagon should have been told that Prussianized Germany had at no time served as a bulwark against the East. This was a propaganda slogan which the Germans had effectively used in overcoming the military defeat after the First World War and then in the blackmail diplomacy of the Weimar Republic and later under Hitler, Goebbels and Ribbentrop.

From the beginning, it was an illusion to believe that the Germans could be brought around to our side by generous dollar handouts. This policy has had its drawbacks, especially in Germany where it created only hate and contempt for us. If the military planners believed that we could win Germany as a friend by making her a "going concern" and "strong military factor," they overlooked the essential fact that an alliance can only be built on the basis of common interest and mutual trust. Possessing the requisite facts on Germany's real interests and ambitions, it was the function and duty of the State Department to demolish the Pentagon's illusions. The historic truth is that the German ruling class, industrialists, aristocrats, army officers and diplomats, had always viewed, with great apprehension, the United States as the chief antagonist and menace for Germany and the whole of Europe.

The record shows that German industrialists were among the main plotters against the United States. Their aim was always the destruction of America's industrial supremacy and the conquest of world markets. For this reason alone it was the most unrealistic policy we could ever have embarked upon. To resurrect Germany as a dangerous competitor and establish her

again as a dominant military power in Europe is a folly which should have been prevented through intelligent guidance of the State Department. Even if we take into account that the outcome of World War II had created an unbalance of power, especially in Europe, we could have found other ways and means to check Russia's advance.

The lesson of the past should have served as a warning not to fall for Germany's diplomatic booby trap—the myth of a "bulwark against the East."

[4]

Was It Planned That Way?

TODAY THE GERMAN RESISTANCE IS BOLDLY SHOWING HOW little it seeks genuine cooperation with the West. According to the planning of the Germans, the U.S. must pay for German rearmament, but after having made them strong they will have the means to use their regained military power as a trump-card in a deal with Moscow. The *United States News*, quoted in the previous chapter, observed that this was not the way the United States had planned it. However, it can hardly be said that this should come as a surprise to our policy shapers.

As early as 1944 it was well known in Washington what the Nazi High Command was planning in order to "overcome the catastrophe." When in 1943 the German war machine stalled on the Russian plains, German diplomats worked diligently to find a way out of the inevitable military defeat.

Was It Planned That Way?

In March and April of 1945, our State Department announced that the Germans had elaborated a complete plan on how to upset the military victory of the Allies and thereby win the peace for Germany. According to the *New York Herald Tribune* of March 31, 1945, the State Department gave the following account of Germany's secret postwar plans:

"The Department of State announced today that reliable information collected by Allied Governments clearly indicates that the Nazi regime in Germany has developed well-arranged postwar plans for the perpetuation of Nazi doctrines and domination. Some of these plans have already been put into operation and others are ready to be launched on a widespread scale immediately upon termination of hostilities in Europe. . . . German technicians, cultural experts and undercover agents have well-laid plans to infiltrate foreign countries with the object of developing economic, cultural and political ties . . . This government is now in possession of photostatic copies of several volumes of German plans on this subject. The German propaganda is to be an integral part of the overall postwar program. The immediate aim of the propaganda program will be directed at removing Allied control measures, by softening up the Allies, through a subtle plea for fair treatment of Germans, and later the program will be extended and intensified with the object of giving rebirth to all Nazi doctrines and furthering German ambitions for world domination. Unless these plans are checked, they will present a constant menace to postwar peace and security."

A few days after this announcement, Assistant Secretary of State Julius C. Holmes, on April 7, 1945, sounded a warning in an official broadcast that "German leaders are trying to find refuge in neutral countries" and that they are planning for a comeback:

"They realized that they had lost the war almost a year ago, and began laying the groundwork for the postwar period.

They hope to achieve world domination through a third world war. We have ample evidence of that intent . . . von Papen told a close friend of his in 1943 that Germany could no longer hope to win the war and that every possible move should be made to save German industrial and military power for the future."

Discussing Germany's preparation for a world-wide underground network, Assistant Secretary Holmes stated:

"We Americans are too ready to believe things like this don't really happen. But they *do*. They *are* villains in the plot. They'll search for every possible loophole in the Allied military plans for controlling Germany. One of the most interesting angles of the German plan is to place technicians where they can be most useful to the Nazi underground in its next bid for power . . . Certain Nazis are assigned to pose as Communists, Socialists, and members of trade union organizations. The Nazi strategists intend to use these people to penetrate into anti-Nazi circles, in Germany and outside. Some may even try to pass as refugee members of the German anti-Nazi movement . . . The Allied Governments are fully aware of all this, and determined to prevent the Nazis from getting away with their schemes. That's half the battle. The other half is still to come."

The sad truth is that this battle was never fought by the State Department, although on June 25, 1945, William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, testified to a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs:

"The second matter I should like to discuss relates to the current and urgent problem of frustrating German attempts to hide abroad a stake for another gamble at world domination.

"The Department of State has abundant evidence that the Nazis, in anticipation of military defeat, made careful plans to carry on in foreign countries a wide range of activities necessary to support an eventual resurgence of German

power. For this purpose plans were made, and carried out in part, to transfer abroad sufficient funds and specially trained personnel to carry on pan-German activities, even while the Allied armies were in occupation of Germany."

A week after Assistant Secretary Holmes' radio announcement, Franklin Delano Roosevelt died and soon afterwards the military planners in the Pentagon set quietly out to implement their new policy based on "calculated optimism" towards Germany.

The new policy was carried out in complete disregard of the German record and without a thorough evaluation of the vital evidence which had been discovered in occupied Germany by our victorious armies. The files of the German foreign office contained detailed memoranda of the secret "America Committee" that had operated under the direction of Dr. Dieckhoff, the former German Ambassador in Washington. In these memoranda detailed plans had been drawn up for disruptive war and postwar propaganda in the United States. It appears from these documents that the main objective of the German High Command was to obtain a separate peace either with the West or with Soviet Russia. In case this objective could not be achieved then the Germans could bank on the development of a chaotic postwar world which would provide the opportunity to regain their former power and influence.

Under the date of July 7, 1943, Dr. Colin Ross, one of Haushofer's foremost collaborators on geo-politics and his liaison officer to the German Foreign Office, submitted a fifteen-page report analyzing the favorable conditions for an "ideological offensive in the U.S.A." As a main weapon, he recommended the exploitation of America's fear of Bolshevism, and the creation of a secret organization that would carry on the campaign to undermine the postwar plans of the Allies. In his memorandum, Dr. Ross recommended as an effective argument that Germany, in case she were confronted with the pros-

pect of a harsh peace, would ally herself with the Soviets, thus making Russia invincible in the future.

Other memoranda described schemes of how to strain and disrupt British-American relations, and how to use the Holy See as a channel to spread "confidential reports," manufactured in the Ribbentrop office.

One of the most important documents is a directive issued by the Intelligence Department of the German High Command, dated March 15, 1944, and signed by Admiral Canaris, the mastermind of the German intelligence setup. In the document German agents were ordered to start a subtle campaign in the United States with the object of defeating Roosevelt's policy, splitting the Allies and securing a separate or soft peace for Germany.

"SECRET STATE MATTER

OKW—*Abwehr*

March 15, 1944

"At a meeting of the representatives of the Foreign Office, the Security Division, ('SD') and the Department of Defense ('Abwehr'), the following resolutions were adopted for unified action by all our agents in foreign countries:

- "1. Utilize to the fullest extent all available possibilities in neutral and enemy countries, in order to support our military efforts with political and propaganda campaigns.
- "2. Our goal is to crush the enemy's plan whose object it is to destroy forever the German Reich militarily, economically, and culturally.

"The new regulations put into effect by the political leaders for the dissolution and disintegration of the enemy bloc should be carried out more intensively. We must do our utmost to create a state of confusion and distrust among our enemies. Such a state of disunity would enable us to sue for a quick separate peace with either side. While it is true that the efforts made in that direction have failed so far due to the implacable hate policy of Roosevelt and Churchill, it does not mean that some day, under different conditions, the

unnatural front of our enemies could not be broken. Roosevelt's electoral defeat this year could have immeasurable political consequences.

"The political and military leaders are of the opinion that Germany cannot expect any mercy from the Soviets; on the contrary, should the war take a turn for the worse, we must assume that the Slavs will do everything in order to retaliate against the harsh treatment we have inflicted upon them. In spite of everything, no effort should be spared to stir up, through carefully directed propaganda, political animosity inside the Anglo-Saxon countries which would enrage the Soviets to such a degree that, as a consequence, they would welcome a chance to conclude a separate peace with Germany.

"In the event of a negotiated peace, or should we be defeated, Germany would have everything to gain—in the long run—by joining the East.

"Right now, the chances for a separate peace with the West are a little better, especially if we succeed, through our propaganda campaign and our 'confidential' channels, to convince the enemy that Roosevelt's policy of 'unconditional surrender' drives the German people towards Communism.

"There is great fear in the U.S.A. of Bolshevism. The opposition against Roosevelt's alliance with Stalin grows constantly. Our chances for success are good, if we succeed to stir up influential circles against Roosevelt's policy. This can be done through clever pieces of information, or by references to unsuspecting neutral ecclesiastical contact men.

"We have at our command in the United States efficient contacts which have been carefully kept up even during the war. The campaign of hatred stirred up by Roosevelt and the Jews against everything German has temporarily silenced the pro-German bloc in the U.S.A. However, there is every hope that this situation will be completely changed within a few months. If the Republicans succeed in defeating Roosevelt in the coming presidential election, it would greatly influence the American conduct of war towards us.

"The KO-leaders abroad and their staffs have innumerable opportunities of constantly referring to Roosevelt's hate policy. They must use in this campaign all the existing contacts and they should try to open up new channels. We must point to the danger that Germany may be forced to cooperate with Russia. The greatest caution has to be observed in all talks and negotiations by those who, as 'anti-Nazis,' maintain contact with the enemy. When fulfilling missions, they have to comply strictly with instructions."

(sgd.) *Canaris.*

Another significant document, dated April 3, 1945, was written a few weeks before Germany's surrender. This document bears the initials of the Chief of the High Command of Hitler's Wehrmacht, Field Marshal Keitel, and of Grand Admiral Doenitz who, after the collapse, became the immediate successor to Hitler. The document, entitled "The Overcoming of the Catastrophe," stressed the point that Germany's final comeback can be made only in close cooperation with the Soviet Union. The most important parts of the document can be found in the appendix. In the conclusion the document says:

"A colossal bloc of world-dominating greatness, economic power, energy and numbers of population would be created from ocean to ocean.

"Not only would the danger of future wars for generations be eliminated from Europe but also from the double continent of Eurasia.

"The two great peoples, the Russians and the Germans, have extraordinary possibilities for development without collision of their interests.

"The chief emphasis in this bloc will shift more and more to the racially superior, intellectually more active and more energetic (people), that means to Europe.

"Thus, would be formed an alliance between the young Socialist forces against the old rotten entrenched powers of the West."

All these documents prove that the German High Command had drawn up a detailed plan in order to change defeat into victory. However, even before we had captured the files of the German Foreign Office, our State Department knew from countless intelligence reports that the Nazi High Command had planned from 1943 on, the transfer of German assets to neutral countries, and the organization of a large-scale underground network with its center outside of occupied Germany.

In every document the German thesis laid stress on the view that the military defeat in World War II has only to be regarded as an unhappy episode in the far larger struggle for world supremacy. In many documents it was stated that Germany had to go ahead in spite of all set-backs in her strivings for world conquest. In 1944, the French weekly *Combat* published a sixty-page memorandum, written by General von Stuepnagel, which examined the causes for German military set-backs in World War II and analyzed the conditions for victory in a coming war:

"In the next world war, which should take place within 25 years, the same mistake must not be made. The principal adversary will be the United States, and the entire effort must be concentrated against this country from the beginning . . . Our defeat in the present war need not be considered except as an incident in the triumphal march of Germany towards the conquest of the world, and from now on we must give a defeated Germany the spirit of a future conqueror.

"What does a temporary defeat matter if, through the destruction of people and material wealth in enemy countries, we are able to secure a margin of economic and demographic superiority even greater than before 1939? If we can succeed in doing this, this war will have been useful, since it will enable us, within the next 25 years, to wage another war under better conditions . . .

"Our enemies will grow weary before we do. We shall have to organize a campaign of pity designed to induce them to

send us needed supplies at the earliest possible moment. Above all we must hold on to the assets we have deposited in neutral countries. The present war will thus have been victorious, in spite of our temporary military defeat, because it will have been a march forward towards our supremacy. We have not to fear conditions of peace analogous to those we have imposed, because our adversaries will always be divided and disunited."

On December 13, 1944, the Associated Press reported that Himmler had started plans for an underground network at the end of 1943 and that the propaganda warfare was to be carried on "by some 200,000 Nazi followers in Europe and elsewhere." It was stated in the dispatch that many party members had prepared double identities and that the Nazi propaganda campaign was designed toward setting the Allies against each other.

Tracing the pitfalls of American post war policy planning in retrospect, and comparing the present situation with the German blueprint for resurgence, it becomes clear that the Germans planned it that way, though our State Department had the necessary information to foil the plot.

Many of the objectives toward which the German High Command in 1943-45 devoted its planning have been realized today. A very impressive account of the successful execution of the German post war conspiracy was provided in a secret memorandum dated September 1950 and issued by the German Geo-political Center in Madrid. The document in question, the full text of which is translated and published in the Appendix, constitutes a general analysis of the world political situation after the Korean War broke out. The importance of the document is shown by its directives pertaining to the diplomatic attitudes of the West German Republic in its dealings with the Western powers. There is no doubt that the Madrid document constitutes something like a blueprint for the foreign policy of the Bonn Government. In a larger sense, the Madrid Circular

Letter is a general staff plan for a new German approach to divide and conquer the world. Quoted below is a chapter of this document entitled "Has Germany an Obligation towards the United States?":

"Germany has emerged from the cold war as the chief beneficiary. That is our great asset in the ledger of the five-year period since Potsdam. For the first time in the history of nations it has been proven that clever propaganda, especially when it is camouflaged and directed through other channels, accomplishes far more than the mightiest army or the best diplomatic service of a smoothly-functioning state. It is a great mistake to assume that Western Germany recuperated so quickly thanks to America's sympathetic concern for us. We repeatedly encounter, especially as expressed by some politicians in Bonn, the idiotic opinion: 'But the Americans have put us back on our feet, should we therefore not show our gratitude?' To this our answer is as follows: The Americans put us back on our feet, not purely for altruistic reasons but for their selfish interests and on the basis of clever calculation. It must not be our worry but theirs if in the last resort their calculations prove to be abysmally stupid. We are not wholly innocent in the shift of America's postwar policy. For us the war has never stopped and, as is well known, in war every ruse is permissible. We cannot repeat too often that Germany never has ceased to carry on the war with political weapons and propaganda, with economic sabotage and other means. In order to protect Germany against total destruction of its military and economic potentials, as planned at Yalta, we blueprinted a bold plan and created a flexible and smoothly working organization which, during the first months of the war, provided the pre-condition for all the gains that by necessity emerged for Germany out of the chaos of the postwar period. All our calculations at that time were not fulfilled without a hitch. Some of our expectations proved faulty. We had to sail around dangerous cliffs and the German people had to suffer for a while even under conditions deliberately created by ourselves. It even seemed at

times as though every effort was in vain and that all our hopes had to be given up. Today, however, five years after Potsdam, we can look back with pride on our accomplishments.

"Future historians will one day reveal the great vision with which responsible leaders of the Third Reich created with confident determination those measures which subsequently smashed the united front of the enemy and made Germany again a much desired partner in a new politico-strategic alliance. And all this was accomplished at the time when German leaders had to go through the severe crisis of the oncoming defeat. By no means did the political and military leadership of the Third Reich skid into the catastrophe in an irrational manner as so many blockheads and ignoramuses often tell us. The various phases and consequences of the so-called 'collapse' ('Zusammenbruch') were thoroughly studied and planned by the most capable experts ('faehigsten Koepfen'). Nothing occurred by chance; everything was carefully planned. The result of this planning was that, already a few months after Potsdam, the coalition of the victors went on the rocks.

"The decision for a Western or Eastern orientation was influenced by the factors of Realpolitik. In the light of conditions prevailing in 1945, we could expect from only the West—or rather from the United States—moderate conditions for an armistice, measures of relief, and a sympathetic understanding. Only in America did there exist at that time a small but influential group who had not fallen victim to the hate and revenge outcry of the Jewish triumvirate Rosenfeld *-Morgenthau-Baruch, but had maintained in a well-concealed but consistent manner throughout the war its sympathy for Germany.

"The machinery which we had prepared so carefully in ad-

* The name "Rosenfeld" refers to the late President Roosevelt. It was frequently used by the Nazis, who tried to imply in their propaganda that the President was a descendant of a Dutch Jewish family.

vance had consciously brought about conditions and situations which after the collapse confronted America's political leaders with the choice of accepting chaos and Bolshevism throughout Germany, or adopting a constructive program that would save Germany and the whole of Europe. Such a plan and such a bold program could only be successfully carried out by a political schooling now proved to have been of paramount importance. When we take into consideration under what tremendous difficulties and dangers the organization had to work in an underground manner and directed from abroad without any protection or backing by any state, carefully watched and persecuted by agents of a revengeful enemy, then the successful outcome seems like a miracle. In order to bring the Americans back to reason and away from Potsdam, we organized chaotic conditions in a thorough and systematic manner ('haben wir mit gruendlicher Systematik das Chaos organisiert'). It was a subtle political resistance, seemingly unorganized and seldom visible, but nonetheless having a deadly effect. The peasants were delivering almost next to nothing to the cities; no coal was brought up from the pits, the wheels of industry were not turning, the people came near to starvation; the monetary system was disintegrating—there remained nothing for the Yankees to do but to give in and scrap the Potsdam program. Soon thereafter the Western Zone received food supplies, local self-government, extensive economic help, credits for currency reform, and, finally, broad political self-determination. Today we are on the last stage towards complete sovereignty.

"Through superb planning and disciplined use of the political weapon of quiet resistance, the German people have brought to nought the plans for revenge of the victors. By forcing the Americans to give in, the first broad cracks were caused in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. As a consequence, not only did the front of our enemy break wide apart, but the Soviets too were forced to abandon their mad program of destruction in Eastern Germany. Thus it was proven that the excellent political skill and remote control

of a well-trained people can score such great successes even after total military defeat as have never before been recorded in history. This could only have been achieved by the leaders of the Third Reich through superb planning in the realm of psychological and political warfare within the United States before and even during the war.

"Just as Clausewitz declared that war is merely an extension of action by other means, so the German people continued the war after the 'collapse' by propaganda and other means. Despite sacrifice and hardship, the German people won this political war along the whole front. It is our great asset in the ledger of geo-political schooling and planning that five years after Potsdam, the aims of our enemies have been abandoned, Germany's strength has been preserved, and the Fatherland can look forward to a revival rich in possibilities.

"The revival of Germany was not a gift of the Americans but exclusively the result of our own far-sighted planning. The first overwhelming success of this planning was achieved through our well-organized anti-Morgenthau campaign. We thereby succeeded in undermining Roosevelt's plans of revenge against Germany and created total confusion in Washington. By keeping Germany industrially strong and by gaining the support of influential senators and representatives in the American Congress for our propaganda against the dismantling of large industrial enterprises, we finally succeeded in preserving Germany as the leading industrial power in the heart of Europe. Thus the plans of Potsdam and Yalta came to nought and the period of the cold war began which developed into a struggle between the East and the West on the decisive question as to who should exploit German industry and within whose orbit Germany's industrial potential should be incorporated. In this way, Germany gained valuable time for further maneuvering. Thus, without a doubt, the correctness of our earliest planning was proved, which anticipated that orientation towards the West would open up great possibilities for the speedy overcoming of our military defeat. In 1945, orientation towards the East would

have been totally wrong. It could only have stirred up the West against us and, in view of the deep-rooted hatred of the Russians at that time against everything German, it would have brought common action of our enemies against us and would have spelled 'finis' to all our aspirations. Thanks, however, to our correct decisions, the situation has changed entirely today. We are now once again in the position to influence the turn of events—today we are again making history.

"Five years after Potsdam, the Yankees are stuck deep in the mud; they are now seeking the advice of our generals whom they formerly called criminals; they come pleading for our help against Russia. That of which we could never convince the world, namely; the injustice of the policy of revenge, was finally accomplished by the Americans themselves who, speculating on German help, have propounded the necessity for a revision of policy toward Germany. They have even convinced the French and the English of this.

"The helplessness of the Americans in the midst of this chaotic situation has caused such confusion that, barely five years after Potsdam, we have obtained as much as—according to the most optimistic calculations—we had hoped to attain in only ten to fifteen years."

Here is bluntly described how the Germans accomplished the "miracle" of a comeback. Today the same men of the Goebbels-Ribbentrop-Haushofer clique who charted the program to undermine the security of the Allies before and during the war now proudly boast in their secret memoranda how they succeeded in duping the U.S. policy planners.

[5]

Pattern of History

KEY LEADERS IN GERMAN POLITICS SHARE THE BELIEF THAT the future of the Reich can be secured only by close cooperation with the Soviets.

There is an historical basis for this view. Time and again the Germans have inflicted severe defeats on Russia's armies only to face disastrous consequences by the time the last gun had been fired. On the other hand, the Germans have discovered that cooperation with Russia has frequently turned to their greatest advantage.

On January 5, 1952, the Swiss newspaper *Basler Nachrichten* reported a general trend among German politicians to discuss the possibilities of closer cooperation with Soviet Russia. There is, said the paper, a steady withdrawal from a pro-Western

attitude and a growing friendly orientation towards the Soviet Union: "The German political leaders may have different ideas, but all are striving towards the same goal—to neutralize Germany and to establish the Reich once again as a great leading power."

The political and ideological concept that Germany must ally with the East against the West is a very old and deeply-rooted tradition in German foreign policy. It was an important factor in Frederick the Great's diplomatic schemes 200 years ago; it dominated the Iron Chancellor Bismarck's policy during the second part of the nineteenth century; it became the guiding idea of the policy makers of the Weimar Republic; it was Hitler's great solution for the opening of the Second World War, and it has again become the guidepost among leading political and industrial circles of the West German Republic.

Two centuries ago, when Prussia's king, Frederick the Great, faced certain defeat at the end of the Seven-Year-War, an unforeseen event saved the tiny Prussian State from total destruction. The death of Russia's Empress Elizabeth in 1762 brought Peter the Third to the throne. The new Czar, an admirer of Frederick the Great, ordered his armies which had already occupied Berlin, to quit the European coalition and fight on the side of Prussia. This decision laid the basis for a long-range Russo-Prussian alliance, which was climaxed in the first partition of Poland.

A second outstanding event in Russo-German relations occurred after Napoleon's defeat in 1812. General von Yorck, commander of the Prussian Corps in Napoleon's Army, opened friendly negotiations on his own initiative with the Russians, in complete disregard of the orders of his king. This so-called "Neutrality Pact of Taugoggen" was actually the beginning of the Russo-Prussian alliance that sealed Napoleon's fate in 1815. The "Spirit of Taugoggen" has never lost its attraction for German officers.

Friendship with Russia was the guiding idea of the Iron

Chancellor Bismarck's diplomacy during the second half of the last century. The fruits of that policy were wiped out in World War I by a change in policy dictated by Emperor Wilhelm the Second. But the German General Staff, fearing the loss of the war, pulled a master trick. In 1917, on Ludendorff's order, Lenin and 60 leading Bolsheviks were shipped in two sealed Pullman cars from Switzerland to Germany and released on the Finnish border with the assignment to undermine the democratic Kerensky government, break Russia away from the Allies and make a separate peace with Imperial Germany. The scheme worked well, but the German General Staff would never have dreamed that the same Bolsheviks would be able to create a tough military machine which, 25 years later, could withstand Germany's Juggernaut.

Not only did the German generals help Bolshevism in Russia; they also worked to build up the modern Red Army. In their desire to circumvent the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty, the Reichswehr, in 1920, made secret deals with the Red Army. German military experts and German armament firms erected airplane and tank factories in Russia, poison gas plants and laboratories for biological warfare. In turn the Red Army allowed German staff officers and special cadres the use of the military establishments in order to study tank warfare and tactical problems of modern blitzkrieg.

The tacit cooperation between Reichswehr and Red Army was soon bolstered by two important political pacts; the Rapallo agreement of 1922 and the Berlin Treaty for Russo-German friendship of 1926.

Main supporters of the idea of an Eastern orientation for Germany at that time were Reichswehr-Minister General Hans von Seeckt, who laid the groundwork in building up the modern German Army, and Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, the first Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic, who later became German Ambassador to Moscow. The idea of approaching Soviet Russia came up immediately after Germany's defeat in the First World

War, and significantly it originated in the minds of the Prussian militarists. We know today what happened in the first years of the Weimar Republic. We know that Soviet Russia greatly helped the rearmament of vanquished Germany after 1918.

From captured German documents, we are able to throw the spotlight on some hitherto unknown facts dealing with the close cooperation between German generals of the Weimar Republic and Soviet Russia. Back in 1921, even before the Rapallo Pact, a secret agreement for the production of armaments was concluded between the Weimar Republic and Soviet Russia. Ten years later, in 1931, General von Blomberg met with a group of Russian General Staff officers to celebrate the tenth anniversary of Russo-German cooperation. The honorary guest was Soviet Marshal Tuchatchevsky, who was later executed. Toasting the Russian Marshal, General von Blomberg said: "We Germans will never forget what the Soviet Army has accomplished for Germany during the past 10 years. I hope that in spite of all present existing difficulties our thanks will be expressed in deed. I drink a toast to the well-being and the future of the great and glorious Soviet Army and of loyal comradeship in arms for today and in the future."

As is well known, the Versailles Treaty had prohibited the Reichswehr from having any Panzer or air forces. German officers were accepted in the Panzer school of Kazan in Russia and there they received the training and experience they later used as generals of Hitler.

Together with the secret General Staff in Berlin, German big industrialists worked for the same goal. For instance, the airplane manufacturer, Junkers, was permitted to build a factory for fighter planes at Charkow, Russia.

This Eastern orientation of Germany was cemented on April 24, 1926, when the Russo-German Treaty was signed at Berlin. This treaty was a direct predecessor of the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 23, 1939.

Seen against this background, insiders were not surprised that

the Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939 was greeted with the greatest enthusiasm in Prussian officer circles. The goal of German military circles always was—and still is—the destruction of the Western powers, above all of Britain and the United States. This was the road they had prescribed to Hitler. The fact that Hitler failed, has convinced these Prussian militarists even more of the correctness of their original concept.

No wonder, therefore, that German militarists, diplomats and geo-politicians of today follow closely the red line of their old masters. It might be very timely to quote excerpts from a highly important and practically unknown German document, a secret memorandum written in longhand and initialed by General Hans von Seeckt. It is dated September 11, 1922, and addressed to the then Reich Chancellor, Dr. Joseph Wirth, leader of the Catholic Center Party:

“With Poland we arrive at the core of the Eastern problem. Poland’s existence is intolerable, incompatible with Germany’s conditions essential to life. It must disappear . . . With Poland falls one of the strongest pillars of the peace of Versailles, the hegemony of France . . . The restoration of the old frontier between Russia and Germany is the prerequisite of any reciprocal recuperation. Russia and Germany in the frontiers of 1914 should be the basis of a mutual understanding. What do we want from, in, and with Russia? What does the dreaded east-orientation consist of? We pursue a twofold purpose. First, Russia’s economic and political strengthening. By that we shall achieve our own strengthening, because we shall strengthen a future possible ally. Furthermore, we want to achieve—for the time being in a cautious and trying way—our own immediate strengthening by developing a Russian armament industry which will serve our own purpose in case of need.”

The foreign policy of the Weimar Republic was strictly carried out according to this blueprint. Years later, Hitler’s shrewd diplomacy, camouflaged by noisy anti-Bolshevik tirades,

followed this basic line of German orientation towards the East. Hitler renewed the Russo-German friendship treaty in 1933, he extended the Russo-German trade agreement in 1936 and he cemented those ties by the Berlin-Moscow Pact in the crucial month of August 1939.

A careful study of geo-political and Nazi literature should have easily convinced the statesmen and diplomats of other countries that Hitler blueprinted war against the West, but was concerned with safeguarding Germany’s back in the East. This scheme, plainly outlined many years before in *Mein Kampf*, was the pet idea of Hitler’s geo-political adviser, General Haushofer, and of many other Nazi leaders.

Count Reventlow, an expert on Nazi foreign policy, warned that Germany should never side with the Western democracies against the East: “Today, Russia is the counterweight against the West, inclusive of Poland, and a German foreign policy with vision could exploit this very effectively.”

Dr. Goebbels wrote in the early years of the Nazi movement to a young German Communist that “the day will come when Nazism and Communism will fight side by side the decadent powers of the West.” The Nazi party manual of 1933 advocated that Germany “by a close tie-up with Russia will free herself in the quickest way from her present untenable strategic position.”

In 1934 Hitler said to Rauschning: “Why should I not conclude a pact with Russia when, by doing so, I can improve our position? An alliance with Russia will be the last trump card in my hand. Maybe this will become the most daring gamble of my life. But we should not chatter about it in literary salons and we shall not show our hands too early. . . .”

Today, the old game is played all over again. Many of the former diplomats of the Weimar Republic, such as ex-Ambassador Nadolny, as well as the disciples of the Ribbentrop-Haushofer school, have taken the game up where Hitler had left off. The geo-politicians know that Russia, more than ever

before, constitutes the decisive drawing card in the poker game of German Realpolitik.

In the light of history, American diplomats could safely assume that Germany, after the defeat in World War II, would follow the pattern of dividing the East and the West and, after having exploited her favorable position in power politics, would finally line up with the East. That the Germans intend to give a repeat performance can be seen from the circular letter of the Madrid Geo-political Center, written in 1950:

"During the forthcoming months, Germany's foreign policy must be geared to a subtler exploitation of the conflict between the eastern and western blocs. Our aim in the immediate future must be to regain full sovereignty for Western Germany which will eventually result in the restoration of freedom of action to the whole of Europe. With accelerated speed we are approaching the point at which we must liberate Europe from American control. It is Germany's task to take the lead in this campaign. It is up to us to determine the method and the timing. . . .

"In view of the present political situation ('realpolitische Lage'), the policy of orientation towards the West has lost all meaning or sense. A conscious policy of neutrality, going hand in hand with close economic cooperation with the East, would, from a long range point of view, supersede a merely pro-Soviet orientation. The former would finally bring about our freedom, while the last would keep us in the status of vassals.

"We must not forget that Germany has always considered orientation towards the West as a policy of expedience, or one to be pursued only under pressure of circumstances. Such was the case in Napoleon's time, after 1918, and also after 1945. All of our great national leaders have constantly counselled the long-range policy of close cooperation with the East; thus, Frederick the Great, Count von Stein, Bismarck, von Seeckt, Brockdorff-Rentzau, and, in the past 30 years, all our leading geo-politicians. By the end of 1940,

Hitler's policy had run into a blind alley ('Zwangslage'), and the hard decision had to be made to ensure by means of the sword access to the gigantic sources of raw materials in the East, which Russia would never have delivered voluntarily, and without which we never could expect to force a show-down against the Anglo-American bloc.

"Our present policy must be to overcome the consequences of our previous mistakes. An emasculated Germany should never allow itself to be used as a spearhead in an attack against the Russian colossus. This would be an insane act ('Wahnsinns experiment') and would spell our final doom, whereas Germany as the exponent of European neutrality could gain far reaching concessions from the Soviets. As we have pointed out again and again, the Russians have no desire whatsoever to burden themselves with all the difficulties and complex problems of Europe; they would consider a neutral and well-intentioned Europe, exerting its influence also on the Arab world and Latin America, as the best solution.

"We must not let ourselves become befogged by Washington's stupid and meaningless slogans about the 'Struggle of Democracy versus Communism.' The so-called American democracy does not deserve the sacrifice of the bones of even a single German soldier. In the age of regimented and militarized economy, the babbling about democracy and so-called 'free enterprise' is such nonsense that we need not squander a single moment in refuting this American propaganda swindle.

"What Germany needs in the future is not democracy but a system of statecraft similar to that of the Soviet dictatorship which would enable the political and military elite in Germany to organize the industrial capacity of Europe and the military qualities of the German people for the revival of the German race and the re-establishment of Europe as the power center in the world."

Coming back to the Russian issue at the end of the circular letter, the Madrid document states:

"A correct evaluation of the Russian problem is important for Germany's future. World War II clearly proved that Germany was not in a position to mobilize the necessary manpower and the tremendous economic reserves to deal the knock-out blow which would have destroyed the Slavic world forever. Our surprising successes in the Polish and Western campaigns lured our political and military leaders into the belief that they could quickly overrun the Russian armies. And it was demonstrated anew how foolish it was to disregard the wise admonition of Bismarck who, throughout his life, warned us against making Russia our enemy. It will require the greatest diplomatic efforts to lull Moscow's profound distrust of us. The cold war has fortunately relegated the memory of Germany's march into Russia to the background far more quickly than we could ever have hoped. But we must not deceive ourselves; Moscow will not forget the Second World War so quickly.

"The present power position of the Slavic world is a geo-political reality which we must accept, at least for the time being. Germany's future policy should be the quiet penetration of Europe and must aim at consolidating our spheres of interest in Africa and Latin America. We should avoid as far as possible dangerous propaganda ventures with the expellees which might antagonize the East. Russia may one day be willing to yield or negotiate, but we must never let it come to a struggle for prestige."

It will be demonstrated in a later chapter that this blueprint of the Geo-political Center in Madrid shapes the basic direction for the long-range planning of Dr. Adenauer's foreign policy today.

[6]

German Realpolitik in the U.S.A.

AMERICAN OFFICIALS IN WESTERN GERMANY ARE SURE THAT the bulk of the German people are at present anti-Communist. Nobody can doubt the correctness of that observation, but the point is that those observers have entirely failed to grasp the real meaning of what the Germans call "Realpolitik."

A German, whether he is a Communist, Democrat, Conservative or Nazi, doesn't have to learn "Realpolitik." He is conditioned to it. He talks as a Russophile in the Eastern Zone, he is an Anglophile in the British Zone, he pays respect towards France under the Tri-color, and he is full of admiration for America under the Stars and Stripes. But when Germans from East and West come together, they will surely talk German "Realpolitik," as was the case when former Ambassador NadoIny came from the Russian Zone in the Spring of 1949

to talk things over with leading industrial, political and military Germans in the West or when Ex-Chancellor Joseph Wirth visits the East. There is nothing bad or amoral in German "Realpolitik." It is a national tradition in the same way as baseball is a national pastime for Americans. The difference is that baseball leads the American people to harmless outbursts, whereas the game of German Realpolitik ends every 25 years in a world-shaking blast which destroys millions of lives.

Here is an illustration of the workings of German Realpolitik: Toward the end of World War II, a book appeared in the U.S. which became a best-seller in the German-American neighborhoods of New York, Chicago, Cleveland and St. Paul. The title was *The German Talks Back*. The publishing house, Henry Holt, apologized in newspaper ads for presenting this "angry and incendiary book which . . . will prove infuriating reading to Americans." The author, Heinrich Hauser, a German newspaperman, tells us that the Germans have been "disgusted with Western civilization, the culmination of which was and is the United States." The Germans, Herr Hauser said, hate America for various reasons, among which is its reputation as a charitable benefactor and because it is the richest nation in the world.

According to Hauser, the Germans have no other choice than to go with the East. America, he says, "still cherishes strange illusions." There is no hope to build a democratic and capitalistic Germany, because "to restore a bourgeois Germany would be a little matter of a hundred billion dollars at the very minimum."

Believing that the American people would not spend a hundred billion dollars for a German comeback, Hauser predicts that the Germans will turn their hatred against America; that Americans will go down in history "as killers of innocent women and children and as harbingers of barbarism and chaos all over Europe," and that German patriots will never forget these realities:

"Four times we were on the point of winning the war. The first time was after the defeat of France, when we were on the point of forcing Britain to her knees. What saved Britain? Only the American supplies. The second time we almost won the war was when we were knocking at the gates of Moscow and of Stalingrad. What saved the Russians? Only the supplies from America. The third time was when we were about to crash into Egypt and make the Mediterranean a German lake. What saved the British that time? Only the military aid from America. Our fourth and last chance depended on the V-weapons and the atomic bomb which was under development. What spoiled it? The smashing of our industries by the Americans and the American-equipped British."

Hauser writes further that, full of "apocalyptic hatreds against the world of Western civilization and directed pre-eminently against the United States" the Germans, in their final despair, will turn to the East, and that Germany will soon become "the Queen on the giant chessboard of power politics."

Hauser ridicules the idea that Germany will again become either a capitalist or democratic nation. So long as American aid is forthcoming, he declared, the Germans will take as much as they can get—then turn to the East.

It is Hauser's contention that the Germans "must be provided with a dream powerful enough to justify the sacrifice of 8 or 10 million lives," and he adds:

"There is only one great ideology left which as a nation we have not yet tried, which therefore has not yet failed—Communism. If the Germans accept Communism for their new dream and ideology and do it quickly, they will be lifted almost overnight from the status of outcast lepers to the status of—allies of the biggest land power on earth . . . If one has to embrace Communism in order to get Lebensraum, what of it?"

This is the voice of German Realpolitik speaking through an anti-Nazi German. It is a voice that has many echoes. The temptation to play both ends against the middle induced even such a staunch anti-Communist as Friedrich Stampfer, former member of the German parliament, to employ the threat of German-Russian rapprochement. In December, 1944, when the Battle of the Bulge took place, he published an article in the *Neue Volkszeitung*, New York. He severely criticized the Western Allies for planning a long-term occupation, demilitarization of Germany and eradication of its war potential.

Stampfer, who was a top flight Social-democratic leader during the Weimar Republic, warned the West that, unless leniency was shown, the Germans would turn to the East. He wrote:

"There is a way out for Germany from total defeat and—we have to say it openly—the Western powers are pushing Germany systematically toward that way. Germany can change this situation of defeat decisively and at once by lining up with the only real power on the Eurasian continent, with Russia . . .

"Germany, even in defeat, can give many things to Russia: the open way to Hamburg and the Rhine, trained general staff officers, technicians, skilled workers, soldiers, warships, tanks, bombers and the most modern weapons of destruction. "Germany can bring about the final destruction of the French-British barrier, the liquidation of the British Empire and the end of the West European colonial rule. This would mean the establishment of German domination over Africa . . ."

Stampfer's bland assumption of Russo-German collaboration, together with Hauser's bitter anti-American prejudices, are natural progeny of the ever-recurrent Realpolitik.

Though Herr Hauser and Dr. Stampfer hurled their threats during the war, no protest came forth from leading German-American circles. Both men represented the "good Germans," both were staunch anti-Communists, but they were convinced

that, if necessary in the interests of Realpolitik, Germany would side with the Soviets.

In order to provide the reader with a better understanding of what "Realpolitik" really means to the average German, we cite several examples in the United States where Americans of German descent have always lived in freedom and where they enjoy to the fullest extent their national culture and tradition. Official investigators of United States Government agencies found that the many German-American societies and the 300 German-language dailies and weeklies have manifested a pro-German attitude that extended above the normal sentimental attachment to the old homeland. They have often regarded themselves as political outposts ("Vorposten") duty-bound to further the interests of the "Fatherland" in the United States.

After both World Wars, leading German-American circles conducted large-scale "whining" campaigns in order to rescue the Fatherland from the consequences of military defeat. Following their successes on that front, they resorted once more to the usual ruthless methods of German Realpolitik.

The war-crimes trials in Nuremberg have been branded in many German-language papers as illegal infamies. American statesmen are presented as the tools of Jewish revenge. According to these German-American papers, the war guilt was not Hitler's and the German generals' but Churchill's and Roosevelt's. Moreover, they have disseminated fraudulent reports which served to discredit the American Occupation.

For this outspoken pro-German stand, this press not only received the blessings of the Adenauer Government but was also praised in the circular letter of the Geo-political Center in Madrid:

"The discontinuation of the National-Socialist press after the collapse deprived us of the most important weapon for national indoctrination. The victors had tried to suppress every expression of national feeling. They filled the editorial offices of the licensed newspapers with Jews and traitors.

Nonetheless, there were some periodicals which—first abroad and then in the Zonen-Reich—did their best to fight courageously and frankly, sometimes in a cleverly camouflaged manner, for the national interests of Germany . . . Praiseworthy work was accomplished by the German press in South and North America.

"In Argentina, *Der Weg* and the *Freie Presse* have striven in an extraordinary manner to create a distinct political approach among Germans abroad, as well as in the Zonen-Reich.

"The German press in North America, especially the New York *Staats Zeitung*, proved of great value in battling the hate-psychosis and in its efforts to re-establish close German-American relations. There are also numerous small papers in the United States which, in the midst of the most intense German hate-wave, interceded bravely and fought with unbelievable courage for the resurrection of a united Fatherland."

When Dr. Paul Schwarz, the former German consul in New York and later the diplomatic columnist of the New York *Staats-Zeitung*, toured Latin America in the summer of 1947, he brought the good news from New York that the leading German-American circles in the USA had succeeded in carrying out a campaign of "enlightenment" and he boasted that, thanks to this crusade, the name "Nazi" would be forgotten within a few years. According to Dr. Schwarz, Germany had regained much of her former reputation and German-Americans had not only put an end to the idea of punishing Germany, but also were able to secure the help of influential circles in the United States for the rebuilding of Germany.

Dr. Schwarz told some Nazi officials and pan-German businessmen in Rio and Buenos Aires that, thanks to the close contact between German-American leaders and influential Senators and Congressmen, it was possible to lay the basis for a speedy revival of Germany's economy. "Even greater things

could be accomplished," declared Dr. Schwarz, "by coordinating and synchronizing the efforts of the German elements in all countries of the Western Hemisphere." But at the same time Dr. Schwarz visualized in his column in the New York *Staats-Zeitung* the hopeful development towards a Russo-German alliance: "The Soviets have able diplomats who might come forward some day with very reasonable suggestions. They might develop possibilities which could be profitable for the German people."

Dr. Schwarz also reminded his readers that one of the shrewdest diplomats of the Wilhelmstrasse, Ambassador Dr. Karl Ritter, had once told his friends after one of Hitler's fire-eating anti-Moscow speeches: "Germany needs Russia, . . . some day both will cooperate in spite of all the double talk with the Bolsheviken-Schreck. It serves only to gain alliances or to make hay in domestic politics."

The *Deutsche Sonntagspost*, Winona, Minnesota, declared in 1949 "even the greatest hate apostles of Russia and the most bitter enemies of Communism have never forgotten that it was to Germany's advantage when she was on friendly terms with Russia."

Since 1947 many German-language papers in North and South America have endeavored to pressure the United States with the veiled threat that if Germany were not fully restored to her former position of power, the German people would ally themselves with Russia. In 1949 the German-language paper *Buerger Zeitung* of Chicago published on its front page under a six-column headline "An Open Letter to Stalin." It was a most brazen example of how ruthless German "Realpolitik" can be. The author, Herr Bruno Fricke, is a former Nazi and Black Front Leader, and a political collaborator of Dr. Otto Strasser.

The *Buerger Zeitung* is an old and respected German language weekly that carries on its masthead the notice that it is the "Official Organ of the German-American Citizens' League

of Illinois." The paper boasts that it is the mouthpiece for the sentiments of 500,000 German-Americans in Chicago. It speaks for the German-American Citizens League and for the German Day Association which includes 91 German-American Societies in Chicago.

The Steuben Society, the leading pan-German organization in the US for years, uses the *Buerger Zeitung* for its announcements. Thus, in a respected German-American publication, which has its place on the extreme right politically, and has whole-heartedly given support to Senator McCarthy's anti-Communist campaign, the "Open Letter to Stalin" was splashed over the whole front page. And what did the letter say? It proposed nothing less than that Germany and Russia should form an alliance and smash the coalition of Western Powers. Addressing Stalin, the author writes:

"Your intelligence service will tell you who I am . . . Essential and important and interesting for you is only that I am speaking here as a representative of a great part of my Volksgenossen and that it would be good for you to know what millions of battle-trained men think today. This sector of the German people, namely the national sector which not only comprises former Nazis but everyone who feels for the Fatherland, is quantitatively quite noteworthy and qualitatively of decisive importance. Its components are the front-line-soldiers of both world wars and the over-whelming majority of our youth. Thus, its importance from the purely military point of view becomes clear, and this is one of the reasons why the opinions of these circles must be worthy of your consideration.

"In view of the imminent third world war, as well as in view of principle considerations, you are naturally very much interested in us Germans. We may be down materially, morally and ethically, nevertheless, and despite the dismemberment of our Fatherland, we remain with eighty million—the strongest people on the European continent. Whatever one

will tell you, we consider ourselves absolutely as a unity and nobody will drive these ideas from our heads—not for generations to come."

Stressing the importance of Germany's industrial capacity and the intellectual potentialities of the Germans, the writer explains that, after Truman's announcement about a Russian atomic explosion, "Europe's decisive role in a pending showdown" has become greater than ever before. Having obviously in mind a *German-dominated* Europe, the writer continues:

"You, Generalissimo Stalin, are probably much more conscious of the fact than the civilian governments in Washington, London and Paris, that the Western Union as well as the Atlantic Pact are nothing but an organization of military zeros around an Anglo-Saxon one."

Continuing, the writer comes to the key point of his letter by suggesting that if Stalin would restore German sovereignty, he could "win back the German peoples' fist":

"We Germans do not want to have anything to do with the West, with the Yankees, with their capitalistic exploitation and their political arrogance. We Prussians have always been closely associated with the Russians; we Germans return gladly to the traditions of Bismarck, Freiherr von Stein and Maria Theresa, and we as a politically trained people have never forgotten Lenin's intelligent words about the desire of cooperation between Germany and Russia. We are actually predestined for an alliance with Moscow, all the more so since mutual cooperation with the integrated bloc of the Soviet states has attracted millions of Germans, educated under strict discipline. Who could resist us if both our Reichs were united? What Napoleon did not succeed in doing, Truman will not succeed in either: the subjugation of the earth! Socialist Germany and Communist Russia together are invincible and thus our alliance secures the peace of the world."

This and subsequent articles which propagated a German-Russo alliance published in an outspoken anti-Communist paper in the U.S. neatly illustrates the essence of German "Realpolitik."

The authors, Bruno Fricke and Dr. Otto Strasser, are known as daring political plotters. In addition to their regular writings for the Chicago *Buerger Zeitung*, their articles have been published frequently in the German-language press in North and Latin America.

Some people say that the views of Dr. Strasser, Herr Fricke and others of the same stripes represent only the thinking of a minority. The fact is, however, that there were no articulate voices of protest among the 500,000 German-Americans in Chicago against this "Open Letter to Stalin." The *Buerger Zeitung* is read in the editorial rooms of dozens of other German-language papers in the USA, but there is no evidence that any other German-language newspaper, or any of the numerous German-American societies in Chicago for whom the *Buerger Zeitung* serves as an official mouthpiece, protested against this dangerous and open plotting. A sensational front-page feature like this "Open Letter to Stalin" could not have been overlooked by anybody, not even State Senator Charles Weber, the political bigwig among the German-Americans in Illinois, who utilizes the *Buerger Zeitung* as his political instrument.

The fact that the *Buerger Zeitung* could carry on a blackmail campaign in favor of Germany for years and even promote a Russo-German alliance against the West, without encountering any criticism from patriotic stalwarts, is proof of the extraordinary strong position of leading German-American circles in American political life. It is easy to imagine what would have happened if this "Open Letter to Stalin" would have appeared in the *Daily Worker*, or in a Hungarian, Polish or a French language paper in the USA. The "Open Letter to Stalin" would have been exposed under screaming headlines. Congressional investigation would have been going on for months under klieg lights, and our FBI would have gone into immediate action.

But nothing like this happens when German-American groups are engaged in promoting this kind of "Realpolitik."

Considering the possibility of a Russo-German tie-up and its ramifications in terms of our security, the question arises: What is the attitude of representative Germans on this subject both here and in Western Germany? We can turn to many sources, well-informed on the subject—such as the editor of the Chicago *Buerger Zeitung*—for a partial answer.

On May 11, 1950, the *Buerger Zeitung* published on its front page an editorial under the caption "Will Germany Side With Russia?" In this article, running over several columns, the editor quoted from letters which he had received from Germany from people of all walks of life "within one week." According to the editor, all of the letters were unanimous in favoring a German alliance with Russia. The editor states that many millions in Germany are discussing the question whether it would not be to the greater advantage of the Fatherland to side with the East than to go with the West. He quotes from a letter of a former Colonel who declared that in the eyes of leading German generals the revival of Germany creates problems which can more easily be solved under the Eastern pattern than under a democratic system. "Only an alliance with Russia," says the writer, "can free Germany from the eternal threat of the French and the British."

In another letter from a German politician, whose name is not given, it is stated that it is whispered in leading circles that Russia is willing to compensate Germany for its lost provinces in the East with huge territories in the West, such as Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and large parts of France. Other letters in the *Buerger Zeitung* stress the point that Germany and Russia have much in common and could get along well, and it was hinted that Germany, in maybe 50 years, will have another Fuehrer—a "Caesar—with the soul of Christ."

In an effort to prove his point, the editor of the *Buerger*

Zeitung quoted from a column by Karl H. von Wiegand who reported on February 15, 1950 in the Hearst press that German orientation is veering towards the East. Wiegand reported that on the occasion of his recent visit in Bonn, he was told that one-third of the deputies of the Western German parliament were privately recommending an Eastern orientation and that this number was steadily increasing.

During 1951 the trend towards Russia has gained momentum in Germany. The recent conversations of the former leader of the Catholic Party, ex-Chancellor Joseph Wirth, with high Russian officials and Pastor Niemöller's visit to Moscow gave new impetus to the movement to "Neutralism" and for the unification of Germany on Moscow's terms.

When the Moscow note of March 10, 1952 suggested German reunification and a national army, the reaction among the German-language papers in the USA was very much in favor of a deal with the Russians. As an example, we refer to an article by Father E. J. Reichenberger, published in the German-Catholic paper *Nord-Amerika*, April 17, 1952. Father Reichenberger states that the reunification of the Reich "cannot be achieved without the consent of the Russians." According to Father Reichenberger, Moscow's primary aim is "not the spread of Communism in Germany, but to make Germany an Ally." He comes forward with the following question:

"We cannot see the reason why Germany should not line up politically with Russia, especially after the Western democracies found nothing objectionable against Russia as an Ally. For Germany, the political question is therefore: From which side has Germany, in a long run, to expect the better bargain?"

Reminding the readers that Germany will never forget how the West "robbed German foreign assets, stole German patents and eliminated German competition on the world market," Father Reichenberger sees the "better bargain" with Russia, be-

cause she is able "to offer a market from the Elbe River far over to Korea."

Taking the line of the Madrid Circular Letter, Father Reichenberger says that Communism and Western Democracy are only different forms of vicious materialism which in the end will be overcome by the sweeping triumph of German "Weltanschauung."

It is noteworthy that this article of the well-known pan-German propagandist, who has a substantial following among millions of expellees in Germany, was reprinted in other German language papers.

Reports from Latin America make it clear that among the large German groups in Argentina and Chile, the feeling is also predominant that Germany should ally herself with Russia. This attitude is reflected in the scurrilous anti-American propaganda spread by such German papers as the *Freie Presse* and *Der Weg* in Buenos Aires.

Piecing the evidence together, analyzing the editorials of the pro-Adenauer press, and reading the reports of reliable American correspondents on the spot, one cannot help but conclude that America's position in Western Germany rests on quicksand. The Allies came out victoriously in World War II, but German "Realpolitik" is winning the peace.

[7]

The Geo-Political Brain-Trust

AS WAS PREVIOUSLY INDICATED, THE UNITED STATES WAS forewarned during World War II about Germany's secret plans to regain her dominant power. It was pointed out that Washington policy-planners could have prevented the Germans from carrying out this program. Germany's record after World War I should have served as additional evidence as regards her political and economic capabilities to undermine world security.

During the First World War the leaders of imperial Germany had preached the idea that they would need "Three Punic Wars" to destroy the British Empire and the United States. Hitler and the German war lords followed this concept when they explained to the German people that military defeat should not be accepted as the final judgment of history. In one of his

rare speeches during the war, Hitler told his faithful, on November 9, 1943:

"We shall never capitulate. We shall not give in at the eleventh hour. We shall go on fighting even after twelve o'clock."

Thus the German planners followed the time-honored principle that a lost war has to be continued by political means. "Defeats are simply lessons to be learned in preparation for the next and greater attack," declared General von Stuelpnagel in his memorandum of 1944.

The Netherlands' Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Alexander Loudon, a man with a deep knowledge of German history, stated in a radio address at the end of 1943:

"The Germans will do exactly the same thing they did in 1918. In case of defeat, the Nazis and the Gestapo will go underground in order to prepare for the next war."

This is exactly what the Germans did. They transferred their brain-trusts in geo-politics, in economics, in technology, and military science to Spain, Switzerland, and Argentina. When the Germans still occupied France, they organized a mass exodus of men, money and material across the Pyrenees. Files and secret formulae were shipped to Spain by the carloads.

The existence of a German escape plan was reported as early as January 25, 1943 by Burnet Hershey, foreign correspondent of the Hearst press, in a dispatch from Lisbon. He reported the "influx of Nazi officials into Spain and Portugal" and stated:

"Every talk I had with the Germans in Lisbon made that fact clearer. They may be defeated on the battlefield, as they were in 1918; but they expect to win again at the peace table as in 1919. Of course, they will sacrifice Hitler as they sacrificed the Kaiser; but the old gang—the generals, big industrialists, phony professors of mis-education about German race superiority—will try to go underground again to lay the eggs for another war of German conquest."

A year later, on January 17, 1944, *Times* correspondent Harold Denny cabled the following dispatch from Madrid:

"Heavy new increments of German agents have been pouring into Spain in recent days in an obvious effort by Germany to save what she can of a situation that has gone badly against her.

"A thousand Gestapo agents and other German representatives have appeared in Madrid alone in the past fortnight. Significant additions to the German population have been noted in other parts of Spain . . .

"They are not easy to deal with, for Germany has extensive commercial interests in Spain and many of these agents are here in the plausible guise of executives, technicians and lesser employees of these interests, as well as cogs in Germany's vast diplomatic, consular and propaganda machinery. In Madrid, spies swarm in the big hotels in such numbers that even casual visitors cannot help noticing them . . ."

On April 13, 1944, the New York *Herald Tribune* carried a two-column report with detailed figures from the records of the British Intelligence Service and the American Alien Property Custodian concerning the huge sums placed by high Nazi officials and industrialists in American and neutral banks. On July 19, 1944, the Office of War Information reported that "Swiss bankers are alarmed about the huge sums transferred recently by Germans to Swiss and Portuguese banks. . . . They are of the opinion that these money transfers will serve one day to finance the resurrection of the Third Reich." *Newsweek* magazine of October 19, 1944, reported that, according to diplomatic advisors from Buenos Aires, "German technicians and military experts are believed to be reaching the country incognito by devious routes." On January 15, 1945, *Newsweek* magazine declared:

"Many of the men Himmler sent to Spain and Argentina to carry out Nazi plans for postwar survival, carried passports under false names and later were reported dead in Ger-

many. All have had training in Nazi political methods and experience abroad in commercial and other posts."

In this way the Germans transferred thousands of experts, technicians, military instructors, political planners and propagandists to Spain and Latin America. Long before the war ended, a sort of geo-political general staff had been organized in Spain which operated on a world-wide scale from its center in Madrid. The German planners in their lush offices in Madrid, Barcelona and Seville are not burdened with administrative routine work as are their counterparts in Washington, Paris and London. They enjoy a luxurious life and they devote their entire time and talent to one task only: to resurrect a powerful German Reich.

The German Geo-political Center in Madrid and the other German planning agencies are well-camouflaged as commercial enterprises or as German relief organizations. According to recent European press reports (*Frankfurter-Rundschau*, February 23, 1952; *Die Nation*, February 13, 1952), the main centers of the Neo-Nazi set-up are located in Madrid and Rome. From here a huge network of activities is directed to Argentina and other Latin American countries, to North America, Africa, Asia, West and East Germany, and even to the Soviet bloc. More recently, another Nazi center was opened in Cairo to direct the anti-Western activities in the Arab world.

Before we analyze the strategy of the geo-political masterminds, it would be worth while to take a close look at what the Germans pride themselves on as their most formidable weapon. Geopolitik is described by the professionals as a new science of the relations between space and power. The roots of geo-politics go back to the "Heartland" theories of the British geographer Mackinder, which were later on developed by the organizer of the German geo-political school, Herr-Professor Karl Haushofer.

Before the First World War, Haushofer was known as a gifted officer. He was a fanatical pan-German who could and

would not accept the fact that Germany was defeated in 1918. When he brought his division back from France to Germany, he developed a detailed plan for Germany's resurrection which, subsequently, served as a master blueprint for German diplomats and industrialists. Haushofer recognized that with the Kaiser's flight to Holland, the Monarchy was dead and the German masses required a new symbol—a Fuehrer. He was one of the first backers of the Nazi movement, and helped pave the way for Hitler's rise to power. As a dominant figure behind the Deutsche Academy in Munich, the meeting place of Germany's elite, the General exerted a great influence on industrialists, scientists, and political leaders. It was Haushofer who sold the idea of the Fuehrer Staat to the ruling circles in Germany. Haushofer prepared the platform on the basis of which the plan could be carried out. His new science of "Geopolitik" was merely a term for the old pan-German theories of world conquest and "might is right." Geo-politics can be defined as "total science for total war." Geo-politics is concerned with many subjects including: physical geography, ethnology, military science, the husbanding of technological advance for military needs, exact information about economic and political conditions in other countries, the art of espionage and psychological warfare.

Haushofer once described geo-politics as the "most deadly weapon, a double-edged Japanese dagger in the hands of the expert." He compared his well-trained geo-political assistants and agents with "hungry crows sitting on the fence of world politics eagerly waiting for opportunities to plunder."

Before the end of World War II, this network of geo-political planning and leadership was dispersed strategically partly in Spain and Argentina, and also set up surreptitiously in Germany.

The Nazi headquarters in Madrid has been financed throughout the post-war years by treasure chests which had been brought to safety before the German collapse.*

* See "Hitler's Hidden Treasure," in *United Nations World*, April, 1952; and "Rebirth of the Nazi International," in *The Nation* of April 5, 1952.

For years it was known that the Nazi headquarters in Madrid operated an International organization called "Die Spinne" ("The Spider"). Other organizations are known by the names "Edelweiss," "Konsul," "Scharnhorst," "Sechsgestirn," "Leibwache," "Lustige Brueder," etc. The organization of the Nazi Elite Guard operates under the name "Odessa." On May 29, 1951, *Times* correspondent C. L. Sulzberger reported the existence of a group which had revived the Fascist International in various countries "from Malmo to Tangier, and from Rome to Buenos Aires."

There have been reports that Hitler's Deputy, Martin Bormann, "shuttles between Spain and Argentina trying to work for unity and cooperation among Fascist minded bodies."

Other Nazis involved in this underground work include: S. S. Colonel Otto Skorzeny, and the German Luftwaffe ace Ulrich Rudel.

According to the Madrid Circular Letter, referred to above, the German planners have never ceased their political warfare against the Allies. They admit that they had "blueprinted the bold plan and created a flexible and smoothly working organization," in order to safeguard Germany from defeat and to bring Allied post-war planning to nought. They boast that they were able to create total confusion in Washington and that they saved German heavy industry from destruction:

"By no means did the political and military leadership of the Third Reich skid into the catastrophe in an irrational manner as so many blockheads and ignoramuses often tell us. The various phases and consequences of the so-called 'collapse' ('Zusammenbruch') were thoroughly studied and planned by the most capable experts ('faehigsten Koepfer'). Nothing occurred by chance; everything was carefully planned. The result of this planning was that, already a few months after Potsdam, the coalition of the victors went on the rocks."

The geo-political planners in Madrid are convinced that only a politically well-trained nation will, in the end, become the master over all other peoples in the world. Accordingly, the Madrid Circular Letter stresses the paramount importance of the Nazi Weltanschauung ("World Outlook"):

"The great historical accomplishment which overshadows every other deed of Adolf Hitler was his decision, carried out with iron energy, to condition the German people into fighting for their great world political task. The necessity to educate a whole nation for total war had been recognized long before Hitler, but Hitler was the first one who tackled the tremendously difficult problem of getting a firm hold on the people and of organizing them into a unified movement on the basis of National Socialism.

"The training which the German nation received during the twelve years of National Socialist leadership has created a firm basis on which German world politics will be able to carry on again in the future. The National Socialist Weltanschauung furnishes the intellectual potential ('geistiges Potential') in the struggle for world supremacy.

"The future of the world will be decided by the conquering force of a political ideology. 'Democracy' is a wishy-washy term which has found no ear among the German people, notwithstanding the efforts made by the Americans for re-education. No German is willing to fight and die for democracy. The German people, well trained and steeled under national socialist leadership, are dominated by two sovereign ideas: the concept of a German Reich and Germany's mission of leadership in the world ('deutsche Fuhrermission in der Welt'). These two ideas have given our people a powerful driving force for the dynamic execution of their world mission. The mystical element and the religious tradition embodied in the concept of the Reich, sparks our political mission and is especially attractive within the Catholic world. Even after the collapse, the National Socialist Party continued to work in a camouflaged way ('getarnt') in dozens of seemingly innocuous societies and groups, in order to

keep alive and undiluted the National outlook of the German people. In the same way as many small brooks go toward making a mighty stream, the various nationalistic and radical groups in the Zonen-Reich carried out, almost without exception, worthwhile and powerful propaganda. Each of these groups had its special task and had to adjust its work in line with certain situations and circumstances. However, it was of chief importance to direct the underlying trend of the patriotic propaganda towards the same goal. The more diverse and unconnected these groups appeared on the surface, the less they were apt to arouse suspicion (of the Occupying authorities) that they were directed and influenced by a central organization.

"We have placed our confidential agents, observers, and representatives for special assignments in all groups and parties—even among Communist organizations and their fronts. The greater the number of organizations controlled and influenced by us, the more effective will be the results of our work . . .

"The convulsive effects of the military defeat have not broken the German spirit. The national tradition is carefully fostered among the youth and the veterans. The biological substance of the German people remained unshaken in its foundation. Our people are ready to be called upon for historic decisions. A nation which has lost two world wars in the short span of 30 years but is already again conscious of its future tasks, can never be defeated. National training and political schooling have conditioned the German people as a first-class instrument for the execution of world politics on a grand style. No other people on earth has such political maturity, fanatical faith, iron-clad willpower and flexibility in tactics—not merely to overcome defeat but also to start again from scratch. German tradition and belief in a world mission uplifts the whole German nation. Everyone feels within his deepest consciousness that the great national task—the struggle for world domination—will ultimately be crowned with victory."

The geo-politicians in Madrid have created an intimate tie-up with their former pals from General Haushofer's geo-political staff in Germany, with leading journalists and officials who served in Dr. Goebbel's propaganda set-up and with the diplomats of Ribbentrop's foreign office who are today shaping Bonn's foreign policy under Dr. Adenauer.

In a subsequent chapter we will provide the names of the men who operate today as the geo-political masterminds in Bonn. Among them are some of the old stalwarts of pan-Germanism under the Kaiser, there is the whole propaganda brigade which served the Nazis, and finally the geo-political disciples of Herr Professor Karl Haushofer who now pose as "Christian Democrats" in the Adenauer camp.

After the end of World War II, the State Department made no serious attempt to smash the German geo-political network. It is true that the then Assistant Secretary of State, Spruille Braden, endeavored to smoke out these conspirators but he was blocked at every turn. The policy of the Pentagon was decidedly unsympathetic with Mr. Braden's efforts and was reflected in the late General Patton's attitude that "Nazis are the same as Democrats and Republicans."

The main contacts of the geo-political general staff in Spain are with people in influential positions in Western Germany, especially in the Foreign Office of the Bonn Government. During a debate in the Bonn parliament on October 16, 1951, Dr. Adenauer admitted that 134 former Nazis who were once serving in Ribbentrop's Foreign Office, are now in the high echelons of the foreign service in the Bonn government. Other well-known Nazis and geo-political planners are today holding top positions on leading German newspapers and magazines. Thus, there is a steady stream of information and instructions flowing between the Madrid Geo-political Center and its collaborators in Western Germany and vice versa.

What is the long-range program of the geo-political brain-

trust in Madrid? A careful perusal of the Madrid Circular Letter reveals the fact that they see their main objective to be the maintaining of German and European neutrality if a showdown should come between the Soviets and the U. S. A. They visualize the creation of a united Europe under German domination and the build-up of a third power bloc. The Geo-political Center recommends a long-range orientation towards the East, which will subsequently open profitable markets to German industrialists. The Madrid circular clearly emphasizes why Germany and Europe should remain neutral in the event of war between the Soviet bloc and the United States:

"Not merely Germany, but the whole of Europe has been bled white and is not now in a position to act as a decisive factor in world politics. The aim of German policy, and that of Europe as a whole, must be to remain neutral in any new world conflict no matter the circumstances. This is especially important for Germany for she still has a long way to go until she can regain her political freedom and her economic strength to the fullest extent. Germany has exploited the tension between the East and the West to the utmost and she must continue her efforts in that direction. She must endeavor to influence discreetly the shaping of the future. Not only is it decisive how Germany acts in her own interests, but she in turn is also tremendously affected by the policies of the other European powers. England and France today are perhaps more dependent on the U. S. A. than the still occupied West German Republic.

"Europe, on the one hand, is today in an unenviable strategic position, but, on the other hand, it enjoys the advantage of being the geo-political center astride the Soviet colossus and the U. S. A. Present circumstances make it therefore necessary for Europe to be on guard against both sides in order to avoid being swallowed up by one of the two colossi. The dollar imperialism is certainly in no way less aggressive or reckless than communism. The British and French, al-

though former 'allies' and 'victors' feel the impact of that arrogant dollar diplomacy to a greater extent than we Germans whose sympathy they (USA) hope to gain . . .

"German foreign policy must be directed with a view to steering Europe clear from another world conflict. Conditions for such policy are favorable. The European nations long for peace. The self-interests of France and England categorically demand that a new holocaust must be avoided. The interests of the Vatican run along the same lines. Our paramount attention must be devoted to the preservation of German strength and its native potential ('Erhaltung der deutschen Substanz'). World political events could take such a turn that a situation may emerge in which Russia, North America and a great part of Asia may become the battleground for a third world war, whereas Europe might be spared. Were Russia to give a guarantee to the European countries that she would abstain from attacking them, then the whole of Europe could take a neutral stand in the event of a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. The prevalent mood in every country of Europe is against war, and in England broad masses of the people are convinced that the next war will be one provoked by America. If, therefore, we were to succeed in obtaining from Russia a guarantee that she would respect the neutrality of Europe, then the United States could be confronted with a similar demand, and the war could thus be confined to the territories of both great victorious powers and their vassals. In this manner, German strength ('deutsche Substanz') and the resources of Europe would be safeguarded against annihilation. Such an outlook may seem fantastic at the moment, but the realistic policy recommended ('Realpolitische Zielsetzung') is the only one which should be followed by Europe today. A war of exhaustion between Russia and America, in which Europe could be spared, would automatically result in the upsurge of a third power bloc. If the continent of Europe succeeds in preserving its strength, it would thus regain the leadership in the world . . .

"It must therefore be our supreme duty to place ourselves in the vanguard of the struggle to keep Europe out of any future war. If we succeed in this, we will surely gain the trust of the people and undisputed leadership in Europe, not excluding Britain. In such a roundabout way we would be able to establish the foundation for future world leadership. The world is longing today for the millennium. In the role of champion for peace, we would gain stature in world public opinion and create for ourselves an unshakable moral position. The propaganda against German 'militarism' would subside entirely, old charges would be forgotten and Europe would then be willing to follow German leadership. Such a policy can be pursued successfully, especially in view of the present attitude of the Vatican. The Pope is a realist in politics ('ist Realpolitiker genug') and knows well enough that, in the age of the Atom bomb, there is too much at stake for the Church and for Europe as a whole.

"The Atlantic partners will always be able to find an opportunity to evade their obligations by pointing out that the provocative behavior of the United States has foolishly brought about a conflict for which the Russians cannot be charged as the aggressor and therefore, all contractual obligations to help becomes void."

We will show from statements of the pro-Adenauer press that this plan for the betrayal of the U.S. has been adopted as the basis for the West German government's long-range foreign policy.

If we compare the thorough and detailed planning of the geopoliticians in Madrid with the program of our own policy-shapers in Washington, we must come to the conclusion that the Germans have once again shown themselves as masters in Realpolitik. Yet it is not that these German schemers were unusually smart in their planning; on the contrary, they are merely repeating the essentials of the old game which they had played after the defeat of 1918. The sad fact is that after Roosevelt's death

the geo-political amateurs in the Pentagon took diplomacy in their own hands and our State Department had not the courage to speak up. Due to our failure, Germany's star is rising again, whereas America is sinking deeper and deeper into the morass of a self-defeating policy.

[PART TWO]

"What can Russia win if she plays her trump card? . . . In order to jump out from her present isolation she can, exactly as the Rapallo Treaty did 30 years ago, place Germany as a protecting buffer between East and West. From the politico-economic point of view, she could repeat the old game for world power position by concluding long-term agreements with German industry and by reviving her trade with Germany. Thus, Russia might re-open the door to the world market."

EDITORIAL, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 15, 1952

"Western Germany should follow a policy of cooperation with the Western powers. But this must never lead to a situation in which Germany becomes the battlefield and the Germans the cannon fodder. . . . When, however, against all expectations and reasons, the Americans should start an aggression against the East, disregarding our determination and probably those of other Europeans to stay out of the war, then we should not be forced into participation of a war just for the reason the Americans had helped us in our rearmament. In such a case, the superior strength of Europe should then be automatically directed against any disturbance of the peace that comes from the West."

EDITORIAL, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Sept. 4, 1952

[8]

The German Problem of 1944

IN ORDER TO GRASP THE FULL EXTENT OF THE TRAGEDY WHICH has darkened the post-war affairs of the United States, we have only to compare the situation in which Germany found herself in the year 1944, with the political predicament in which we find ourselves today, or—according to the forecast of German political writers—that will confront us by the end of 1954.

From captured German documents, we know how the German High Command, in 1944, had reached a military and strategic impasse with every hope for victory gone. The Germans had made futile attempts to break up the Grand Wartime Alliance by offering, alternately, to the Russians and to the West a separate peace and even alliances. They even had the audacity to suggest that the West change sides and join together with a

"reformed" German government in a holy crusade against the Russians. As the captured documents reveal, the German High Command channeled proof about their secret negotiations with the Americans to Marshal Stalin through agents who were in contact with the German Ambassador von Papen. That was the cause for the serious discord between Moscow and the Western allies during the last months of the war. This discord found expression in the exchange of letters between Stalin and Roosevelt, in which Stalin bluntly charged that he had proof that American representatives indulged in secret political negotiations with Nazi officials.

Facing certain defeat in 1944, the Germans centered their political fire on the unity of the Allies, hoping that success in this direction would preserve their power for revival.

The German High Command had recognized, since 1943, that its traditional weapon, the German steam-roller, was not capable of overcoming Russia's military power. Thus they saw the necessity of switching over to political conspiracy. The many captured German documents, coming from such sources as Admiral Canaris, the Chief of German Intelligence, and from the Ribbentrop Foreign Office, speak for themselves.

The Germans hoped that they would find the necessary support in the United States as had happened after 1918. We must recall the fact that, in 1944, a small but vocal group in the U.S.A. had launched a "Salvage Germany" campaign. The "line" at that time was: The United States must give defeated Germany a chance and a helping hand; otherwise, the Germans will go Bolshevik and the whole German Schrecklichkeit plus Bolshevism would descend like an avalanche upon Western civilization. Of course, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his closest advisors were not frightened by such devices. Although this argument was rehashed in many forms in American newspapers, magazines and books, no one bothered to counteract this poisonous propaganda sowed by agents and dupes of the enemy. But today we know that this propaganda had its effect on a number

of high officials in the Pentagon and in the State Department who were frightened to such an extent that they desperately seized the idea to build Germany up again as a "Bulwark against the East."

Drew Pearson reported in his column of April 25 and 26, 1944, that the day after President Roosevelt was buried "a meeting was held in the State Department at which the policy of a hard peace for Germany was reversed by appeasers who proposed a new line." Thus we had, at the end of the war, two different blueprints for our post-war policy, an official one shaped under Roosevelt, and a secret one prepared by the Pentagon. The Roosevelt post-war program for a realistic treatment of Germany and friendly relations with Russia had been recognized as a sound approach by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The other plan, backed by a few influential men in the Pentagon, was based on the geo-political realization that Russia's dominating rule over the Eurasian "heartland" must be contested. Therefore, it would be a smart idea to establish Germany and Japan as strong outposts of the free world. The idea of a strong Germany completely disregards German realities, her historic past and the warnings of experts who had a profound knowledge of the German problem.

One of the strongest warnings came from Bernard M. Baruch, the elder statesman, who had an experience with German affairs going back over more than 30 years. During the First World War, he was the chief of our war industry and later he accompanied President Wilson to the peace conference at Versailles. The comeback of Germany's military power under Hitler made it clear to him that Europe was again on the road to disaster, and that the Western Hemisphere was in great danger. As early as 1938, Baruch urged the creation of an Atlantic-air-armada of 50,000 long-distance bombers to counterbalance the German Luftwaffe.

Baruch knew the German danger and he had learned a lesson

from the errors we committed in the past. He saw the key to the whole post-war problem in Germany's gigantic industrial apparatus, in her control of raw materials in Europe and her skilled labor.

Starting from the basic belief that Germany must never become a bone of contention between the East and West, Baruch demanded the prompt whittling down of Germany's military, industrial and scientific power. Aware of the traditional German trend to line up with the East against the West, Baruch foresaw that in an Allied tug of war to favor Germany, the West would in the end lose out to Moscow. Therefore, to him the settlement of the German question was the core of the peace-making. His program for a "sure peace" was based on four main points:

1. To "prevent the revival of Germany's warring might."
2. To "keep the Allies united in peace as in war."
3. To "keep America strong and adequately prepared."
4. To "create a higher human standard throughout the world."

"War must be displaced as Germany's chief business," declared Bernard Baruch before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in June 1945:

"No more important question will ever come before you than this one—of how to prevent the revival of Germany's warring might. It is the heart of the making of the peace. What is done with Germany holds the key to whether Russia, Britain, and the United States can continue to get along."

Mr. Baruch stated correctly that we cannot solve the economic problems of peace unless we take steps "to demilitarize Germany's traditional war economy." If this is not done, we "face the certainty that Germany will make a third try to conquer the world."

"Break once and for all Germany's dominance over Europe. Her war-making potential must be eliminated; many of her plants and factories shifted East and West to friendly countries. All other heavy industry destroyed; the Junker estates broken up. Her exports and imports strictly controlled; German assets and business organizations all over the world rooted out."

In the light of Baruch's program for Germany, we can measure today the failure of the Pentagon policy-shapers.

Baruch's plan for just punishment of Germany's entire warrior caste was as follows:

"Russia and other countries are entitled to labor reparations, particularly if they will include in their labor battalions the principal war makers—the Nazis, the Gestapo, the Junkers, the General Staff, geo-politicians, war industrialists, and war financiers—leaving the ordinary peasants and workers."

To those who declare that Germany is the industrial heart of Europe and that her de-industrialization would entail suffering for the whole world, Baruch answered emphatically: "To accept the view that the restoration of German industrial dominance in Europe is inevitable—something we can do nothing about—is to resign ourselves to the return of a new cave age."

In a memorandum dated March 18, 1945, Bernard Baruch, speaking about the planners and plotters, made a daring prophecy that after the war "the German general staff will be found hiding all over the world." His recommendation was to "send the schemers away" and let them do reconstruction work under inter-Allied supervision. Instead of adhering to Baruch's advice, the Pentagon organized "Operation Lustig" and brought many of the schemers as "experts" to the United States, providing them with comfortable homes, substantial salaries and for good behavior—American citizenship. When the Russians and the English did the same, the Germans recognized immediately that

the Allies were competitors for German scientific "know how" and there was hope that they could finally win the peace.

Judging from thousands of articles, editorials and letters to the editors of newspapers, it is clear that important sections of American public opinion throughout 1945 favored a realistic policy toward Germany. When the whining campaign for "poor Germany" reached its height, Major George Fielding Eliot wrote on June 27, 1945 in the *Herald Tribune*:

"Why shouldn't the German standard of living be lower than that of Germany's neighbors? Since when has it been considered an obligation of civilized society to see to it that a criminal, in the custody of the law, must enjoy every privilege, every luxury and every article of Lucullan diet which may be available to the law-abiding members of the community?"

When the Occupation Directive 1067, containing the Roosevelt program for Germany, was published, it had the full backing of American public opinion. This Directive had been kept secret for months by the Pentagon, because it ran counter to their program. The essential objectives of the Allies were stated in the Directive 1067 as follows:

"The principal Allied objective is to prevent Germany from ever again becoming a threat to the peace of the world. Essential steps in the accomplishment of this objective are the elimination of Nazism and militarism in all their forms, the immediate apprehension of war criminals for punishment, the industrial disarmament and demilitarization of Germany, with continuing control over Germany's capacity to make war and the preparation for an eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis."

Key American Occupation officials have charged that the execution of this Directive was systematically sabotaged by leading military figures.

Even General Eisenhower saw the necessity to give stern

warnings against those officers under his command who were not with their hearts behind this policy. Unfortunately he was unable to remedy the situation for soon afterwards he had to give up his command in Germany.

It is not true, as the German conspirators would like to have it appear, that the Americans do not know their way around in world politics. Under Roosevelt's guidance Americans found the right approach to tackle the German problem once and for all. If the Pentagon had not ditched the realistic post-war program of Roosevelt, the Madrid geo-politicians would not be jeering today at the "American Cowboys" who burnt their fingers in geo-politics.

America's Problem of 1954

WHAT WILL BE THE CONDITION OF THE WORLD BY THE END of 1954 if the blueprint of the Pentagon policy-planners is carried out completely? According to State Department experts, who had to translate the basic ideas of the military into practical diplomacy, Germany will become the strongest nation—industrially and militarily—on the European continent. In some high quarters, it has been contemplated that Germany might become the USA's main ally.

Germany, the planners say, will not only become the strongest military factor in Europe, but also a shining beacon testifying to the great achievements of American democracy. Western Germany is spoken of as the American "show-window" not only to East Germany but to all the other Soviet satellite nations in Eastern Europe. From here defection should spread into the Soviet

orbit until the Soviet regime has been sufficiently weakened to a point that would make it possible to overthrow the masters in the Kremlin.

Important sections of the German press, however, regard this as the daydreaming of a "very, very young nation" which has yet to understand the realities of world politics.

It has been stated repeatedly by our policy shapers that by 1954 we will be "over the hump." America will then have created "Situations of Strength" everywhere which will impress the Russians, then "everything will be fine." This of course involves the concept that Germany must play a decisive role in taming the Russian bear, and by Germany's incorporation in the Atlantic defense, peace will be preserved.

However, the future, America's future, looks quite different when seen through German eyes. Here is how the Germans describe the shape of things to come. According to the geo-politicians, Germany has the situation well under control. The Adenauer government is in the strongest bargaining position. Germany, "in the driver's seat," can wait and let the other fellows do the bidding. Washington has staked everything on its German gamble. When Chancellor Adenauer recently warned the Bundestag that the refusal to rearm would entail grave consequences, the Social Democrats laughingly shouted, "You know very well that the Americans cannot pull back."

The Germans expect us to do a job that they have repeatedly attempted through aggression, but were never able to accomplish: the unification of Europe or, as Washington policy planners like to call it—"The Shotgun Wedding."

The Germans, having instigated this long-range scheme, can rely on their inside knowledge that America will force France and the other European countries into a merger that will create a great European trading area. Thus, our policy will put Germany in the saddle, first economically and later on politically. In that way Germany will be able to gain command over the whole European continent.

An accurate analysis of German space-thinking and world planning was given long ago by an intelligent American observer who had an intimate knowledge of Germany's sinister political plotting:

"The Germans have a clear plan of what they intend to do in case of victory. I believe that I know the essential details of that plan. I have heard it from a sufficient number of important Germans to credit its authenticity . . . Germany's plan is to make a customs union of Europe, with complete financial and economic control centered in Berlin. This will create at once the largest free trade area and the largest planned economy in the world. In Western Europe alone . . . there will be an economic unity of 400 million persons, skilled, civilized white men, with a high standard of living. To these will be added the resources of the British, French, Dutch and Belgian empires. These will be pooled, in the name of Europa Germanica. . . .

"The Germans count upon political power following economic power, and not vice versa. Territorial changes do not concern them, because there will be no 'France' or 'England,' except as language groups. Little immediate concern is felt regarding political organizations . . . No nation will have the control of its own financial or economic system or of its customs. The Nazification of all countries will be accomplished by economic pressure. In all countries contacts have been established long ago with sympathetic businessmen and industrialists, and those who have been openly hostile will be punished by boycott.

"As far as the United States is concerned, the planners of the World Germanica laugh off the idea of any armed invasion. They say that it will be completely unnecessary to take military action against the United States in order to force it to play ball with this system. They point out that there will be no other foreign market for the raw materials and agricultural products of the United States, since these can hardly be sold in the Western Hemisphere. Here, as in every other country, they have established relations with

numerous industries and commercial organizations, to whom they will offer advantages in co-operation with Germany. Certain conditions will have to be met . . . The immense gold reserve of the United States will be, obviously, worthless. The international currency will be a managed currency, the German mark, and all external trade, will be based upon barter. This new world-wide complex will want raw materials, and will pay for them in manufactured goods. The United States will become an economic colony, for its economic independence will be lost. . . .

"South America will be conquered by business agents, not by guns. The plantation owners will be asked by the Germans whether they want to send their meat, cotton and raw materials to Germany in exchange for machinery, industrial material, automobiles, etc., or whether they want to be boycotted. Inasmuch as the chief market of South America is Europe. . . .

"They do not believe that the proletarian workers in any country will seriously oppose them—even if they could. They argue that the tendency in all democracies demonstrates that workers only want to eat and have work, and care nothing for national matters or for individual liberty . . . 'And,' they add, 'There is nothing that capitalists will not do, if profitable. Democracies have taught their people, workers or corporation chiefs to believe only in money.' And finally, only the master race, the Germans, will be allowed to bear arms. If, however, the United States wants to concur, all armaments can be radically reduced."

The foregoing analysis is taken from Dorothy Thompson's article "The World Germanica," published in the *New York Herald Tribune*, May 31, 1940. Nothing in this picture has changed. The strings are pulled by the same geo-politicians, the same Ribbentrop diplomats, and the same industrialists who are behind Dr. Adenauer, as they were once behind Hitler—all striving for the same goal: "The World Germanica."

Through the heroic efforts of freedom-loving peoples, Ger-

many's plans came to nought by 1945; but a few years after the bankruptcy of the "Thousand Year Reich," the Germans are nearer to their goal than they ever had been under the Kaiser or "Der Fuehrer." This time the Germans don't have to fire a shot, they hope to obtain control of Europe free of charge with the American taxpayer footing the bill.

It is a well-known fact that the Germans, after the failure of the First World War, tried to dominate European industry through a pre-war European steel cartel. The same tendency is evident today. Some diplomats believe that a marriage of convenience is possible between French and German interests by way of some cartel agreement or Schuman Plan, whereby France could limit German industrial production and check German aggressiveness. This idea will turn out to be an illusion.

Washington supported the Schuman Plan for entirely different reasons. Our planners see in a European steel and coal combination a first step towards the "integration" of Europe to be followed subsequently by the political unification of Europe in which Germany will play the leading role. The Germans, however, have quite different plans. Statements by Dr. Adenauer and his press reveal that Germany regards the creation of a united Europe as the first step in the direction of a Third Power bloc that some day shall become independent from the United States as well as from Russia.

Plans for a Third Power Bloc have been discussed in German geo-political circles for many years. It was an old pet idea of the pan-German school under the Kaiser and it became again the main strategic objective during Hitler's Third Reich. The unification of Europe was the undying hope of General Haushofer and his geo-political disciples.

What the Kaiser and Hitler could not gain with their war machines is now served to Germany on a silver platter by our policy planners in the Pentagon and the State Department.

A European Union with Germany as its strongest pillar will turn out to be the greatest blunder. Germany's industry will not

only dominate the markets in Europe, in competition with the British and the U.S.A., but it will also conquer additional markets in Latin America, Africa and Asia. The logic of events would bring inevitably economic and political rapprochement between a German-dominated Europe and the Soviet Union. Thus, we would have just accomplished what we are trying feverishly to prevent: namely, that Europe will line up with the East against the Anglo-American bloc.

The German scheme of changing defeat into victory envisages the following steps: After the establishment of a German-dominated Europe, a close tie-up will follow with a Peron-dominated Latin America. At the same time, the big German industrial combines will initiate an ambitious plan for the economic exploitation of Africa for which they expect great financial support from the United States. Having gained a foothold in Africa, Germany will create close relations with the nationalistic Union of South Africa, and at the same time she will buttress her friendship with the whole pan-Arabic world. Of course, that scheme can only be carried out after Germany will have established friendly political and economic relations with Russia. The agreement with Russia will also open the door to a very profitable trade with China and South-East Asia.

That a resurrected strong Germany will see her future task in the creation of a Third Power Bloc is clearly demonstrated by Dr. Adenauer's speeches and articles, in which he told his fellow Germans about the great advantages resulting from the acceptance of the Schuman Plan. In a signed article in the *Rheinischer Merkur* of May 20, 1950, Dr. Adenauer greeted the Schuman proposal as the first step towards the unification of Europe. A united Europe, he said, will "become the Third Force in the world, powerful enough to intervene successfully—in a decisive moment—to safeguard the peace." He then mentioned, as the main attractive feature of the Schuman Plan, the common European "long-range economic venture in Africa." There was not a word about the fight against Communism; instead Dr. Ade-

nauer had to stir German imagination towards the alluring idea of creating a great Euro-African Power Bloc.

Already under Hitler, the Germans had made elaborate plans for gigantic economic projects in Africa such as hydroelectric power stations, new waterways, great irrigation projects in the Sahara, the closing of the Mediterranean at the Atlantic side and the reclamation of a hundred million acres of new fertile soil. The Germans have never abandoned those long-range economic plans. German industrialists, engineers, and scientists have traveled year after year through Africa as "explorers" since the end of the Second World War. German newspapers and magazines feature regularly articles about the great possibilities in Africa. The book of the geo-politician Anton Zischka, *Africa—Europe's Common Task*, has become one of the German political best-sellers.

Since the days of the Kaiser it has been the fond dream of pan-Germans, industrialists, merchants, and ship owners to create a powerful German colonial empire, "Mittel Afrika." The Germans are today the most vigorous and energetic pushers of great African exploitation projects. These programs have also had the backing of our policy-shapers. For example, Mr. John Foster Dulles, one of the chief architects of our foreign policy, writes:

"The countries participating in the Marshall Plan have a total population of more than 200,000,000 and there is a high level of education and culture. That population is greater than the entire population of the Soviet Union or of the United States. . . .

"These 200,000,000 and more people have, in Europe and in their African colonial possessions, a great part of the world's natural resources. Coal, iron, copper, potash, phosphate, uranium, are only a few of the many mineral resources found in greatest richness within this Western-controlled area, a natural wealth that cannot be matched either in the Soviet Union or in the United States. . . .

"Why should an area that possesses such tremendous resources, human and material, be a poorhouse where the people live in a state of weakness which is frightening to them and their friends and a source of delight to their foes? "There is only one reason. All the great qualities and assets possessed *collectively* must be discounted because they are not possessed *unitedly*. Disunity alone prevents Western Europe from being a great—perhaps the greatest—distinctive area of spiritual, intellectual, economic, and military power . . ." *

What better means can be devised to satisfy German ambitions than to foster opportunities in Africa?

Under Dr. Adenauer, the great African project has become an electrifying concept such as the "thousand year" Reich under Adolf Hitler. The Adenauer government recently announced the setup of a "Deutscher Arbeitstab Afrika" ("German Planning Command Africa"), whose task is to "interpolate German industries into the U.S. \$8,000,000,000 Program for the development of Africa." (*Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, March 12, 1952.)

This \$8,000,000,000 development program is destined to lay the foundation for a gigantic armament industry in North and South Africa which will be run chiefly by the powerful industries of the German Rhine and Ruhr. As German newspapers have stated, the technicians and skilled personnel will be furnished by Germany. They expect to place thousands of their skilled men in key industrial and agricultural positions. The native population shall provide millions of cheap hands for the hard work. Hitler frankly advocated in *Mein Kampf* that "a truly great civilization can be built on the backs of enslaved subject peoples." Long before Hitler, a German scientist advocated:

"The German race is destined to impose its domination upon the entire world, to make the most of its natural resources

* John Foster Dulles, *War or Peace*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, pages 212-213.

and man-power, and to utilize the inferior races as slaves for its culture." (Dr. Ludwig Waltmann in *Politiische Anthropologie* [Political Anthropology], 1903, page 298.)

One of Hitler's accomplices, Count Reventlow, declared in 1931:

"There is no civilization without slavery. We must not forget a statement that is as courageous as it is true: civilizations can be created only with the help of Slavery." (*Weltkampf* [World Struggle], 1931, page 533. Monatschrift fur Weltpolitik.)

In a secret memorandum which was circulated a few years ago here in the United States among big business circles,* a plan was discussed to send the Negro population of the United States back to Africa for employment in such a large-scale development project.

Under Hitler the Germans tasted the sweetness of living on the backs of slaves. Today Africa, with its many millions of colored people, is their great hope. The Malan Government in South Africa has completely adopted the Nazi racist theories. There exist close contacts between the Nationalist Movement in South Africa and the German geo-political planners. Many large German industrial firms have established "branches" in Africa. The Adenauer Government is going to honeycomb the "Dark Continent" with a network of Consulates and representatives for the promotion of German trade. In this connection, it should be pointed out that as early as the Fall of 1950, the firm of Friedrich Krupp, whose head, Alfred Krupp, was sentenced at Nuremberg for war crimes, received an order of one hundred locomotives from South Africa. The New York *Times* of December 16, 1951 carried a dispatch which disclosed the fact that the Krupp interests were interested in acquiring and developing titanium-bearing mines in South Africa. This precious metal,

* The secret memorandum was first published in Kenneth de Courcy's *Intelligence Digest* of August 1947.

according to the *Times* report, is of strategic value and the "United States is reported to have found secret uses for it connected with atomic bombs and every effort is being made to attain mass production of the metal."

Africa has become the great hope for the Germans. Here a new power bloc is to be developed strategically located and relatively safe from Soviet Russia and America. Anton Zischka stated in his book on Africa:

"Our present position might be unpleasant but it has one advantage: The East is blocked to us and the process of Americanization has reached its dead-end. Thus, the only way open is to the South, to Africa."

The African plan is a vital part of a third power bloc which is mentioned above. It also encompasses Latin America and the Near and Middle East. It involves the ultimate control by the Germans of approximately 800 million people.

The Germans believe that during the next five to ten years, they will gain such tremendous economic strength and will make such great strides in scientific accomplishments that in a not too distant future they will be ready for a knockout blow against the Anglo-Saxon world. According to a dispatch in the Hearst press by Karl von Wiegand, published in the spring of 1950, a British General in occupied Germany ventured his opinion as follows: "Given the opportunity and necessary credits, Germany, with its extraordinary stockpile of brains, energy and working capacity, would within ten years become the most modern country in Europe, if not in the world."

During a Hearing in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, March, 1952, Senator Hickenlooper declared:

"I was told . . . that Europeans were not so fearful of German military resurgence but that basically there was running through the minds of each of those countries, the French, the British, the Italians and so on, the thought that if they took Germany into a comparatively integrated

Europe, in 10 years' time, Germany would own all of Europe; that is, the German industry, the German organizing ability, . . . would completely dominate the economy of Europe, and the rest of them would be more or less economic satellites of Germany within about 10 years' time . . . Within 10 years, they will have obtained by peace what they could not obtain by two wars . . ."

German planners expect a severe economic crisis in England and in the U.S.A. within the next few years. If such an economic slump comes, it will have a terrific impact on the Anglo-Saxon power position in the world. The Germans are confident that, under such conditions, the British Commonwealth will begin to disintegrate and the United States will be torn to pieces in a turbulent domestic crisis. At that moment a German-dominated Third Power Bloc will have its chance to make another bid for world mastery.

A decade ago American foreign policy was determined to help the European nations in order to remain free from German overlordship. Today our policy has been reversed. It is usually believed that the stronger Germany becomes, the better will America be protected. The Germans think differently on this score. Everyone who has followed the so-called reputable German press, the middle of the road and the pro-Adenauer papers, such as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Deutsche Zeitung*, Stuttgart, *Christ und Welt* and other papers, will find ample proof that Germany is only waiting to become sovereign again, of course with American help, and then turn to Russia for decisive bargaining. Even Chancellor Adenauer himself has declared that he will never allow Germany to become a battlefield and that German rearmament would strengthen his bargaining position with the Russians.

German geo-politicians predict that we will be confronted with the greatest difficulties in 1954-1955, when in Europe the cry for peace will be irresistible. We will then arrive at the crossroads of American armament policy. A German-dominated

Europe will declare "Ohne Mich," and Russia will also manifest loudly her intention for peace. At that point the U.S. will have reached a blind alley, with a huge armed force and all her industries geared for war. The complex situation will plunge America into a turmoil of confusion and a powerful and sovereign Germany will pull all the tricks and devices to drive the United States to the brink of economic and political disaster.

This is how the German geo-politicians in Madrid see America's future for 1954:

"The higher the difficulties pile up for the Americans, the more favorable become our prospects for successfully overcoming our defeat. The Yankees are willing to pay a high price for our help. This is clear from all confidential reports which we have obtained from circles close to the American High Commissioner . . . How should Germany proceed diplomatically in the present situation? It is openly stated in Washington that Europe cannot be defended without German help. The Americans are becoming insistent and we must give them some hope, but we must at the same time point to the fact that the German people are hesitant and not inclined to defend Europe so long as Germany is treated as a defeated nation. By constantly squeezing concessions out of the victors, we can best prepare the way towards the re-establishment of our Wehrhoheit.* During the coming weeks and months we must extract the utmost in concessions. We will therefore not be able to avoid making promises . . . But there is a difference between mere promises and such commitments as would bind us irrevocably. We must ultimately remain free in our decisions towards all sides, even if we are obliged for reasons of expediency to agree formally to such obligations. We should reap all advantages but never commit ourselves . . . The fact that the Americans would now like us to join them in the defense of Europe

* "Wehrhoheit" is the German term describing a country's exclusive prerogative to determine the size and disposition of its armed forces.

and become their ally will thereby enhance our bargaining power with the Russians. The Americans have lost the peace, the cold war, and their entire future, but they are not as yet aware of it. After the failure of their amateurish policies in Asia, the Americans will one day experience a far more painful and devastating smash-up in Europe . . . We should grab a few more billions from the Yankees' huge dollar-chest and then kick them out or simply hand them over to the Russians. A few little hints and threats would perhaps make them scam in time . . . The strategy of breaking the chains of our enthrallment ('Fesselsprengen') is sometimes more daring and dangerous than the most dashing feat in war. We could, for instance, visualize that through secret negotiations with Moscow a situation would be brought about whereby the Yankees could overnight be eliminated as a power factor in Europe . . . Economic difficulties will one day plunge the United States down from its present dizzy heights. Such a catastrophe can be brought about through crafty manipulations and through artificially engendered crises. Such maneuvers are routine measures which have already been employed in international power struggle and will be used again and again as long as economic rivals fight for power positions and markets in the world. It is quite conceivable that America, weakened by a depression, will one day seek support from a resurrected Germany. Such a prospect would open tremendous possibilities for the future power position of a bloc introducing a new order in the world."

If we should ever come to face the dreadful decision of war, the Germans have already hinted which formula they will use in order to evade the Atlantic Pact obligations:

"The Atlantic partners will always be able to find an opportunity to evade their obligations by pointing out that the provocative behavior of the United States has foolishly brought about a conflict for which the Russians cannot be charged as the aggressor and therefore, all contractual obli-

gations to help become void." (From the conclusion of the Madrid Circular Letter.)

The leading geo-political paper in Western Germany, *Christ und Welt*, stated in an editorial that a strong German-dominated Western Europe could make the following offer to the Kremlin:

"Continental Europe would break away from the Atlantic Pact if the Soviets agree to withdraw their forces behind the Pripet-Marshes and release not only the Eastern Zone of Germany, but the whole of Eastern Europe into the European Union. A Western Europe standing on its own feet and possessing its own powerful army . . . could afford to carry out such an independent policy because it will have the strength of a third power." (*Christ und Welt*, December 27, 1951.)

Dr. Adenauer stated the same idea, only camouflaged by a little diplomatic restraint:

". . . A federated Europe will become a Third Force in the world, not as strong as Russia or the United States, but powerful enough to intervene successfully—in a decisive moment—to safeguard the peace . . . Germany has again become a factor with whom others will have to reckon in international affairs . . ." (*Rheinischer Merkur*, May 20, 1950.)

Up to now developments have run smoothly according to the German timetable. American blueprints look fine on paper but in the reality of world-politics they have resulted in Germany's revival, and at the same time brought America nearer to a dead end. If this development should continue, Germany will become a threatening world power again but the United States will reach—by the end of 1954—the same blind alley which the Germans faced in 1944.

A Frankenstein Monster Again?

TWICE WITHIN A GENERATION A COALITION OF NATIONS fought and defeated German militarism. When the German military machine collapsed at the end of World War II, the Allies resolved that Germany must be rendered harmless once and for all. Today, we are on the way to resurrect, for the third time, a powerful German military machine.

A great part of the German plans for a comeback have been realized. Politically, the Germans are again power drunk and inflated with the old superman ideology. The old Nazi leaders and reactionary militarists are coming to the fore again. The arrogant spirit and the abusive language of German political writings give convincing proof that the Allied denazification program failed completely. The United States High Commis-

sioner in his report on Germany (December 1951) noted the emergence of an "increased number of extreme rightist and ultranationalist organizations." All those groups propagate, more or less openly, Nazism. They do not differ materially, says the report, in the propaganda against capitalism, in "their theories about a governing elite, their use of mysticism, their contempt for democracy, their preoccupation with war guilt theories and their desire for Germany to play the role of a bystander in the East-West struggle." The report of the High Commissioner admits that the highest ranking officers of the former German Wehrmacht are back in politics again, organizing the veterans and agitating among all nationalist groups and parties. The trend towards a rabble-rousing nationalism runs through the whole German political structure:

"Unhappily, most of the established political parties have also been stocking the merchandise of nationalism. Individuals or circles, and in a few cases even the controlling elements of an entire state political organization, have expressed highly nationalistic sentiments, either out of conviction or as a vote-getting device. Even some Federal Ministers have not been above such actions. They seek to draw the followers of the extreme rightist forces or to prevent losses of their own, by attempting to appear as nationalistic as the extremists . . . The use of the extreme nationalist narcotic creates the need for larger doses. Worse, the users must ultimately find that they cannot subsist on talk alone but must resort to some action to avoid decline. The consequence of such a course, if long continued, must be general disaster . . ." (Report of the United States High Commissioner, *December 1951.*)

In spite of the many alarm signals, United States policy-shapers still have not been awakened from their complacency and illusion. These officials really feel proud of what they have accomplished towards the resurrection of Germany. They will work like beavers to finish what still remains to be done in order

to create the new Frankenstein monster—of course, as a “bulwark against the East.”

The beginnings of Germany’s return to power have been partially hidden from public view. They go back to the days when Roosevelt was still alive and had to defend his German policy against roadblocks of the Pentagon and some circles in the State Department. The men who, after Roosevelt’s death, became more and more influential in formulating our policy on Germany were, in the first few years of Occupation, concerned with the safeguarding of Germany’s industrial potential and, since 1947, with the gradual mobilization of her manpower. This desire to change defeated Germany into an American ally was discussed more and more openly as early as 1946. This was the reason for the constant pressure on President Truman to oust Secretary of State Byrnes, who at that time suggested a four-power agreement for the control of Germany for 40 years. When General Marshall became Secretary of State and George Kennan Chief of the Policy Planning Division, the Pentagon planners obtained full sway for the carrying out of their blueprint.

Since 1947, reports of these plans had been leaked out to the press as trial balloons in order to influence American public opinion. On March 31, 1948, columnist John O’Donnell wrote in the Washington *Times-Herald*:

“. . . We are now about to make military sense in Germany. Despite denials from some sources, we have drawn up plans to reactivate some of those tough fighting German Panzer and SS divisions, give them plenty of food and first-rate American equipment and let them, led by American officers, fight the rear-guard action when and if Pal Joey decides to send a few Commie armies against the MPs and non-combat service troops we have now dispersed in pathetically thin lines all the way from the Baltic to the Mediterranean . . . Years and years ago, we pointed out that FDR was backing the wrong horse in this war—that the continent of Europe, so far as sternly isolationist Amer-

ica was concerned, was better off under Germanic rule than under Joe Stalin . . .”

That the re-establishment of an American-equipped German army was not a daydream of an unrepentant pro-Axis propagandist can best be seen from the following report in the well-informed and conservative *U.S. News* of July 30, 1948:

“U.S. military officials in Germany are talking in terms of a re-building of the German army as an offset to Russian strength in Europe. This talk is causing a rather sharp reaction in France and among other countries in Western Europe.”

This was followed up, on August 6, 1948, with a few other interesting items:

“U.S. Military men, who have been shaping U.S. policy in Germany, favor rebuilding a German military force as an offset to the Russians. The military attitude is that the Germans are more ready to take on military obligations than are the French, who are slow to make serious moves toward rearmament . . . Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, is complaining privately that those who are shaping U.S. policy in Germany are trying to build a U.S.-German front.”

The policy of reviving Germany as a military factor evoked, at that time, bitter criticism among leading newspapermen and columnists in Washington, and it stirred fear in France and in England. Walter Lippmann wrote on July 19, 1948:

“Though our German policy is in fact the determinant of our whole European policy, and will be decisive for peace or war, it is notorious that it has not been made by the President, or by Secretary Marshall, or by the so-called ‘policy-makers’ but by General Clay and General Draper, and in the Pentagon . . .”

Before the Western German Federal Republic came into being in 1949, secret negotiations had been conducted between the

Pentagon and German politicians and ex-Nazi generals on the question of rearmament. Dr. Adenauer, who became the first Chancellor of the Bonn Government, had such confidential talks on rearmament as early as 1948. In a recent press conference he declared that in 1948 he asked General Speidel to prepare a secret report dealing with the question of German remilitarization. The Adenauer-Speidel memorandum of 1948 became the basis for the subsequent discussions in Washington, Paris and London on the advisability of German rearming. The negotiations were carried on with great secrecy due to the fact that public opinion in the United States as well as in Europe was overwhelmingly opposed to any form of German remilitarization.

In 1949 the Pentagon showed great eagerness in forcing the German rearmament issue ahead regardless of the political consequences. The second half of 1949 was characteristic of the great confusion in which demands for quick German rearmament changed alternatively with official denials of such intentions. It will be remembered that in the Fall of 1949 Dr. Adenauer, who had then just become Chancellor of the new Republic, had given press interviews in which he suggested the rearming of Germany. After the Chancellor had asked for a new Wehrmacht with 25 German divisions, he stated a few weeks later, on November 24, 1949, that it is "the earnest determination of the Federal Government to maintain the demilitarization of the Federal territory and to prevent by all means in its power the re-creation of armed forces of any kind."

It was the opinion of the Pentagon that the time was ripe to condition the American public with the idea that Germany must be rearmed. There appeared in all leading magazines articles discussing the problem of German rearmament. The following quotations are taken from the reliable *U.S. News and World Report*:

"Generals and admirals heading U. S. armed services, in private, are far less enthusiastic over the idea of giving weapons to European nations than they are in public. Mili-

tary officials of this country are not too sure that the French, Belgians, Greeks and some others could resist Russia effectively. They find the German potential more interesting." (*August 12, 1949.*)

"Question of a German army of 25 divisions, as privately urged by influential Germans, is to be postponed. It's too hot to handle now." (*September 16, 1949.*)

"George Kennan, No. 1 brain truster in the State Department, has a new idea that the U. S. had better put its faith in Germany, rather than in France, as the bulwark against Russia. Mr. Kennan's view is that France never will regain her old position of leadership in Western Europe." (*November 18, 1949.*)

"Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, signalled a vital turn in U. S. policy when he traveled to Germany to promise things to the Germans, instead of having German officials, representing a defeated nation, travel to a meeting with U. S. officials to ask for favors, hat in hand. Original U. S. plan to turn Germany into a sheep pasture is revised into a secret plan to rearm the Germans into a powerful nation." (*November 25, 1949.*)

"Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, is embarrassed by the way Senators and former officials are talking about rebuilding a German Army. Gen. Lucius Clay, retired Military Governor, started the talk with a remark that Germany might contribute some troops to a Western European army. Senators picked up the tune with the result that French, Belgian and other governments are upset." (*December 2, 1949.*)

"Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of Western Germany, is crossing up high Allied officials in Germany with his open talk about rebuilding of German military power. That subject was supposed to be kept under cover." (*Dec. 30, 1949.*)

Along with the propaganda for German rearming, there was constant pressure in a certain section of the American press to make Germany a partner or ally of the U.S. It was suggested that we cease supporting the French and British. Even Senators like George of Georgia, and Thomas of Oklahoma, pleaded for the strengthening of Germany militarily. *Newsweek* magazine reported on November 28, 1949 that an influential group in the Pentagon urged the re-establishment of a German Wehrmacht: "The group feels . . . the U. S. must rely on Germany as the main source of continental manpower." Two days later, on November 30, Arthur Krock reported in the *New York Times* that plans were pending for the re-establishment of a German army. On December 12, 1949, *Life* appeared with an editorial, "The Rise of Western Germany," which declared that four and a half years after unconditional surrender, "the resurrection of German power is the foremost fact of Europe." *Life* demanded an "end to the official double talk that obscured the German problem." The editorial declared that sooner or later "the Western Germans are going to be rearmed, or they are going to rearm themselves," and came to the conclusion: "What is on the way is the re-creation of a German army under German command. Nothing else, and nothing less."

This type of propaganda for rearming Germany had the desired effect—it conditioned the American people into accepting the Pentagon thesis of German rearmament. On the other hand, however, it created fear and distrust among the former victims of German aggression in Europe, and it made the German political leaders and militarists cocky in their negotiations with the Western powers. The reaction to this semi-official "line" created such fear among European peoples that the President, Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Johnson, General Bradley and others had to come forward with solemn assurances that German rearmament was not in the cards and not contemplated for many years to come.

The year 1950 brought the war in Korea. Again organs of

public opinion returned to the theme of remilitarizing Western Germany. However, even at this late date leading government officials denied again that such plans would be carried out. When the Schuman Plan was announced it was declared that the economic integration should be followed up with the creation of a European army including a substantial manpower contribution by Western Germany. The developments in German rearmament during 1951 and 1952 are recent history.

It is noteworthy that all earlier plans of the Western Powers, especially the limitations on Germany's contribution contained in the Pleven Plan, have been dropped. Under the pressure of the Pentagon, most conditions and demands that the Adenauer Government and the German ex-generals had brought forward during the past three or four years were accepted by the Western Powers.

Today it seems as though the United States Government fears to refuse Germany's demands. This is indeed a far cry from the year 1945 when we still had the situation in control and the Germans seemed to respect the power of our strength and prestige.

The agitation of the Pentagon for German rearmament and the often-heard cry "without German help we are sunk" placed Dr. Adenauer and the German militarists in a powerful bargaining position. If the Germans had really feared a Russian attack, one would have expected them to volunteer their help without our prodding. However, it was we who sought Germany's help and it was this immature behavior that placed the Germans, as Walter Lippmann stated, "in the driver's seat." Thus Dr. Adenauer knew that he could squeeze U.S. diplomats or the High Commissioner like a lemon.

What price have we paid up to now for a German rearmament contribution that will not even materialize within the next year or two? What price have we paid for Germany's "ghost army"? It is known from the record that the State Department, which had little to say as regards actual functions of the occupation in

Germany, gave Mr. McCloy a free hand in building up Germany as the mightiest bulwark of the free nations in Europe. After the Bonn diplomats were reassured that the Americans were "on the hook," they went ahead with their blackmail diplomacy and pressed for everything they wanted. We will show in a subsequent chapter how insidiously Chancellor Adenauer worked out a "manipulated opposition" in order to frighten the U. S. High Commissioner into submission.

In 1947 and 1948 when the German generals and the Adenauer geo-politicians had been fully informed about the Pentagon secret plan for Germany's remilitarization, they formulated the price and the conditions under which they were willing to play ball with the Pentagon. When Adenauer, in 1949, became Chancellor of the Bonn Republic, these conditions of the German militarists were officially announced and they became the basis and the guide-post for all diplomatic dealings which followed over several years.

As early as 1948 we had completely dropped our de-Nazification program. From nearly 4 million Germans who had been found chargeable under the law, we selected only a few hundred cases in which war criminals had to stand on trial. Up to April 1948 approximately 2½ million Nazis had received amnesty without trial. The rest enjoyed the same magnanimity a year later.

After de-Nazification was scrapped, the second and third German demand followed: an end to the dismantling of German surplus heavy industry and the freeing of all convicted war criminals. To the second demand, the USA yielded in 1949, and the third condition—the freeing of all war criminals—was gradually carried out in 1950-1951. The remaining few hundred war criminals are expected to go free in the near future.

Along with this policy, most economic and political restrictions have been dropped. Indeed, atomic research and experiments on super-modern weapons are allowed and the German militarists, the geo-political schemers, the Ribbentrop diplomats,

the Goebbels fire-eating agitators, and the Streicher disciples of anti-Semitism are enjoying a Roman holiday.

The main lever the Germans employ in order to get rid of all Allied controls is the demand for "full equality," which means the re-establishment of Germany's sovereignty, so that they will be completely free to shape foreign policy according to the requirements of their special interests. As we will demonstrate later on—by quoting from the Adenauer press—it means that a Germany which has regained its full sovereignty will finally open the door to close cooperation with Moscow. Here again it becomes clearly visible that the Adenauer diplomacy has painstakingly followed the blue-prints of the geo-political schemers in Madrid.

All the pampering and coddling by the U.S. has not been sufficient to satiate the appetite of Dr. Adenauer and his generals. In spite of all the agreements that Germany should be the last on the receiving end in regard to American relief, the former enemy got the lion's share in dollar grants and in relief. The Pentagon and the State Department have not dared to make public the full bill which the taxpayer has had to foot during the seven post-war years. In this connection, the *United States News* reported on September 14, 1951 that the U. S. poured into Germany 9 billion dollars and that "the Germans took it for granted." In contrast, Washington policy-planners have constantly placed France, our ally and a victim of German aggression, in a disadvantageous position.

This policy on the one hand is partially responsible for the demoralizing effects which are today so visible in French political life, and on the other hand it is responsible for the re-Nazification and re-militarization of Germany. The record shows that under constant German blackmail the French and British diplomats have had to acquiesce to every German demand brought forward first by Dr. Adenauer and then suggested and pushed through by American negotiators.

No wonder that the French people became more and more embittered so that the middle of the road parties have become the constant losers and that the election shows a trend towards the extreme right and left. The French people see the open betrayal. They are horrified by the thought that German militarism, after its total defeat, can stage a comeback for a second time. The French still remember the German conquerors ruling with a hard hand when they shot hostages by the hundreds, when they plundered and looted their country and shipped Frenchmen by the thousands as forced labor to Germany. They remember Prussian militarism as the monster and the German conquerors as the barbarians:

"In such a war—full of indescribable atrocities—there will be no longer any victors or vanquished, but only survivors and those whose names are stricken from the list of nations . . . The elite lies torn to pieces and poisoned on the battlefields. The survivors, a mob without a leader, demoralized, broken in body and mind by unspeakable horror and suffering and by terror without end, are at the complete mercy of the victor . . . It is irrelevant how many remain alive. Fifty million trembling Fellahs are no more difficult to subjugate than five; for many million times zero still makes zero."

(*Deutsche Wehr, official organ of the German General Staff, June 13, 1935.*)

The French remember this too:

"If the world looks upon Germany as the disturber of peace, it does so from its intuition that this approaching German super-man will disturb one thing: the peaceful rumination of the satiated, who are content with a life which is merely a digestive process."

(*Colonel Wulf Bley, Wehrpflicht des Geistes, [War Service of the Mind], 1935, p. 58.*)

And the French remember this voice long before there were "Nazis" in Germany:

"It is necessary that our civilization build its temple on mountains of corpses on an ocean of tears and on the death cries of men without number."

(*General Count von Haeseler, in 1893.*)

And the French remember this pan-German voice under the Kaiser:

"War must leave nothing to the vanquished but their eyes to weep with. Modesty on our part would be pure madness."

(*Tannenbergh, Greater Germany—The Work of the Twentieth Century, Leipzig, 1911, page 304.*)

The French, with their intimate knowledge of German military tradition, instinctively fear that German rearmament will bring about the re-emergence of German aggressiveness. In recognition of this fact, the *New York Times* recently warned in an editorial:

"We are not going to rewrite our histories to expunge one line of German guilt or the foul deeds that Germans performed, in some ways among the most horrible in recorded time. Germany may one day be forgiven for those crimes, but the crimes themselves will never be forgotten."

(*New York Times, September 17, 1951.*)

The French still feel the burning shame of the Frenchmen who became collaborationists of the Nazis, and traitors to their country. And now come the Washington policy-shapers and arrange a "shotgun wedding" whereby "Marianne" should "voluntarily" espouse herself to the same Nazi generals.

The following newspaper item, taken from the front page of the *Wall Street Journal* of February 15, 1952 is symbolic of the

profound distrust which the French feel toward a remilitarized Germany:

"FLARE-UP IN FRANCE . . . U. S. DIPLOMATS ARE WORRIED

By A. E. Jeffcoat

Staff Correspondent of the Wall Street Journal

"Paris—in the great marble chamber of the French National Assembly this week, ushers helped a crippled concentration-camp victim named Georges Heuillard down the aisle and onto the dais.

" 'We survivors of the last war swore not to allow the revival of German militarism,' shouted Monsieur Heuillard, now a legislator from one of the government coalition parties. 'I don't want my sons to serve alongside the butchers of their father. I beg you—don't trust Germany.' The entire assembly was on its feet in a second, amidst an explosion of applause."

French fears are shared by the other peoples of the Western community. The French and British have correctly stated that a strong Germany will by no means be a reliable Germany. They remind us that it was a strong Germany under Hitler that, in August 1939, concluded the Berlin-Moscow Pact which helped precipitate World War II.

Competent observers are of the opinion that a German-dominated European army will create a wave of opposition among the European peoples reminiscent of the period of the Nazi occupation. If Russia ever attacked a free and independent Europe, they would find themselves in a hornet's nest. The free spirit of the Swiss, the French, the Dutch, and the Yugoslavs would not submit to a Russian occupation. However, with Germany as the new master in Western Europe, the free nations would not only lose enthusiasm to defend themselves, but might even turn to the Russians for "liberation" from the rule of the Germans. Thus a remilitarized Germany may spell the doom of freedom and democracy in Europe.

European peoples wonder why American policy-shapers are so

insistent about the revival of a powerful Germany. To them it would be more sensible, and sounder for American security, if the military power of the French, British, Scandinavians, Italians and the Yugoslavs were strengthened.

They are convinced that only in this way can Western Europe be saved from German or Russian domination.

“Uncle Sam Must Pay the Bill...”

THE ADENAUER-PENTAGON PLAN FOR EUROPEAN REARMAMENT has a different meaning to the Bonn Government than it does to the Pentagon. The Pentagon still clings to the illusion that a German-dominated Europe will serve as a bulwark against Russia, whereas the Germans regard their rearming only as a stepping stone from which they can attain an independent position of power.

Skillful propaganda has told us again and again that the French are weak and unreliable, that the British are unwilling to fight and that all other European nations do not count—there remains only the Germans. Thus, the agreed policy is to make Germany really strong. First, there was talk of a German “contribution” of only five infantry divisions, then the figures

rose rapidly, like the mercury in a thermometer, to ten and twenty divisions. Now 30 to 50 German divisions are mentioned. Of course, there is not even one German division in existence, but this does not prevent Dr. Adenauer from gaining more and more concessions on the basis of his ghost army.

It has been clear to those directly responsible for the European rearmament program that the sums involved will place a great strain on the European economy. In this connection, the *New York Times* carried a series of articles (May 21-25, 1951) on the economics of Western European rearmament wherein it was bluntly stated that “Europe can’t bear the cost of rearmament.”

Little light has been shed on the sums which will be required for this project although a detailed Associated Press Dispatch from Lisbon (February 23, 1952) reported that the Atlantic Council “unanimously approved a master economic program” for a three-year defensive build-up against Communism:

“The program calls for tapping Western taxpayers for 300 billion dollars to build the anti-Communist armies—a sum, planners believe, which can be scraped together without bringing economic ruin.”

Though the Secretary of State has since denied the authenticity of this report, the fact remains that the rearming of Western Europe in the next few years will cost untold billions of dollars. It is the general feeling of European statesmen and has been hinted in the press frequently that the United States must shoulder the major burden of these expenditures. This view is shared by the Germans, who declare that they are unable to raise more than one to two billion dollars annually for defense. This plea of poverty comes with ill grace when it is recalled that the Germans were only too happy to work, sweat, and pay taxes for the rearming of Hitler’s Wehrmacht.

Let us see from newspaper dispatches and articles what Germany expects in the way of financial contributions from the

United States for her rearmament program and the expansion of the basic industries upon which the rearmament program must rest.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from Bonn, of December 2, 1951, Western experts have "estimated the first year's cost of arming twelve German divisions at fourteen billion dollars." That sum is for the first year only, for the equipment and setup of six Panzer divisions and six motorized infantry divisions.

In addition, a new German Air Force is planned by the Germans with approximately 2,000 modern jet fighters and bombers and Luftwaffe personnel of a hundred thousand men. The investment for this new aircraft industry and the cost for the Luftwaffe will amount to many billions of dollars. That is not all. The Germans have come forward with demands that America should pay for the required investment to expand their basic industries, a sum which is estimated at three to four billion dollars. The last sum is needed for the increase of coal production and other basic materials. In regard to the strategic armament industry, Dr. Adenauer and his military experts have frequently declared that it would not be advisable to create a new armament industry in the Ruhr. He has, therefore, suggested tapping the riches of strategic raw materials in Africa and creating there, with German technicians and American financial help, a new armament industry for the support of European defense. The initial sums needed for this gigantic venture in Africa have been estimated by German technicians to be between 20 and 40 billion dollars.

In the Adenauer press there recently appeared many articles dealing with the financial cost of European rearmament. The *Deutsche Zeitung* in Stuttgart of December 22, 1951 published a three-column article in which the question was brought forward why "at so late an hour and in a rush for the solution of political and military problems, the financial experts were

finally called in to look at the reverse side of the coin: The cost of European rearmament." The article stated that the sums necessary for continental rearmament are so "fantastic" that only one thing seems sure: "The financial requirements for continental defense go far beyond the economic potential of the European partners and, therefore, there remains only one way out—the Americans have to carry a great part of the burden."

The Frankfurter *Rundschau* published in January 1952 a series of four articles analyzing the initial investments for European defense in the first year. The result of the inquiry was that "for the first year an investment of 35 to 40 billion dollars is necessary to cover the expenses for the equipment for the first 43 divisions of the European army."

From these discussions one can readily imagine how high the cost will be if the NATO forces in Europe will gradually be increased to 80 or a hundred divisions. A hundred divisions are the minimum that German military experts have declared are necessary for an effective defense of Europe. On the basis of the figures mentioned above, the total sum necessary for the complete setup and maintenance of the European defense system reaches astronomical proportions. A substantial portion of the U.S.A.'s contribution to European rearmament will go to Germany. Where shall the money come from? The Frankfurter *Rundschau* answers: "Uncle Sam will have to continue in the role of the rich uncle from America."

Dr. Adenauer has frequently pointed to the great accomplishments of Germany's revival since the collapse of 1945. The Circular Letter of the Geo-Political Center in Madrid boasted that Germany had become "the chief beneficiary of the cold war." Now Germany is on the way to become the super-profitier of the European armament boom. Recent press reports reveal that Germany contemplates the build-up of a cadre-army of five hundred thousand men with the latest equipment and an air force of two thousand modern fighter planes. According to the official German news agency, 100 billion D. Mark will

be spent during 1952 for the strengthening of the defense of Germany, which includes the creation of a German armed force and the build-up of allied forces in Germany. A reading of the German press indicates that the main portion of this sum will have to be paid for by the United States.

Nobody knows what top-level American officials have promised to the Germans. Yet, one fact can be relied upon: There will be no German divisions until the Germans receive billions of dollars. The military experts and the industrialists behind Dr. Adenauer are realists. They remember that Hitler's industrial investment plus the rearmament outlay of 1933 to 1939 represented an equivalent of approximately a hundred billion dollars. That armament was sufficient to overrun Europe, but it was not enough even with all the additional resources of the conquered countries to defeat the Russians.

The enormous sum required for the build-up of German Armed Forces takes on added significance when one considers the fact that we are living in an inflationary period. Moreover we must take into account the additional expenses arising from the more complicated equipment used today by the military.

The Germans are well aware of the staggering costs of modern warfare. That is the reason why they wait to see whether Uncle Sam will be willing to "pick up the check." The West German magazine *Der Spiegel*, January 2, 1952, discussed the financial requirements for European defense. It came to the conclusion that the cost for European rearmament is so tremendous that the United States in all probability cannot fulfill her promise to rearm the Atlantic Pact partners. The article stated:

"The system of limited dollar injections will bring no solution to the pressing economic problems of Europe and the additional task of European defense."

It seems strange that figures and details of the NATO budget are widely discussed in the German press whereas a virtual

news-blackout exists in the United States in regard to the vital question: "How much is the European Rearmament going to cost?"

It is a fact that leading Washington officials dealt evasively with this important problem when they were queried before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March and April 1952. The 800 printed pages of the hearings, mainly containing the statements of Acheson, Harriman, Lovett, Draper, and their chief assistants, show that these top officials hesitated to discuss the hot question regarding the extent to which European rearmament will drain the purse of the American taxpayer.

The Western European nations, altogether, raise annually 12,000,000,000 dollars for their armed forces. It is generally agreed that the economy of the European countries is already overstrained and that some of them labor under the burden of heavy military commitments in areas outside of Europe. Thus it becomes obvious that our NATO allies are unable to raise the tremendous sums necessary to carry out the Lisbon Program of equipping 50 modern divisions and 4,000 combat aircraft. The sums necessary for building up an effective deterrent against 200 Soviet and 50 satellite divisions with 30,000 aircraft and 60,000 tanks are so far out of all proportions to our normal concept of budget figures, that Washington officials quite naturally hesitated to touch this sensitive point.

Walter Lippmann, in his column of May 27, 1952, reported on the basis of information gathered in Europe that "radical measures" are necessary to make our global policy work:

"For the policy of these agreements can be carried out only if the United States makes a very considerably greater military and financial contribution than it is now making to the global alliance . . . The real question is whether after our election the American Congress, this one or the next one, will underwrite the measures which will be required in order to make the policy workable."

In view of the foregoing, what may be anticipated in three or four years after the United States has financed the rearming of Europe in which a resurrected Germany will be a cornerstone? Here again the answer is given in the German press and by Dr. Adenauer. The pro-Adenauer weekly, *Christ und Welt*, the leading geo-political mouthpiece in Western Germany, published, on November 1, 1951, a long editorial in which the thesis was expounded that Dr. Adenauer's policy aims at the creation of a strong Germany as the main pillar in a United Europe. The editorial, which explained the long-range view of Dr. Adenauer's foreign policy, came to the conclusion that the Germans "as the most dynamic among the nations" will gain immensely through the unification of Europe and will thus enhance her bargaining position towards Russia. A few weeks later, on December 27, 1951, *Christ und Welt* envisioned a strong Western Germany that could make, in the name of a United Europe, an offer to the Kremlin as previously indicated.

The same idea that a strong Germany could make a deal with Stalin in order to free Eastern Germany was expressed by Count von Rechenberg in the session of the Federal Parliament in Bonn on October 17, 1951.

All leading German newspapers have pleaded for a moderate approach in Germany's foreign policy towards Russia. They have sharply rejected the ideological concept in Washington's global policy for the very reason that it might draw Germany into a showdown between East and West. The thesis of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Deutsche Zeitung*, *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, and of many other papers, is that Germany must do everything in its power to avoid an armed conflict, and do everything possible in order to arrive at a friendly understanding with Moscow.

"Without the consent of the Russians," stated the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of November 6, 1951, "the re-unification of Germany is impossible." The editorial emphasized the fact that the Germans and Russians have to live peacefully

together and it suggests that the Russians, in order to be reassured, should have "the right of regular inspection of the strength of the German armed forces."

One of the leading geo-political schemers behind the Adenauer policy, Herbert von Borch, the editor of the monthly, *Deutsche Aussenpolitik*, pointed to the fact that it was Marshal Stalin who, on May 8, 1945, in the midst of the German collapse, issued a manifesto to the German people in which he gave assurance that the Soviet Union does not intend to dismember Germany. Von Borch declared that within a few years Germany will reach the peak of rearmament and that this will be the turning point in ending the cold war and in reaching a general agreement with the Soviet Union. This significant article was published in *Das Ganze Deutschland*, December 22, 1951.

The weekly, *Der Fortschritt*, in Essen declared in an article of January 18, 1952, that the strategy of the German foreign policy must be:

"Never burn the bridges towards the East; gain time and keep on with diplomatic negotiations."

There is one aspect which needs some explanation. When the Western Powers discussed the issue of German rearmament in the fall of 1950, the Kremlin hastened to send notes of sharp protest to France and Britain claiming that such rearmament will constitute a violation of the Potsdam Agreement and also of the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Alliance, which was concluded in December 1944. The Russian press was filled with threats and it was stated that any German found in uniform would not be regarded as a combatant, but would be shot as a partisan. Since the beginning of 1951, the Russians have stopped this kind of propaganda. The question arises—what facts have changed the Russian attitude? They still attack Dr. Adenauer and his policy as part of "Wall Street Warmongering," but they are no longer so bitter in their denunciation against German rearmament. Now, when the plans for German rearmament have

grown larger in size, why is the remilitarization of Western Germany not the same burning issue as it was in 1950?

Some statements of Chancellor Adenauer and his press may give a hint of what has happened in the meantime. In the great debate against "Neutrality" during 1951, Dr. Adenauer stated that he had "good reasons to believe that Russia would not interfere with the planned rearmament in Western Germany."

How could Adenauer be so sure of Russia's intentions in the beginning of 1951? Did the Bonn Government or some Western industrialists or geo-politicians receive reassurances from Moscow? Had Dr. Adenauer advance knowledge of Russia's note of March 11, 1952, which removed Russia's objections to German rearmament? Is this a part of the Moscow scheme to let the U.S. sink dozens of billions of dollars into Europe? Are the Russians already informed that West German policy will end with a somersault à la Rapallo of 1923, or in a Berlin-Moscow pact as in 1939 under Hitler? The respected and leading West German magazine *Der Spiegel* reported on August 31, 1950 that two schools of thought were pondering the German problem in the Kremlin. One school recommended a preventive action to stop rearmament in Western Germany, whereas the other preferred a resurrected, rearmed and independent Germany that could serve as an effective buffer between Russia and the Anglo-American world. The Soviet note of March 11, 1951 seems to indicate that the latter group had won out. Yet there is additional proof: *Christ und Welt* stated in an editorial on German foreign policy on November 1, 1951 that Pieck and Grotewohl, the rulers of the East German zone, had given assurance to the Bonn Government that they could carry on their dealings with the West, if they only would continue their negotiations with the East.

Of course, Chancellor Adenauer understands his role thoroughly. It is his duty to keep the "American Cowboys" in line and he does so by frequent allusions to the great part that Germany will play in warding off the Soviet menace. Yet, at the

same time, he keeps his fellow Germans in line by reassuring them that his policies will not incur a Soviet attack. Whatever Dr. Adenauer's plans with the Russians might be, there is unanimous agreement among German politicians that some day the Germans must sit down with the Kremlin and come to an agreement on the most important problem of German reunification.

Such negotiations will be the beginning of a general discussion of Europe's position as a whole towards the Soviet Union. When that moment arrives the Germans will sit again in the driver's seat—as the strongest nation economically, politically, and militarily on the European continent, nourished with billions of dollars from the USA.

If that happens, and the Germans predict that it will happen within the next three years, then our predicament will be the same as that of the Germans in 1944: the world will hate us, everyone will be our enemy, we will have strife and turmoil within our own borders—and Germany will be the laughing victor.

This is what they mean when they say in the Madrid Circular Letter of 1950: "The Americans have lost the cold war and the entire future, but they are not as yet aware of it."

[12].

“Ohne Mich”

DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS AMERICAN CORRESPONDENTS in West Germany have frequently reported that large sections of the German people show a great unwillingness to rearm. The common expression of this German feeling in regard to another war is: “Ohne Mich” (without me). This, of course, does not express a pacifist’s attitude but rather it emphasizes the fact that the average German is horrified by the thought that he might have to fight the Russians again. “The memory of the Russian campaign still haunts like a nightmare all those who took part in it” reported Sonia Tomara in the *Herald Tribune* of May 18, 1950. An important factor in the German refusal to fight against the Russians is the experience of the horrors of two long-drawn-out wars. German officers and

“Ohne Mich”

soldiers alike are most reluctant to take on the hell of the Russian winter again, with partisans hounding them at every turn. The Germans went twice through this agony and they say: *Never Again!*

This attitude is only a confirmation of a well-known psychological fact, frequently referred to in German military literature, namely that German soldiers are handicapped and discouraged from the beginning, when they are ordered to launch an offensive or an attack which had previously ended in a setback or defeat. That is the reason why few German generals would like to see another campaign against Russia. The ghost of Stalingrad has left a deep imprint on the psychology of the Germans.

On the other hand, there is a growing sentiment among former German soldiers and officers that it would be far better for the Germans to side with the East against the West. A most popular argument among German veterans is this: “If we fight for the Americans, Stalin will ship us by the millions as prisoners to Siberia; that means misery, slave labor and death. But if we fight with the Russians and the Americans win, we will go as prisoners to the United States which means good food, good treatment and nothing to fear. Thus it is better we go with the Russians.”

The slogan “Ohne Mich” has become the popular description for German resistance to the plan for remilitarization. However, we must differentiate between the prevalent mood in all strata of the German people, and those non-Communist groups who are opposed to Adenauer and who propagate the concept of immediate agreement with Russia and the position of “neutralism” for Germany and Europe. These middle-of-the-road groups fear that European rearming will prevent the reunification of Eastern and Western Germany which is the number one demand of all Germans regardless of creed, party, or class.

The trend of “Ohne Mich” gained tremendous impetus after

President Truman's 1949 announcement of the discovery by American Intelligence that an atomic explosion had occurred in the Soviet Union. When a poll was taken in 1949 on the question of whether it would be advisable to create a new German army, 75 per cent of those approached answered "no"; only 6.9 per cent agreed and the rest qualified their answer or had no opinion.

William Attwood reported in *Colliers' Magazine* of March 24, 1951 his experience from interviews with German factory workers and white-collar people in the little town of Remagen, Germany. The arguments of the Germans were striking. "So far as we can make out the problem is really quite simple, we just don't want war. If you Americans have to fight the Russians, go ahead, but *Ohne uns*. Don't count on us." Another fellow said: "Isn't it true that you need German soldiers to cover your retreat to the Atlantic?" Or this argument popped up: "Who wants to be a rear guard for the *Amis*? If the Russians come and find me in uniform, it's a firing squad or Siberia. My brother's there already. Who'll support my parents?"

The director of a factory, a former officer, declared: "If you want my own opinion, as an officer who fought in both wars, I would never serve again so long as German officers are being held in jail as war criminals. And I saw how rottenly the Americans behaved who took Remagen. I've had a bellyful of wars! Talk to my men—you'll see they feel the same way." Correspondent Attwood reported that he found "no other employee in the factory who didn't feel basically the same way." All were convinced "that Germans in uniform would be used as cannon fodder by the Western high-command."

A Navy veteran and former prisoner of war in England declared: "We all had enough. A war's the worst thing that could happen. Danger from the East? I think that's a fairy tale. You could settle your quarrel with the Russians if you really wanted to."

Many other British and American correspondents have re-

ported similar conversations with German veterans. It all sums up to this: Most Germans are unwilling to fight on the side of the Western powers. Due to economic, strategic and psychological reasons they would rather tie up with the East against the Anglo-American bloc. Chancellor Adenauer and his military advisors are well-informed on this score. If they offered man-power to the policy planners in the Pentagon they certainly did it with ulterior motives. They would like to have a new German Wehrmacht and let Uncle Sam pay for the rearmament, but in the end they hope to make a deal with Moscow.

The Russians know that they have nothing to fear from Western Germany. They have secret and open assurances from the industrialists of the Ruhr of Germany's desire for close co-operation with the East. On Stalin's birthday, according to a report by Karl von Wiegand, chief foreign correspondent for the Hearst papers, leading industrialists in Western Germany sent carloads of gifts to the Red Czar in Moscow. Every informed newspaperman in Europe knows that Western Germany would not be a reliable ally but rather a powerful satellite of Russia. In spite of all this evidence, our policy planners in the State Department and in the Pentagon still live in a fool's paradise.

From the beginning, we staked our whole policy on the assumption that the Germans, due to the rough treatment they received at the hands of the Russians, would be filled with hatred and would turn towards the West, if America would give them the necessary assistance to quickly overcome their defeat.

We could have found out the basic error in our approach had we attentively followed the "great debate" among the Germans which started very early around the central issue "West or East Orientation"? The issue was first discussed in 1948 in the leading geo-political monthly *Der Weg* in Buenos Aires, and it was doubtlessly inspired by the policy shapers in the Madrid Nazi headquarters.

The fact that Hitler's great mistake was to attack Russia had the effect of promoting the Haushofer concept of Russo-German collaboration. For virtually every German whether industrialist or worker, an out-of-job general or hungry ex-private, peasant or politician, knew that the cardinal principle of the Haushofer School demanded cooperation with Russia. As a consequence, therefore, the group of Haushofer geo-politicians operating from Madrid and Argentina represents, in German eyes, a source of irrefutable logic and guidance.

Thus there developed in Germany a powerful national front. The Communists in the East and the ultra-nationalists in the West are jointly orienting the dynamic militaristic instincts of the German people toward cooperating with Russia against the West. The men who are blueprinting Germany's future knew that their program appealed as much to conservative manufacturers anxious for profits as it did to beaten militarists yearning for revenge.

The economic program is closely tied in with military considerations, for the planners assume that the Russian side will be the winning side in a third world war.

One important reason they cite for certain Russian victory is that Russia has been building its armaments at a far greater pace than the U.S. Russia, being totalitarian, they emphasize, can direct her industry and labor force as she chooses. The U.S., on the other hand, even while stepping up its preparedness for war, must also maintain the freedom of private enterprise and democracy.

The Soviets, the geo-politicians note, are accomplishing tremendous industrial expansion particularly in hydro-electric power, pig iron and steel production. Their tractor-tank capacity is prodigious and their airplane capacity up to 100,000 a year. Hence, as early as November 1948, the editor of *Der Weg* had concluded that it would be "impossible for the West to stop communism in a world war . . ."

German experts are convinced that Russia can gain full com-

mand over Europe and the Middle East within a few weeks after the outbreak of hostilities. In any such event, they point out, the Eastern bloc would acquire a tremendous advantage in resources and manpower. They stress the point that Russia is not inferior in modern weapons—about which they know much more than any non-Russian general staff. Readers of *Der Weg* were told that Russia had an atom bomb long before President Truman reported it to the world.

The final conclusion of the German planners was, already in 1948, that the Free World is heading toward disaster. Like Hitler, they hold that the democracies are soft, empty shells condemned to inevitable defeat at the hands of more vital, more dynamic nations. In the issue of May 1949, *Der Weg* declared:

"The soldiers of Moscow's international army are not tired of war; a powerful impulse is alive in them. But the bourgeois world of the West is bare of fanatical belief, lacking those elementary forces that stir up whole peoples, shape history, make decisions and are the source of power . . . The rulers of the Atlantic cannot kindle the enthusiasm of other nations in support of their world power."

This is the appraisal of the West which is now sold to the German people, pro-Communist and anti-Communist, neo-Nazi and Roman Catholic. Of course, it is not a question of Communist sympathies. Many conservative leaders were fully convinced, in 1948, that Russia's need for Germany will persuade the Kremlin to leave the Germans masters of their own destiny as far as their internal political and economic system is concerned. To them, an alliance with communist Russia against the West is Realpolitik in action.

Influenced by the directive given from Madrid and Buenos Aires, the great debate soon stirred the entire population in Western Germany. Officers and veterans showed an outspoken contempt for the Western Powers but, for reasons of expedi-

ency, they thought it worth while to exploit, as long as possible, the illusions of our policy planners. On the issue of German rearmament as part of the Atlantic Pact defense, they stood unanimously on the platform of "Ohne Mich." This, of course, together with the opposition of the Social Democrats, was a tremendous help to Dr. Adenauer's blackmail diplomacy.

When the discussion for German rearmament had reached its peak, a few weeks after the outbreak of the war in Korea, *Herald Tribune* correspondent Joseph Newman reported on August 27, 1950, from Germany:

"There is a widespread impression abroad that the German people would jump at a chance to get into uniform again and try a few more blitzkriege. Every political and labor leader with whom this correspondent spoke in the principal cities of West Germany said those who hold that impression are sadly mistaken."

Other newspapermen reported a widespread feeling among ex-Wehrmacht officers that it would be wiser if Germany would line up with the East against the West. In the beginning of 1950, the Bruderschaft, then a secret society of high Wehrmacht officers, had circulated a memorandum in which the following principle was stated:

"The goal of the Bruderschaft is the union of the peoples of Europe between the Atlantic and the Urals with the Reich of all Germans in its ethnographic and historic borders as an organic part."

In an Associated Press report of December 18, 1949, German generals were quoted as follows:

"A year ago you called us war criminals," said one high officer. "You can't expect us to turn around overnight and be your allies after that insult." But if they were asked, how many of the ex-generals would offer to raise an army to help defend Western Europe? "About 35 to 40 per cent," said a former S. S. (Elite Guard) general. "The rest

are utterly fed up, although a few think Germany's future could be best strengthened by fighting for the Russians."

Karl von Wiegand reported in the *New York Journal American* of April 16, 1950 a long interview he had with the former chief of staff of the German Wehrmacht, General Guderian. The General stated bluntly that the Western powers would first have to accept all demands the Adenauer Government would put forward, otherwise Germany will "turn to the East and even endeavor to find a basis for cooperation with Soviet Russia."

What kind of cooperation the German nationalists envision with the Soviets was best expressed in one of the speeches of the rabble-rousing General Remer who recommended that in case of a Russian attack, the Germans should do everything "to facilitate a quick advance through Germany so that the theater of war, within 24 hours, will be shifted to France and England."

Dr. Otto Strasser, the former Nazi pal of Hitler, analyzed in one of his articles the precarious situation of Allied troops in Germany. He stated that in case of another war the Germans would help "to arrest the 200,000 British and Americans in one dark night without any struggle." (*Nord-Amerika*, October 28, 1948.) Such a coup could be effected, said Dr. Strasser, due to the "exact knowledge of the private quarters of every officer and the location of every tank and airplane."

A similar hope was expressed in the circular letter of the Nazi Headquarters in Madrid, where it was stated:

"The strategy of breaking the chains of our enthrallment is sometimes more daring and dangerous than the most dashing feat in war. We could, for instance, visualize that through secret negotiations with Moscow a situation would be brought about whereby the Yankees could overnight be eliminated as a power factor in Europe."

In a recent article in the *Saturday Evening Post* (March 15, 1952), associate editor James P. O'Donnell tried to answer the

question "Will the Germans Go Along With Us?" O'Donnell found our position in Germany a very shaky one. He does not feel comfortable at the thought that we are raising "the Frankenstein monster of a new German army." We have used "bad psychology and poor diplomacy" in Germany and it reminds him that "in the past ten years, we have had so many policies that looked good at the start and later blew up in our faces." Here is his pessimistic judgment: "There are forces lurking around in the Teutonic political underworld yearning to use the East-West clash as a springboard for one more attempt to cut the throat of the world."

[13]

The Island and the Sailboat

THE GERMANS INTEND TO BUILD THEIR NEW WORLD EMPIRE on the ruins of what today constitutes the greatness and the power of the United States. Whether these professional plotters will help the Soviets to destroy America by military means, or whether they will attempt to subjugate us some day through an "inside job," is of no relevance. The fact that the German planners regard the United States as doomed becomes clearly visible from the writings of the geo-politicians. The schemers in the Madrid Geo-political Center have quite openly described how the United States will be thrown on the rocks. They are dreaming of building up a new Third Power bloc and declare that this "new power combination would plunge the United States down from its present dizzy heights," and they boast that it would

depend entirely on their "diplomatic and propaganda finesses when and how we would take over an America enfeebled by its foreign and domestic policies."

A similar anti-American propaganda has been peddled by the Goebbels and Ribbentrop disciples in the geo-political monthly *Der Weg*, Buenos Aires. The Adenauer geo-politicians in Germany have also foretold the doom of the United States, but they have been more circumspect in voicing their views. In a long article, they described in *Christ und Welt*, how the United States one day will encounter great difficulties after Europe is fully rearméd and the American armament has reached its peak. At that moment, according to these planners, the props will be pulled from under and the American economy will become a shambles for a very simple reason—there will be no war. By having a full voice in the Atlantic Council, Germany will be able to prevent a war against Russia, the paper stated. The article stresses the fact that Germany must not hasten future developments. Germany must shift its policy alternately towards the United States and to Soviet Russia:

"The West German Republic can best be compared with a sailboat cruising towards two islands far on the horizon and, in order to withstand strong-blowing winds, it sets its course alternately to the left and to the right. Will the day then not arrive when we must make a decision on which island to land? Maybe, but it is not certain. Perhaps one of the islands will be washed away by the waves before we reach it. . . ."

(*Christ und Welt*—November 1, 1951.)

In our reading of German newspapers, we have not encountered any articles which discuss the possibility that the Soviet Union might be the "island" which "will be washed away by the waves." All German expectations in that respect center around the United States. The German geo-political monthly *Der Weg* in Buenos Aires spoke of the "coming

doom" of the United States as early as 1949. A year later it was stated in the Madrid Circular Letter that "the present power position of the Slavic world is a geo-political fact which we must accept, . . ." but in the same document it was declared to be Germany's task to "take the leadership in Europe's struggle against the United States," to "grab a few more billions from the Yankee's huge dollar-chest and then kick them out or simply hand them over to the Russians."

Of course, the camouflaged geo-political journals in the Bonn Republic cannot print in so blunt a language or predict outright that "economic difficulties will one day plunge the United States down from its present dizzy heights," as stated in the Madrid Circular Letter. Thus *Christ und Welt* expresses the same thought carefully sandwiched in the metaphor of the island and the sailboat. To compare the United States with an island "washed away" by the waves of the future is a quaint way of describing the ultimate fate of Western democracy. In a way of calculations of the geo-politicians may be summed up in the following parable:

There was a rich and influential banker named Pentagonius, whose life had been troubled by threats and attacks from gangsters. One of the toughest leaders in gangland was a certain Germanicus who, after a long and most strenuous search was finally hunted down. Just when the gangster's jig was up, a bright idea flashed in banker Pentagonius' head: "Wouldn't it be wonderful to have such a tough fellow as a bodyguard? This Germanicus," the banker pondered, "certainly knows all the ins and outs of gangland, he is a most powerful and ruthless fighter—and if I save him from the electric chair and gain his gratitude, maybe he can be of use to me and can keep lots of unpleasantness from my door."

Thus, through his influence, banker Pentagonius saved gangster Germanicus from the electric chair. Of course, this action shocked the police experts. The Police Commissioner Lippenwald warned the banker against such a foolish undertaking. He

called to his attention the long criminal record of Germanicus, his absolute unreliability, his trickery, his uncontrolled temper, and so forth. But all these and other warnings were of no avail. Banker Pentagonius was deeply afraid of another gangster, Sovieticus, and he firmly believed that gangster Germanicus could give him better protection.

Thus, Germanicus became the bodyguard of the banker, and moved into the gardener's house on the banker's estate. Banker Pentagonius felt proud and satisfied with what he had engineered. He was convinced that he had done a good deed, and felt sure that in the end gangster Germanicus would be reformed and would show his gratitude and devotion towards his benefactor throughout his life.

In the beginning, the feelings of the banker were bolstered by the assurances of eternal gratitude which Germanicus daily expressed. As time went by, a few incidents occurred which made the banker a little skeptical of the soundness of undertaking this self-styled reform work. Yet, considering the fact that this was an unusual experiment, he did not allow his trust to be shaken too much by these initial incidents. At any rate, he was unafraid since he knew that Germanicus was still on parole and in case his behavior should become improper, the banker could ask the police to take corrective action.

Germanicus, in the meantime, was fully aware of the situation, and cunningly worked with promises and little threats until he had gained a firmer position and was finally free from parole. Now it was time for him to act in accordance with his new outlook on life. He was well aware of the advantageous position he was in and was determined to make the most of the various possibilities that the turn of events had presented to him. The banker had indeed opened a new aspect of life for Germanicus. As a smart, calculating and ruthless fellow, he was set to exploit these new opportunities to the fullest extent possible. He convinced the banker that in order to be more useful to him, he, the ex-convict, would have to regain his self-respect. He

told the banker in unmistakable terms that he would have to stop treating him in a charitable way by giving him handouts, and he made it clear that what he wanted was to be treated like an independent person. Germanicus said that if he could own the gardener's house or another piece of property, it would give him his self-assurance and the independence he wanted. Pentagonius yielded to these requests, all of which were backed up with menacing tales intended to frighten the banker, but in which Germanicus himself did not believe. The banker, still clinging to his faith in the basic soundness of his experiment, continued to let himself be taken in more and more by Germanicus. But with every new concession and compromise, the pressure of new and greater demands grew in increasing proportion.

Finally, Germanicus confronted the banker with the demand that since he was now a remade man, he wanted to take his place in accepted society. He asked his benefactor to introduce him into the circle of high society. Again, Pentagonius conceded. Thus, at least, in outward appearance, Germanicus entered into the status of social equality. As a result, however, the banker lost some of his social prestige for having become too intimate with a former gangster. Quite naturally some of the banker's most faithful friends resented the fact that he had foisted this former gangster on their circle. Many of the old friends of Pentagonius began to question his wisdom and his sanity.

As things developed, Germanicus became more and more dissatisfied with his new role. The old "king of gangland" was determined to use all his tricks to reconquer for himself a position of power. The more his demands were met, the more cocky he became. Increasingly, he became resentful at having to take orders and follow certain directives of the banker.

In the meantime, there were new developments which made Pentagonius very uneasy. Reports came to him that secret dealings were taking place between gangster Germanicus and that other character and archenemy of his, Sovieticus. Pentagonius

found himself in an untenable position. He could no longer appeal to the police for help, and practically all of his influential friends had deserted him. The banker became irritated and lost his cool judgment; he suffered considerable financial losses under the increasing blackmail tactics of Germanicus. Impoverished through the expensive protective measures he had undertaken, and driven nearly insane with fear and worry, he saw no way out of his sorry plight but to take his life. And so, in December 1955, Pentagonius met his tragic end by leaping from a window.

By strange coincidence, Pentagonius' end not only had been foretold in the diaries of Germanicus (in *Christ und Welt*, November 1, 1951), but was also predicted in an article "How America Took It," published in the *Moscow New Times* of January 1, 1952. (NOTE: Historians who are interested in the details of the rise and fall of banker Pentagonius will find additional facts in the interesting booklet written by the American banker and author J. P. Warburg, entitled *Rearming Germany—How Stupid Can We Be?*, 1949.)

[PART THREE]