

U 21076 25X1A2g

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF FREE JOURNALISTS
OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE AND BALTIC AND
BAIKAN COUNTRIES

10, Stanhope Place, London W.2.

CPYRGHT

May, 1953

PROBLEMS OF EASTERN EUROPE IN WEST GERMAN
POLITICS

The political interests and ambitions directed to the East of Europe are reflected in Western Germany of today in two different trends of thought. These differences are expressed in the programmes as well as in the forms of organisation. And each of these two trends finds its adherents in a different circle of society.

The briefest description of these two trends is as follows:

1. The trend of "limited" political aims - advocating a return to the status quo prior to 1939. (Only a small fraction of this camp supports a more drastic programme, of the return to the status quo prior to 1914).
2. The trend of "unlimited" political aims: a reconstruction of Germany's position in the East of Europe. As to the means towards this end, many various tendencies exist, such as:
 - (a) the return to the RAPALLO system
 - (b) the reconstruction of the pre-war Central European system, with Germany as its chief factor,
 - (c) the establishment of an economic system concentrating around Germany, based on the principles which were promoted by CLAUDIUS in the years 1934-38,
 - (d) the disintegration of the Soviet Union on the ethnographic principle, and a political and economic penetration by Germany into the new national states. (Beside the countries of Central Europe in the strict sense of the word, this camp advocates the necessity of creating the independent states of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Caucasian countries and Turkestan).

CPYRGHT

- 2 -

The first of these two trends is the result of the conditions brought about by the war, i.e.: territorial changes, compulsory deportations and of the refugee exodus from behind the Iron Curtain.

The second trend marks the rebirth of traditional tendencies in East-European policy of Germany. With very few exceptions, it is, on the whole, devoid of drastic imperialistic tendencies of the Hitlerite type and such like. Apart from the search for political solutions which would assure a decisive predominance to Germany, certain attempts may also be observed to work out a programme introducing a balance of equality between Germany and Eastern countries. Here, the only variety which may be described as imperialistic, is the tendency to the restoration of the RAPALLO system, i.e. the system of the division of influence between Germany and Russia on the territories situated between these countries. This tendency, in turn, takes under consideration two alternative possibilities:

- RAPALLO system based on GERMANY's collaboration with the SOVIET UNION,
- RAPALLO system as modus of cooperation between Germany and the future, democratic Russia in which the Communist regime has been overthrown.

On the grounds of this most sketchy characterisation of two main trends of German interests and ambitions directed to the East, the following observations can be made:

1. The trend of "limited" political aims finds its expression in a precised programme. This is also reflected in well-determined organisation forms of its partisans. Furthermore, this trend has at its disposal a strong and extensive apparatus of action, which has already gained certain political position in Western Germany.
2. The trend of "unlimited" political aims has not, as yet, determined its programme. Its adherents are still in the stage of research and discussion. Their direct political activity is rather within the limits of suggesting and inspiring of certain political moves.

CPYRGHT

Of these two trends, the first one has the support of the masses. Several million deportees, expellees and refugees, grouped in "motherland" organisations, are all behind the programme of "limited" political aims, which for them is expressed by the slogan: "we want to go back home".

At the same time, the second trend finds its adherents in a group of elite - experts, scientists, and politicians who however - with few exceptions - do not play a prominent political role at present.

This does not mean however that the importance of the first trend is bigger. The tendencies of "limited" political aims often find their outlet in noisy public demonstrations; the camp of "unlimited" aims works discreetly, behind the official political scene, affecting not so much the superficial moods of the public opinion as the decisive centres of the political machinery of West Germany.

After these few initial explanations, we shall present a detailed description of both main trends.

I. Trend of "Limited" Political Aims.

As result of a process of unification, the year 1952 brought the formation of a general representation of all German deportees, expellees and refugees from Eastern Europe. This large group found its political exponent in the political party GBHE - GESAMT-DEUTSCHE BLOCK DER HEIMATVERTRIEBENE UND ENTRECHTETEN.

In the post-war years, many other political parties had courted the votes of this group of population. The Socialist Party SPD had comparatively the greatest chances of success; this is easily understood, taking into account the difficult material situation of the deportees, expellees and refugees. The Communists, although the most radical, could not hope to gain the sympathies of this category of people, since deportations or expulsions were being decided by the Soviet Union or Communist regimes, which also forced people to escapes.

The political leaders who arose among this group, came to the conclusion that a creation of their own, separate political re-

CPYRGHT

presentation would be the most proper solution. They thought that such a representation would most effectively promote the interests of the group. Simultaneously, it could take advantage of the political interplay between other political parties.

These calculations proved to be justified. The GBHE participated in the local elections, and during the last two years won around 16-18% of votes in various constituencies. In this way, in several instances it gained a very important position, balancing the forces of two political parties which are now the strongest in West Germany, i.e. Christian Democrats of Chancellor ADENAUER, and the Socialists which are in sharp opposition against his cabinet. Waldemar KRAFT, deputy to the BONN parliament and leader of the GBHE, uses this possibility of acting as a balancing force in a most adroit manner. His tactical alliances, whether with Christian Democrats or with the Socialists, are always concluded after the respective other party agrees to support the camp of "limited" political aims. During the period of negotiations to obtain the ratification of re-militarisation agreements between the Allies and West Germany, KRAFT switched the votes of the GBHE to the support of ADENAUER. Nothing has officially been published as to whether, and how far, had ADENAUER guaranteed the support for KRAFTS party. But it is quite certain that without such guarantee the GBHE would not have appeared in the group of adherents of the re-militarisation agreements.

Apart from this political representation, embodied in the GBHE, the camp of "limited" political aims possesses a large machinery of propaganda. Here we find, first of all, more than ten weekly newspapers, of which the most important are:

- DIE STIMME (Hamburg)
- DER SCHLESIER (Recklinghausen)
- SCHLESISCHE RUNDSCHAU (Stuttgart)
- SUDETENDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG (Bayreuth)
- OST-WEST-KURIER (Frankfurt/M., Augsburg, Hamburg)
- DIE BRUCKE (Munich)
- SUDETENLAND (Detmold)

CPYRGHT

- 5 -

Apart from these regularly published weeklies, the camp of "limited" political aims has at its disposal some 40 periodicals, scattered all over Western Germany. Most of them have a specified geographical character, and are interested in different regions from which their readers derive their origin (e.g. BALTISCHE RUND-SCHAU, SCHLESISCHES MONATSBLATT, OPPELNER NACHRICHTEN a.s.o.)

The programme of a return to pre-1939 status quo often gives birth to revisionist tendencies. They are particularly strong with regard to the present Polish-German frontier. Nearly all the deportees are unanimous in their demands for the restoration of the frontier of before 1939. The revisionism of the deportees from the Sudeten is much less marked. Most of them demand a possibility to return, but without a modification of the frontier. Similarly, no revisionist tendencies are apparent in the attitude of the group transferred from Transilvania or Banat. *astounding!*

The revisionist tendencies obtain the support of right-wing nationalist political groups. For example, the FDP party - placed at the utmost right of the coalition backing ADENAUER's cabinet - has emphasized many times its solidarity with the revisionist trends. (Here, a discussion may be quoted as example, which developed in Western Germany at the beginning of 1952 over the so-called documentary film "KREUZWEG DER FREIHEIT" - Crossroads of Freedom. This film treated as German not only the territories situated between the Odra-Nisa line and the 1939 Polish-German frontier, but even those Polish territories - as POZNAN county and Polish Pomerania - which found themselves within the frontiers of independent Poland after 1918. In this nation-wide discussion, the FDP party declared its full support for the claims expressed by the film.)

It should be added that in the conglomeration of deportees, expellees and political refugees from the east, the neo-Hitlerite groups which - though within modest limits only - still are active in Western Germany, have found but an insignificant number of supporters. The lack of popularity of neo-Hitlerism is attributed to the fact that it was the Hitlerism who had initiated mass transfers of the population (e.g. in BANAT and TRANSYLVANIA), and

CPYRIGHT

- 6 -

afterwards - owing to Germany's defeat - had become the cause of compulsory deportations.

The activities of the group of "limited" political aims enjoy a more or less official support of the BOWEN Government. The Ministry for the Questions of Deportees headed by LUKASCHKE, and in particular the Ministry for All-German Questions under KAISER, are giving to this group much practical, and often also financial, assistance. Thus, e.g. amongst the official publications sponsored by KAISER's Ministry, a work entitled "JENSEITS VON ODER UND NEISSE" appeared in print. This work advocates revisionist ideas, and its author Silesius ALTER is one of their leading propagators.

On the grounds of this more detailed information about the trend of "limited" political aims, the following assumptions may be drawn:

1. This trend is not a political conception; it is rather a programme of activities. According to the intentions of its representatives and to the possibilities offered by the current political situation, it is revealed either in revisionist claims, in emotional threats of a revenge, or in demands for restoration of property or compensation for material losses, or even in the longing "to go back home" without any requests of political nature. It is a programme brought about by circumstances, born from territorial and constitutional changes after the last war.
2. With the passage of time, the importance of this trend diminishes. The number of its partisans, though always considerable, gradually grows smaller. Some of them become assimilated in new conditions. This applies in particular to the younger generations, and also to those of deportees and expellees who have managed to create new conditions of existence in a new place. It is not beyond the point to add here that according to the official statistics of the Western German Government, the unemployment on the territories under its control vacillates between 1.1 and 1.3 million for quite a time already. Taking into account that

CPYRGHT

the number of employable people in the mass of deportees, expellees and refugees from the east amounts to some 4-5 millions (which rather overestimates the position), these statistics demonstrate that a very considerable part of this large group has already been able to settle down. As example, we may quote the new centres of folklore industry on the BODEN Lake, in which the old, traditional centres of this industry from SUDETEN or Lower SILESIA have been reproduced.

These observations allow the conclusion that the current interests and ambitions directed to East European affairs, insofar as they are reflected in the trend of "limited" political aims, do not exert a decisive influence on the shaping of the new German political doctrine with respect to the East.

In this sphere, the leading role is played by the second trend, described in our introduction is the trend of "unlimited" political aims.

II. Trend of "Unlimited" Political Aims

As already stated in the initial remarks, this trend has not yet worked out a new German political doctrine with regard to the East.

The primary reason for it are presumably the encumbrances of traditional German concepts of Eastern Europe. Another serious reason is undoubtedly the fact that the results of the war had imposed the greatest sacrifices on the Prussian group which had formulated these concepts and enforced them on the German policy. Apart from great losses in human lives, this group has been deprived of its material basis to a much greater extent than other German groups, which in Western Germany are quickly restoring their former standard of property.

The "traditional encumbrances" may be listed as follows:

1. The idea of RAPALLO which refers to ancient German-Russian alliances of the beginning of 19th century. In published works dealing with the possibility of a new German-Russian collaboration, the agreement of TAUROGI is often mentioned

CPYRIGHT

- 8 -

as a symbol of such collaboration. The circles of German "neutralists" consider it possible to establish such relations even with the Soviet Russia. The leading members of this group are: Dr. Joseph WIRTH - former Chancellor of the Reich from the time of signing the RAPALLO treaty; Helene WESSEL - former president of the ZENTRUM Party in the BONN Parliament; Gustav HEINEMANN - former minister of internal affairs in ADENAUER's first cabinet, who also was the president of the Chief Synod of the Evangelical Church; Rev. Martin NIEMOELLER - president of the Evangelical Church in HESSEN province; ^{former} Gustav GEREKE, former minister in the government of Lower Saxony, who however in the second half of 1952 sought the "asylum" in Eastern Germany.

This group has a certain influence in Western Germany; it strives, in the first place, to the "unification of Germany", in accordance with the formula sponsored by the Soviet Union. It is interesting to note that this section of the RAPALLO group has acquired a certain support in the protestant circles. This is the more characteristic that Eastern Germany - with the exception of Silesia - had always been the domain of the Evangelical Church, while Western and Southern Germany had been under Catholic influence.

A more moderate protestant group stands in between the trend towards an agreement with "any" Russia and the camp backing the agreement with Russia "of the future". In March and April 1953, an interesting discussion was enacted in the columns of the official publication of the Evangelical Church "SONNTAGS-BLATT (Hamburg)", between the representatives of the Evangelical Church and of the Orthodox Church. This discussion, without in the least referring to any current political problems, maintained the possibility of a closest cooperation of these two Churches.

The tendencies towards cooperation with "future" Russia are most demonstratively expressed in the activities of the so-called "Society of German-Russian Friendship". The Society was formed on the inspiration of Russian emigrant circles grouped around the KTS ("solidarists"), and has managed to win the backing of many and varied German groups. Dr. Ernst REUTER, Mayor of Western BERLIN, enjoying a high popularity in Western

CPYRGHT

this is news.
Germany, in 1951 gave his sponsorship to a number of occasions arranged by the Society. (In all fairness, it should be explained here that during 1952 Dr. REUTER revised his former attitude and, in an undemonstrative manner, withdrew his support from the Society.)

In the number of those openly propagating the idea of collaboration with Russia "of the future", there is also the so-called "Colonel MULLER's group". (This group, recruited from officers of the former German army connected with the attempt on HITLER of "20 July", had once tried to seize control of the German combatant movement, but did not succeed.) The "Congress of Free Nations" called to DUSSELDORF in July 1952, was held under the auspices of "Col. MULLER's group" on one hand, and of the Russian NTS group on the other.

What?!
Also, the collaboration with "future" Russia is promoted by the group "KAMPF GEGEN UNMENSCHLICHKEIT", particularly active in Western BERLIN. Its chairman Ernst TILLICH participates in the work of the Society for German-Russian Friendship.

This particular section of the "RAPALLO of the future" has for the main principle of its programme the recognition of the present territorial range of Russia, i.e. the refusal to acknowledge the strivings to independence of the nations which had been incorporated in the Soviet Union in the years of the Great Bolshevik Revolution.

The cooperation with Russia, whether "now" or in the "future", finds also partisans in certain circles of former army officers. It is rather difficult to cite the names in this respect. But characteristically enough, in the political literature there is a continuous series of works praising the benefits which Germany had drawn from the collaboration with Russia. The example may be given of the large synopsis of the memoirs of former minister GROENER published by "DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU" in 1950 already; or quite lately - the work by the former airforce general Helm SPEIDEL (his brother, Gen. Lieut. Hans SPEIDEL, is military advisor to ADENAUER), which was published

CPYRIGHT

- 10 -

in 1953 by "VIERTELJAHRSSHEFTE FÜR ZEITGESCHICHTE" in STUTTGART. Both these works, printed on different dates, deal with the German advantages from the cooperation with Russia.

During ADENAUER's latest stay in the USA, he declared at a press conference that there is no fear of the renovation of the RAPALLO policy, since objective conditions for such policy do not exist. (It is interesting to note that the identical formulation of Germany's attitude to RAPALLO was set out already in 1951 by professor M. WINKLER). Such a statement does not exclude the possibility that, were such objective conditions - i.e. balance of power between Germany and Russia - to reappear, a new, one-sided, Russian-German cooperation might emerge. Chancellor ADENAUER, invariably most precise in formulating his statements, in this case also adopted the principle of "leaving the bridges unburnt". In Germany, the political circles gave to his declaration a great deal of serious attention. This tendency to insure the possible future RAPALLO policy is expressed, e.g., in the columns of the liberal newspaper "TAGESSPIEGEL" from BERLIN, having no connections with any political party, which has a great importance for shaping the public opinion, and not confined to Western BERLIN only. (The "TAGESSPIEGEL" published quite often the articles by O.E.H. BECKER, one of the leading adherents of Germany's collaboration with "future" Russia.)

Another newspaper which also, from time to time, follows the line of "insurance" for the possibility of collaboration with "future" Russia, - and which is even more influential than the "TAGESSPIEGEL", - is "ALLGEMEINE FRANKFURTER", published in Frankfurt/M. The paper, also liberal and reputed to have connections with the free-mason circles, now and again prints an article of Paul SETHE, its permanent collaborator. SETHE supports the idea of "not burning the bridges" and the tendency of a possible, future cooperation with "future Russia".

All these trends of restoration of the RAPALLO policy have, however, a certain drastic implication for the political circles of Western Germany, since they are at the same time propagated not only by Eastern Germany but also directly by MOSCOW. The

CPYRIGHT

11

"TAGLISCHE RUNDSCHAU" - newspaper of the Soviet Army of occupation in Eastern Germany, appearing in the German language - reminds its readers most earnestly of every anniversary of RAPALLO or TAUROGI agreement, as the example of the just and proper political line of Germany with respect to the East. In 1953, the same newspaper printed an article by Wilhelm PIECK himself, glorifying RAPALLO. These Soviet suggestions and hints sometimes place the Western German politicians and writers in an awkward position, since the latter would prefer to avoid the charge that they act under the Soviet influence. Therefore, the tendencies to the return to RAPALLO policy are often expressed not only with utmost carefulness but also in such form which would imply that they have nothing to do with tentative whispers from the Soviet side. This is particularly stressed in political memoirs. E.g. in the book "DEUTSCHLANDS WEG NACH RAPALLO" (1951) the author Wipert von BLUCHER, former employee of the Eastern Department of the German Foreign Office, endeavours to put an emphasis on the German initiative behind the RAPALLO treaty.

Despite the statements to the contrary in the BONN parliament (declarations of GERSTENMEIER, one of the leading deputies of CDU, during the debate on re-militarisation agreement in July 1952), the tendencies of returning to the policy of RAPALLO must be considered as well rooted in the range of German political concepts, especially in the right-wing political groups, as well as in certain circles of the German General Staff, now in its renaissance.

2. Other traditional encumbrances influencing the evolution of political doctrines with regard to the East, of a completely different nature than those above-described, exist in the circles which in Nazi times, and during the last war, were connected with the regime then in power.

Under the Nazi system, the problems of the East were subordinated parallelly to four different institutions:

- (1) Foreign Ministry, headed by RIBBENTROP;
- (2) German Army (as concerned the administration of near-front areas);

CPYRIGHT

- 12 -

- (3) ROSENBERG's ministry for Eastern Territories;
- (4) HIMMLER's ministry of State Security.

Within the team of these four governmental departments, two different political concepts fought each other. RIBBENTROP and HIMMLER supported the policy of conquest; while ROSENBERG's collaborators, and primarily the members of the Army General Staff, began to consider the idea of Germany's taking advantage of general anti-Communist feelings in the East, or specified deconcentrating tendencies towards national independence among the nations incorporated in the Soviet Union by force or violence in the years 1917-22.

Almost simultaneously, both the OKH (HQ of Land Forces) and ROSENBERG's team came to perceive the benefits which might accrue to Germany from playing on these different tendencies. Only ROSENBERG propagated the concept of establishing a German colonial system in the East, after Russia's collapse; while the military group saw the possibility of forming a chain of free states in the East, connected by economic and cultural collaboration with Germany. The most prominent individual who promoted such ideas and even - to a certain extent - was carrying them to practical effect, was Colonel STAUFFENBERG, organizer of the "20 July" attempt.

The tendency represented by the military group was undoubtedly derived from the old conceptions of "MITTELEUROPA" as well as from the more recent conceptions, formulated before the first world war, by Friedrich NAUMANN and BERLIN's HOCHSCHULE FÜR POLITIK, - later taken up by the Eastern Institutes in BERLIN, BRESLAU and KÖNIGSBERG, and finally - by HAUSHOFER's geo-political group.

Of the names connected with the propagation and execution of both these conceptions: the colonial conception and collaboration conception, the following should be mentioned: In ROSENBERG's ministry, - LEIBRANDT, Prof. von JENDE, Dr. Otto BREUTIE GAMM. In STAUFFENBERG's group: Gen. Heinz HELFELICH, Gen. Ernst KOSTRING, Col. HERRE, Col. FREYTAGH-LORINGHOVEN, Major KONNE, Major VÖLKEL.

CPYRGHT

- 13 -

The relations between the OKH and ROSENBERG himself were rather scarce; however, their respective subordinate teams of civil servants and officers were in frequent and very close contacts. Together, they resisted the principle of the conquest and oppression of the East, sponsored and introduced by RIBBENTROP and HIMMLER. Also, the dynamic group of STAUFFENBERG succeeded in winning over a group of employees of the Foreign Ministry, including SCHULLENBURG, former ambassador in MOSCOW. (The functions of liaison were performed by baron HILGER, former secretary of the Embassy, connected with the class of Baltic-Russian aristocracy through his marriage to baroness PAHLEN.)

There was a moment when STAUFFENBERG's group succeeded in securing the support of GOEBBELS for its ideas; but it could never gain the approval of HITLER, in whose opinion even the colonial conception of ROSENBERG was not in accordance with the principle of an all-out conquest of the East by the German "HERRENVOLK".

In practice, STAUFFENBERG's ideas resulted in the organization of "free" military formations of various nationalities (first of all Caucasians, Turkestani and Cossacks) and in the activities of pacification on the territories lying close to the front and army-administered. All this work was centralized in a special department of the OKH (OBERKOMMANDO DES HEERES) under the name "FREIHE HEERE OST".

The liquidation of STAUFFENBERG's group, following the attempt of 20 July, brought an almost complete annihilation of all activities directed to the East which had been undertaken by Army circles.. These activities were taken up in an entirely different form by HIMMLER, when at the end of 1944 he carried through the project of the creation of VLASSOV's army, based on the principles stated in the "SMOLYNSK Manifesto" in 1942. The few months of existence of VLASSOV's army (ROA) and of a political committee formed beside it (KONR - Committee for the Liberation of the Nations of Russia), were the results of these plans sponsored by HIMMLER and supported within the General Staff by yet another group of officers (including e.g. Wilfried STRIK-STRIFELDT, officer of propaganda for Russian questions

CPYRGHT

14

at the OKW). After the disappearance of STAUFFENBERG's group, several officers from the OKH, including Col. HERRE and Major RÖHNE, endorsed this new conception, which found also the support of baron HILGER.

These explanations of historical nature are rather important, since the evolution of political plans directed to the East, which had been going on even under Hitlerism, is still continuing. Many persons who had been engaged in the execution of these plans before the war and during the war years, are still alive and again working on the same problems.

Two main groups can now be observed, which constitute the most important centres of not only studies and research but also precisising the programme of German policy towards the East:

1. Civilian group - concentrated chiefly around the German Association for Research of Central European Questions (DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPA KUNDE)
2. Military group, in the frame of the German General Staff now under reconstruction. ?

Their crystallisation, for natural reasons, proceeded rather slowly. The aftermath of a lost war, with losses in human lives, and the collapse of the material and organisational basis, brought about a psychological breakdown. The first period of the occupation did not allow an open activity which therefore began to reveal itself only in 1946-47, as if on the margin of the participation of some Germans in the research or information activities of the Allies. It is sufficient to mention the position of baron HILGER who was in touch with the US occupation HQ, or the role played by prof. von MENDE in the centre of eastern research in the British zone of occupation. Among the lower ranks of these institutions, as well as of other bodies of similar character, could be found a comparatively large number of former civil servants and officers of the German Army, acting now as assistant-experts.

The first official institution for eastern research in the

CPYRIGHT

13

guise of the so-called "DER GOTTINGER ARBEITSKREIS" was born in November 1946. It is worth remembering that this team was established at the GOTTINGEN University in the first place as a group of experts for the preparation of some materials for MOSCOW Conference on Germany (in 1947). The team worked out a memorandum on East Prussia which was handed to Minister MARSHALL as information material on political and economic conditions in the respective area.

In the course of time, the GOTTINGER team was transformed into a study centre for eastern affairs, and in 1949 was admitted to the register of the recognized scientific associations. The group of its founders comprises the names of professors of the former University in KOENIGSBERG and members of Eastern Institutes from KOENIGSBERG, WROCLAW (BRESLAU) and BERLIN.

At the same time, the project of continuation of extensive research and studies on eastern problems was also promoted by other centres. On 19 November 1949, the association called "DIE DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FUR OSTEUROPAKUNDE" (German Society for Eastern European Knowledge) was formed in STUTTGART. Since then, it has become the main civilian institution in which the efforts to precise new German political thought with regard to eastern problems are concentrating.

DIE DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FUR OSTEUROPAKUNDE

The resolution on the constitution of this Society refers to the traditions of former Eastern Institutes and to the results obtained by the German Society for Studies on Eastern Europe founded (in 1911) and led by prof. Otto HOETSCH (died in BERLIN after the war). HOETSCH began his scientific career in 1906 as a historian at the then-German University in POZNAN. His interests were directed primarily towards Russia, and he considered Eastern Europe as the domain of either German or Russian influence, depending on the actual balance of forces between these two great powers. Later, prof. HOETSCH was also the editor of the monthly "OSTEUROPA" published in the period between the two World Wars, and he initiated the formation of Eastern Institutes in WROCLAW (BRESLAU), BERLIN and KOENIGSBERG.

The Society adopted as its purpose the work of developing the

CPYRGHT

- 16 -

interest in eastern problems, initiating and organising studies on these problems, by supporting the projects of a creation of special institutes. These aims show the Society to be not so much a research centre as a centre of initiative and coordination in its special sphere. The above mentioned resolution states the problems of: economic, political, historical and cultural nature.^{which} will constitute the main subjects of interest.

In practical consequence of this programme, three sections were formed within the Society:

- (a) for the questions of law, constitution and economy,
- (b) for the questions of history and geography,
- (c) for cultural questions.

It was decided to direct the work of the Society through its local teams (which at present exist in STUTTGART, MUNCHEN, HAMBURG; MAINZ, FRANKFURT/M, GOTTINGEN, MARBURG, BERLIN). Finally, it was resolved to restore the publication of the periodical "OSTEUROPA".

That the Society saw its birth in STUTTGART, may be attributed to the fact that after the war this town gave refuge to quite a numerous group of people who between the wars had been actively engaged in the problems of eastern policy and later were connected with Col. STAUFFENBERG's group. It was not long before they were able to secure the support of the newspaper "CHRIST UND WELT" published by liberal protestant circles, and of "DEUTSCHE ZEITUNG" (formerly "WIRTSCHAFT ZEITUNG") which continued the old tradition of political-economic press in Germany.

The specific atmosphere of post-war STUTTGART did not remain without a certain influence on the movement of "DIE DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FUR OSTEUROPAKUNDE". The Society started its existence with rather liberal ideas; it gave up the traditional tendency of sharp revisionism represented by the "OST" Institutes between the wars, and excluded from its programme the "colonial" concepts of ROSENBERG's type, not even speaking of any concepts of "conquest" of the type of HITLER's. Its attitude to the traditions of RAPALLO policy proved to be rather indifferent; the formula in this respect (Prof. WINKLER in: "RUSSLANDS BEDEUTUNG FUR DEUTSCH-

CPYRGHT

- 17 -

LAND IN VERGANGENHEIT UND GEGENWART - "Russia's Importance for Germany in the Past and Present") - being, that in the present situation, with strong Russia and weak Germany, such a policy of RAPALLO type would be to no purpose.

"DIE DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE" numbers at present about 300 active members. The number of people interested in its activities is however much larger. The quarterly **"OSTEUROPA"** is issued in about 5.000 copies. But the Society strives to limit its membership to real experts of the question, and to propagate its doctrines in an indirect way.

At a certain moment, the Society assisted in the creation of the so-called **"JOHANN GOTTFRIED HERDER INSTITUT"** with the University of HAMBURG, which continues the old traditions of an institute of the same name, once operated in RIGA. Its main interest are the Baltic and Polish problems. The Institute publishes two information monthlies: **"WISSENSCHAFTLICHER DIENST"** and - the latest - **"ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR OST FORSCHUNG"**. Since its formation in 1931, the Institute has also managed to acquire a part of the collection of books of the former Prussian State Library, which possessed a very ample section of books on Poland.

Further, owing to the Society's initiative and assistance, two more research institutes for eastern problems were born in 1960-61. One of them is the Eastern Institute in MUNICH. The project was to establish it as a continuation of the historical **CAROLINEUM** in PRAGUE - the academy set up in Middle Ages by the common efforts of the monarchs of Poland, Hungary and Germany, for cultivating the idea of Central-European cooperation. This primary idea, by the way, had not prevailed very long in the old **CAROLINEUM** which later became a purely German university. - The Institute in **MUNICH** concentrates its work on the questions of Central Europe and of Southern Russia. A special attention is also given to Orthodox faith from the point of view of its role of political instrument, formerly of Tsarist Russian, and now of the Soviet. policy.

At the same time, an Eastern Institute was organized in BERLIN, at the Free University of Western BERLIN. It differs

CPYRGHT

from other Eastern Institutes insofar as it devotes most of its efforts to the Russian questions in the strict sense of the word. The prevailing tendency is to support the indivisibility of the Soviet Union, even after substantial political and constitutional changes on her territory.

The leading representatives of "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE" are:

A. STUTTGART:

1. ~~Former Minister Hermann~~ ^{Hermann} DISTRIKH, chairman of the Society
2. Dr. Otto FREIDRICH - deputy chairman, vice-president of the Land Central Bank for Württemberg-Baden
3. Prof. Otto SCHILLER, executive director of the Society, former attaché of the German Embassy in MOSCOW
4. Arthur W. JUST - political writer, German press correspondent in Russia and Hungary of many years' standing
5. Prof. Klaus HENNING - editor of the quarterly "OSTEUROPA", for many years press correspondent in Russia, professor extraordinary at the universities in California, Hawaii and in Shanghai in the years 1936-45
6. Carl Gustav JICHOW - secretary of the Society
7. Otto Heinrich FREIDOWER - publisher of the weekly "CHRIST UND WELT"

B. MUNCHEN:

1. Prof. Theodor GEBELANDER, undersecretary of state in the Bavarian ministry of interior, professor of universities in KÖNIGSBERG, WROCLAW and PRAGUE. Head of the section for deportees and refugees in the Bavarian government.
2. Prof. STADTMÜHLER - MUNCHEN University.
3. Prof. Hans KOCH - director of Eastern Institute in MUNCHEN; formerly professor at universities in KÖNIGSBERG, WROCLAW, VIENNA. Expert on Orthodox Church.
4. Prof. Erich THIEL - MUNCHEN University, expert on Soviet economy.
5. Prof. Erwin KOSCHMIEDER, MUNCHEN University; before the war professor extraordinary at STEPAK BAFORT University in VILNA.
6. Prof. MAIRCZAK - MUNCHEN University, also rector of the "free Ukrainian university" in MUNCHEN.

(First letter not clear on original document)

CPYRGHT

-19-

• • •

7. ~~Prof. Reinhold Mautsch~~ - from Eastern Institutes
~~Prof. Reinhold Mautsch~~ - from Eastern Institutes in
~~Wroclaw and Konigsberg.~~ Wroclaw and Konigsberg.

C. ~~Wroclaw~~ : Laeuen

1. Dr. ~~Walter LARSEN~~, for many years German press correspondent in ~~Warsaw and Bucharest~~.
2. Dr. ~~Ernst MEISNER~~ - lecturer (docent) at HAMBURG University, expert on legal problems, contributor of "EUROPA ARCHIV" (FRANKFURT/M) and editor of a special quarterly supplement to that paper entitled "OSTEUROPA ARCHIV".
3. Dr. Arnold ~~SUCHOWSKY~~ - a biologist.
4. Dr. Prof. Bertold ~~SPULER~~ - orientalist. HAMBURG University
5. Dr. Heinrich ~~KUNZMANN~~ - professor extraordinary at the Faculty of Slavistics, HAMBURG University.
6. Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm ~~NEWMANN~~ - lecturer (docent) at the same Faculty of Slavistics.
7. Georg ~~M. WERNER~~ - political writer.

D. MARBURG:

1. Prof. H. AUBIN - head of the HERDER Institute, formerly professor of history at ~~Wroclaw~~ University.
2. Prof. Dr. H. ~~KYSSER~~ - secretary of HERDER Institute.
3. Docent Gotthold ~~RHODE~~, lecturer at HERDER Institute.
4. Docent Dr. ~~Audolf MULLER~~, professor extraordinary of Slav philology and of the history of Eastern Church at MARBURG University.
5. Dr. Ewald ~~STERN~~, history of art, MARBURG University.
6. Dr. ~~Rudolf NEWMANN~~ - from HERDER Institute in MARBURG, former collaborator of OSTLAND Institute in GDANSK.
7. Docent Georg von ~~RAUCH~~ - lecturer on modern and middle-age history at MARBURG University.
8. Dr. Peter ~~SCHNEIBERT~~ - expert on economic problems of the East.
9. Dr. Helmuth ~~WEISS~~ - director of library of the HERDER Institute in MARBURG, former deputy to Estonian parliament and former president of the Association of German Culture in Estonia.
10. Dr. Wolfgang ~~FRITZE~~ - scientific contributor to HERDER Institute.

CPYRGHT

• 89 •

URBAQ

11. Dr. A. G. ... ^{Urban} ... ^{Herder} Institute

29. Mr. Dr. Arthur Lehmann, member of central committee of the Association of Central European Knowledge, former professor of Moscow University (1903-1914)

CPYRGHT

- II -

- Prof. ~~STUBBART~~ from MUNSTER - in war times expert on psychological warfare at the OKW;
- Vippert von BLUCHER - former diplomat from the Foreign Ministry (1911-1944), former German minister in Iran. in Finland, and participant of the RAPALLO conference;
- Dr. Herbert LUDAT, professor of modern history in MUNSTER University;
- Prof. Carl BIRCKMANN from the university in TUBINGEN;
- Robert INGMAN, author of the books: "AUSSENPOLITIK MIT PALSCHEN BESCHREIBEN" and "VON TALLEYRAND ZU MOLOTOV";
- Franz GASE - author of the book "DEUTSCH-SLAVISCHE SCHICKSALSGEHEIMNISCHAF" (1952 published by the GOTTINGER ARBEITSKREIS) attempting to analyse the possibilities of cooperation between Germany and Central Europe.

In this large group of personalities, some names deserve a special mention for a particularly vivid political activity which they demonstrate in the midst of all scientists and experts. They are:

1. Min. Theodor OBERLANDER, MUNCHEN.
2. Prof. Klaus MEHNERT - STUTTGART.
3. Prof. Otto SCHILLER - STUTTGART.
4. Decent Werner MARKERT - GOTTINGEN.
5. Dr. Harald LAEUE - HAMBURG.

Certain tactical differences appear in the leading group, especially between Minister OBERLANDER and the remaining experts; but externally they all act in great solidarity, and achieve a good coordination of the efforts of around 300 specialists and experts.

The centre, however, being a conglomeration of different and varied schools of German political thought, it has not as yet succeeded in precisising any definite doctrine with regard to eastern problems. If we attempt to describe in a most objective way the tendencies of the "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FUR OSTEUROPAKUNDE", we shall find that the following ideas and opinions may be considered as generally prevailing:

CPYRGHT

- 22 -

- Complete*
1. That it is necessary to restore the pre-1939 status quo with a possibility of small corrections of frontiers;
 2. That it is a just solution to dismember the Soviet Union into a number of independent states, on the principle of self-determination (apart from the Baltic States, the independence should be granted, in the first place, to the Ukraine and the Caucasian countries);
 3. That it is necessary to establish a principle of peaceful co-existence between United Germany and the future structure of Central and Eastern Europe, with Germany - as participant of the Western-European complex - being given the right of "free-hand" policy in the East of Europe;
 4. That it is not advisable to promote federal ideas in Eastern and Central Europe, as in the case of factual establishing of a Central European Federation, the German policy might be hindered in its efforts to create in those territories a balance of powers to the advantage of Germany.
 5. That a principle of elasticity should be adopted in the policy, which depending on the existing international situation would allow either for endorsing the line of RAPALLO treaty, or else for the resignation from such line for the sake of a closer collaboration with the nations of Central European region.

(In connection with this point, one of the alternative solutions, now under discussion, is particularly interesting: namely, that the entire region east of the Rhine should be organised in the frame of three blocs: The German bloc - including Austria, Switzerland and Czechoslovakia; Central European bloc - with Poland and Ukraine as its main components; and Russia proper. Under such an arrangement, Germany would be able to play, to her own advantage, on the differences existing between the Central European bloc and Russia, which she should strive to maintain.)

These are the ideas and tendencies which may be observed

CPYRGHT

from the literature and the course of research work, and even clearer - from personal contacts with the group of DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT. As concerns the 5th point of the above programme, its partisans see in its effects an opportunity for building up Germany's position in Western Europe. Also, one can distinguish some hints that this particular line of policy might be coordinated with the policy of the USA, - in the sense that Germany would receive a sort of mandate of "field operation" on eastern territories on behalf of the United States, but with a wide freedom of decision.

Military Group

It is by no means easy to keep the activities of the military group under a systematic observation, from the moment when it has become transformed into a nucleus of the organisation of the future German General Staff. However, judging by some names of people who participate in it, its interests are presumably directed mainly to the eastern problems, and its ideas and opinions are rather close to those prevailing in the DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE.

Here, the name of General GEHLEN may be mentioned as example; the general belonged to the General Staff in HALDER's time. Another interesting name is that of Colonel (General ?) HERRE, former officer of Gen. HELLMICH's staff, when the latter stood at the head of "FREUDE HERRE OST". In the present nuclear staff organisation, Col. HERRE is to supervise the studies's section. Being a supporter of VLASSOV conception - as different from the conception of independent national formations - HERRE is, perhaps, more inclined towards the RAPALLO political line than many other officers directly connected with the former group and idea of STAUFFENBERG.

To decipher real tendencies promoted by this group, is an excessively difficult task. At any rate - as far as it is known - the group has not yet worked out any precise conception of eastern policy. Two opposed opinions are still at play in its midst. One of them is closer to the liberal programme ideas

CPYRIGHT

- 24 -

of "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE"; the other, more radical, is rather in favour of the view that it is necessary to establish a collaboration with Russia "of the future" - the latter recognized as a whole within the present frontiers of the Soviet Union. With regard to Central Europe, the military group, just as the civilian one, endorses the demand for the restoration of the status quo of 1938.

This very general description proves that, while the civilian group recognizes the existence of the Central European complex and is willing to grant to it a certain importance in the future, if only under the control of Germany - the military group has a purely tactical approach to this problem; its tendencies are rather directed towards a conception which, by way of generalisation, may be acknowledged as the construction on the pattern of "MITTELEUROPA" or RAPALLO, traditional for the German General Staff.

Federalist Movement

While some federalist trends directed westwards certainly reveal themselves in Western Germany - as it is undoubtedly proved by the participation of German representatives in the STRASBOURG enterprise - nothing at all is said about a possibility of Germany becoming federated with the Eastern European region. With regard to this latter question, Germany adopted an attitude of an observer at the Central European conference in LONDON (January 1952), and this attitude has been maintained. The conference itself was strongly criticised by the German political opinion.

Taking under consideration such an attitude of Germany to the cause of the federation of Eastern and Central Europe, as compared to the very favourable approach to the federation of Western Europe on the part of a large section of German political circles, - it seems to be obvious that the programme of a "free hand" for Germany in the east still enjoys a wide popularity in that country.

CPYRIGHT

Other Centres Shaping Eastern Policy

Beside the two main trends, i.e.:

- 1) the trend of "limited" political aims.
- 2) the trend of "unlimited" political aims.

many fragmentary actions may be observed in Western Germany, which however are rather of a transitory-tactical nature than of some wider, long-range political conceptions.

For instance, the German Socialist Party (SPD), in its Eastern Department, is carrying on some research on eastern problems, on the margin of its regular activities which are chiefly directed to the territory of Eastern Germany. The head of this Department is the parliament deputy WEHNER, who has developed the research to cover also the Central European areas. His main assistant THOMAS (of Polish origin) shows a good understanding of this work. But as yet, no precise programme has emerged from these efforts of the SPD.

There are some connections between this activity of the SPD and the so-called "ARBEITSKREIS OSTEUROPA" in STUTTGART, formed in 1952 as a sort of advisory body to the STUTTGART radio station. Apart from the Germans, representing the radio station, this team includes also the representatives of various national groups: Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Poles, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Hungarians and Czechoslovaks. At its origin lay the thought of setting up a German radio station destined for Central European countries, as a competition for the Radio Free Europe. The enterprise was inspired by SPD circles. It is interesting to note that, in the group of representatives of Central European nationalities, there are many names of people who during the war had appeared on occasions connected with the eastern initiatives of the OKH or of ROSENBERG's ministry. The "STUTTGARTER ARBEITSKREIS" has not been wound up formally, but its work, very energetic during the last year, has now ceased almost completely, - allegedly owing to an official intervention of BONN circles.

CPYRIGHT

The so-called Eastern University in BAMBERG and the NORDOST-DEUTSCHE AKADEMIE in LUNEBURG (Prof. BOHM) do not have a serious weight in the shaping of German political thought with regard to the East. Both these institutions, connected with the "FLUCHTLING" movement - and deprived of the support of serious scientific circles - are becoming the centres of pseudo-scientific revisionism.

The Line of Governmental Circles

The review of different trends in German political opinion should be completed by some observations on the effects which their influence finds in the official line of policy of the BONN Government.

Until recently, the eastern problems were almost entirely outside this Government's scope of interests. - unless we consider the work of the ministries of LUKASCHKE and KAISER, seeking solution in the trend of "limited" political aims.

In the Foreign Ministry directed by ADENAUER personally, the so-called Eastern Department practically limited its activity to registering certain developments. The Department was headed by a second-rate Ministry official Dr. KRESSMANN. The Press Office of the BONN Government also satisfied itself with the work of registering, and here also the eastern problems were entrusted to a functionary of small importance. If a necessity arose, the Foreign Ministry or ADENAUER's personal secretariat sought the advice of the "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE", from which Prof. SCHILLER and Dozent MARKERT acted as official advisors.

Later, however, this state of affairs underwent many changes.

In March 1953, the Eastern Department of the Foreign Ministry was entrusted to Dr. Otto BREUTIGAMM, one of the higher officials in the former ministry of ROSENBERG. BREUTIGAMM had started his career in the old Foreign Ministry. After the HIBBENTROP-MOLOTOV agreement, when the number of German Consulates in the USSR was increased, BREUTIGAMM was appointed Consul General in TIFLIS. On the outbreak of the German-Russian war, he went over to ROSENBERG's ministry, and later became a liaison between this

CPYRGHT

. 87 .

ministry and the OKH (Chief Command of Land Forces). In the war years he adhered to the "colonial" solution, and supported the striving of the General Staff for the creation of national military formations of the POWs from the Red Army.

At BRUTIGAM's side, prof. Gerard von MENDE entered the Foreign Ministry. He also had been a close collaborator of ROSENBERG, and after the war acted as an unofficial expert on south-eastern problems in the frame of organisation work carried on by the British authorities of occupation in Germany. During the war he was believed to be a supporter of the idea of dismembering of the Soviet Union. At present, he stands at the head of the Section for Political Refugees from Central and Eastern Europe.

These two recent appointments prove that the official machinery of the BONN Government had acquired some new sections which, considering their personnel, can hardly be considered as existing for the purpose of registering only.

The appointments coincide with the extension of the military apparatus which, although still not official, is growing in strength. Officially, BLANK's office gives its attention to the problems of preparation and organisation; but in its shade serious studies are already conducted by an enlarged research team directed by General GHELEN and Colonel (General ?) HERRE. The progress of these studies undoubtedly prompts the civilian departments to switch over from the work of limited observation towards practical activities.

The selection of personnel, whether accidental or made on purpose, would indicate that a certain division of tasks has been decided:

1. The sphere of research on eastern problems would still remain in the hands of "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE", which now may expect a larger support from official circles in BONN. In the first place, more financial assistance will be obtained; but another claim is that the materials prepared by the Society should be treated not merely as theoretical contributions but as authoritative comments. Considering the

*how much
it had?*

What was that?

personal relationships between the members of the Society on one hand, and functionaries or officers belonging to the newly organised sections of the Foreign Ministry or to the nucleus of the General Staff - on the other, it may safely be presumed that both points will be satisfactorily settled. In this way, the "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE" is taking up the same importance which between the World Wars had belonged to the "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT ZUM STUDIUM OST-EUROPA", initiated by Prof. HOBTSCH.

2. The practical policy is to be taken over by the Foreign Ministry and - with respect to special questions - by the German General Staff, now under organisation. This marks a most substantial change from the political point of view; until now, the activity of the BONN Government in this sphere was limited either to the registering of certain developments or to the one-sided campaigns of the ministries of LUKASCHEK and KAISER, which gave their sole attention to the problems of deportees, expellees and refugees from the east.

This fundamental reorganisation is now taking place. If after this year's parliamentary elections Chancellor ADENAUER will remain at the head of his Cabinet, a further development of this apparatus, based on the division into research and practical policy sections, should be expected.

On such a background the new eastern doctrine of Germany will be shaped as a resultant of two tendencies:

- (a) STAUFFENBERG's programme, with all its liberal-Christian(?) combinations, cf. p. 12-13
- (b) the revised "colonial" programme of ROSENBERG, referring to the traditional concepts of MITTEL-EUROPA or to the eastern concepts of the old General Staff.

Both these programmes had for their principle the necessity of weakening Russia, which in practice means a tendency to the partition of the Soviet Union. At the moment when this is brought to the effect, the RAPALLO policy may again raise its head, in accordance with the opinion - expressed also by Chancellor ADENAUER - that the RAPALLO policy is possible in

CPYRGHT

- 29 -

the periods of Russia's weakness. In such a case, the region of Central and Eastern Europe would be cast for the part of an instrument in the hands of German policy, serving to tip the balance of forces to the benefit of Germany.]

A victory of the opposition in the elections might stop the present process of shaping of the German political line with regard to the east. The German Socialists, who would constitute the section with a decisive influence in a new governmental coalition, at present have a very slight experience in eastern politics. Their own apparatus working on these problems, is small, and the participation in the studies and research run by "DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR OSTEUROPAKUNDE" is almost none. (On the list of Social-Democratic professors and scientists recently published by the "RHEINISCHER MERKUR", there is not a single name of any man engaged in eastern research). Also, no harmony exists between the Socialist Party and the new German General Staff under organization. Finally, the Socialist Party is making attempts to win over the GBHE fraction for the planned future coalition (the Party of deportees, expelled and refugees). Consequently, the Socialists are compelled to concessions in favour of the trend of "limited" political aims, which often causes the impression of a restrained revisionist tendency in their public statements and actions.

Under these circumstances, a certain period of time would have to elapse before any more definite new tendencies with regard to eastern policy could be distinguished in the line of a Socialist-dominated Government. Most probably, the group of the SPD deputy WEHNER would play a part of greatest importance here, since even now this group is best prepared for the tasks in the sphere of eastern problems.
