

Quo vadis Europa?

Maciej Giertych

*Non-attached Member
of the European Parliament*

Brussels 2009

Quo vadis Europa?

© Maciej Giertych 2009

Publisher:

Maciej Giertych
60 rue Wiertz
1047 Bruxelles
Belgium

On cover: „Photo European Parliament”

Sole liability for opinions in this publication rests with the author and the European Parliament is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Index

Distrust of Prussia	5
The fathers of the European Union	6
The German project	8
Imperial origins	8
Bismarck's method of unification	10
Bethmann Hollweg's proposal	10
Hitler's plans	14
Europe of regions	17
German domination	20
Byzantine influence.	24
What Europe should be like?	26
The economic crisis.	28
The demographic crisis.	31
The Islamic challenge.	33
The Islamic expansion.	33
What is Islam like in Europe today?	34
Civilisational geography.	35
Historical experience	36
Meeting the Islamic challenge	37
What can we do?.	38

*My sincere thanks go to Prof. Boleslaw Suszka
for help with the use of German language texts.*

Distrust of Prussia

At the very beginning I wish to make it clear that this book is not aimed against Germany. It is aimed against a certain model of the European Union that has a German origin and which I find unacceptable. It is also unacceptable to many other Europeans including many Germans. One obvious example is Konrad Adenauer, considered one of the fathers of the European Union. His vision was different and all his life he was opposed to what he considered Prussian influence in Germany. Unfortunately however it is this Prussian vision that is being realised in the European Union today.

To justify my evaluation of Adenauer's thinking I shall mention a few opinions of his, that German history would prefer to forget.

During Nazi times the anti-Hitlerite opposition tried to involve Adenauer in its activities. An anti-Nazi resistance leader called Jakob Kaiser came to Adenauer in 1936 asking him to join the anti-Nazi efforts. Elfriede Nebgen, Kaiser's wife, in a book about her husband, describes the encounter thus: "For these reasons neither Kaiser nor his friends would ever agree with the opinion, that did not wish to hear about an active role of the Wehrmacht [name of the German army at the time] against Hitler. Adenauer however had a very low opinion about the intelligence of generals. 'Have you ever seen a general with an intelligent face?' – he asked Kaiser"... "We shall not err in explaining the conversation held in 1936, when we comprehend the distance Adenauer kept from everything that was linked to Prussianness, which defined his negative stance of the time. In Rhineland communities Prussianness was to a large extent identified with the leadership of the Wehrmacht and neither one nor the other was entrusted with any confidence."¹

Later events have shown that Adenauer was right. The July 20th 1944 coup of the generals (Claus von Stauffenberg's attempt at Hitler's life), with which Kaiser was associated, came very late, when Hitler was obviously lo-

1. Elfriede Nebgen „Jakob Kaiser. Der Widerstandskämpfer“ [Jakob Kaiser. Resistance fighter], Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1970. „Deshalb stimmten weder Kaiser noch seine Freunde je einer Haltung zu, die nichts von einer aktiven Rolle der Wehrmacht Hitler gegenüber wissen wollte. Aber Adenauer schätzte nun einmal die Einsicht der Generale nur gering ein. „Haben Sie schon einmal einen General mit einem klugen Gesicht gesehen?“, so fragte er Kaiser... Man ging aber in der Deutung der Unterredung von 1936 sicherlich nicht fehl, wenn man annahm, daß Adenauers Distanz zu allem, was mit Preußentum zusammenhing, seine damalige negative Haltung bestimmte. Preußentum und Wehrmachtsführung wurden nun einmal in rheinischen Kreisen weitgehend gleichgesetzt, und beide wurden nicht gerade mit Vertrauen bedacht.“ (p. 60)

sing the war and even then it was unsuccessful, with the conspirators being executed.

In December 1946, Konrad Adenauer, at that time chairman of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) in the British Zone of occupied Germany, said: “We in the West reject much of what is referred to as the ‘Prussian spirit’. I believe that the capital of Germany should be localized in the south-west rather than in Berlin lying in the east ... Whoever makes Berlin the new capital of Germany will spiritually create a new Prussia”².

The fact that this anti-Prussian sentiment was not only the opinion of Adenauer but was more widely held, is evidenced by a letter of Fr. Laurentius Siemer, the provincial of the Dominicans in Germany, who wrote in June 1945 to Dr. Herman Siemer, future member of the Bundestag: “Most important was the industrial development in the West. In that region there was no confidence in the Junkers from beyond the Elbe.”³

Another famous German, a Rhinelander, Prof. Anton Hilckman (1900–1970) from Mainz University, devoted all his academic life to defending Latin Europe and exposing the negative Prussian influence in Germany. The list of his publications⁴ clearly shows that. He was a prisoner of German concentration camps in the years 1940–45 because of his views.

In Bavaria an expression “Saupreußen” (swine-Prussians) was coined. Obviously there were, and very likely still are, many Germans who do not like the Prussian way of thinking.

The fathers of the European Union

Adenauer with Alcide de Gasperi and Robert Schuman are often mentioned jointly as the fathers of the European Union. The famous British historian Arnold Toynbee, commenting on the Council of Europe conference held in Rome in 1953, wrote: “Both the great pioneers and the architects of European Unity [De Gasperi and Schuman] have told me about their joint experiences,

2. “Wir im Westen lehnen vieles, was gemeinhin ‘preußischer Geist’ genannt wird, ab. Ich glaube, daß die deutsche Hauptstadt eher im Südwesten liegen soll als im weit östlich gelegenen Berlin ... Wer Berlin zur neuen Hauptstadt macht, schafft geistig ein neues Preußen.“ (Die Zeit 12.XII.1946 after Wolf Schneider „Überall ist Babylon“, Econ-Verlag GMBH, Düsseldorf, 1960).

3. Elfriede Nebgen „Jakob Kaiser. Der Widerstandskämpfer“ [Jakob Kaiser. Resistance fighter], Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1970. „Von größter Wichtigkeit war die Entwicklung vom industriellen Westen. Man hatte dort überhaupt kein Vertrauen zu den ostelbischen Junkern.“ (p. 61)

4. “In Memoriam Anton Hilckman” 1975 Herausgeber: Heimatverein Bevergern e. V., 4441 Bevergern, Kirchstrasse 4.

which have helped them get beyond national fences, allowed them to discover wider horizons of thought and feeling. It became clear to me that what brought closer together De Gasperi and Schuman and also Adenauer was their religion. Catholics cannot just concentrate only on their own national issues ...”⁵

A similar view was expressed by Pope John Paul II: „Dear friends, in these days in which you are reflecting on Europe, it is natural to recall that among the principal promoters of the reunification of this continent were men inspired by profound Christian faith, like Adenauer, De Gasperi and Schuman. How can we underestimate, for example, the fact that, in 1951, before beginning the delicate negotiations which would lead to the adoption of the Treaty of Paris, they wished to meet in a Benedictine monastery on the Rhine for meditation and prayer?”⁶

Similarly Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (soon to become Pope Benedict XVI), wrote in 2005: „So we face the question: how shall we proceed? In the great events of our time, is there an identity of Europe that has a future and which we can embrace? It was clear to the fathers of European unity, Adenauer, Schumann, de Gasperi, that such an identity exists and that it is the Christian heritage of our continent, which was formed through Christianity in the first place. For these men, it was clear that the destructiveness of the Nazi and Stalin dictatorships stemmed from the rejection of these Christian foundations.”⁷

It can readily be said that the views about Europe of the current Pope, Benedict XVI, a Bavarian German, are much closer to those of Adenauer, than to those Germans of a more Prussian mentality. I might add here that the full acceptance of a German Pope by Polish people, an acceptance which appears to be fuller than the acceptance by the Germans themselves, stems from the fact that he is so close in his mentality with our Polish mentality. Many suspected that a German Pope might discourage Poles in their fidelity to the Church. This has not happened. Obviously factors other than nationality play a role here.

5. <http://ekai.pl/europa/?MID=3809>

6. Address of Pope John Paul II to the former stagiaires of the Robert Schuman Foundation, 7 November 2003. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2003/november/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20031107_robert-schuman_en.html

7. Joseph Ratzinger „So stehen wir vor der Frage: Wie soll es weitergehen? Gibt es in den gewaltigen Umbrüchen unserer Zeit eine Identität Europas, die Zukunft hat und zu der wir von innen her stehen können? Für die Väter der europäischen Einigung – Adenauer, Schumann, de Gasperi – war es klar, dass es eine solche Grundlage gibt und daß sie im christlichen Erbe unseres durch das Christentum gewordenen Kontinents besteht. Für sie war klar, dass die Zerstörungen, mit denen uns die Nazidiktatur und die Diktatur Stalins konfrontierten, gerade auf der Abstoßung dieser Grundlage beruhten“ *Süddeutsche Zeitung* April 13, 2005.

Indeed Catholicism of the main founders of the European Union and the notion of Christian universalism have been at the root of the idea, that Europe can and should be united. Yes, there were also behind the scenes non-Christian “fathers” of the European Union, among whom one can mention Jean Monnet⁸, Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi⁹ and Joseph Retinger¹⁰, who if not specifically anti-Christian, were in fact closer to freemasonic values in their thinking and plans for Europe. We are of course aware of these two trends at the roots of the European Union and the constant battle between the Christian and secularist outlook is well reflected in the everyday polemics and voting preferences going on in the European Parliament.

However what is much less known is that there is a specifically German project for the European Union that is being gradually realised. Adenauer would have labelled it “Prussian”. Unfortunately it is this “Prussian” thinking that has dominated Germany today and even though the name “Prussia” no longer functions internationally, it lives on under the name of Germany or German mentality. No doubt a significant role in the spread of this Prussian mentality in Germany is played by people originating from territories lost by Germany following World War II. These were mainly Prussians. They have settled throughout Germany and together with their powerful organisation (Federation of Expellees or Bund der Vertriebenen (BdV)) constitute an important element of German politics. Also the current “Ostflucht” (escape from the East), tendency to leave the former East Germany (DDR) for West Germany, contributes to this spread of Prussian mentality.

The German project

Imperial origins

What then is the German (Prussian) project? To understand the German aims one needs to look back a millennium, all the way to the German Roman Emperors. It is not the imperial appetite that is a problem here. In the XIX c. at least 6 European actors had imperial ambitions (Austro-Hun-

8. Monnet was the author of the so called Schuman Plan for the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). When finalised in 1952 Monnet became the first President of the ECSC High Authority. He also organised in 1955 the Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

9. Author of such books as “Paneuropa” Vienna 1923, “Kampf um Europa” Zürich 1949, “Die europäische Nation” Stuttgart 1953.

10. Retinger assisted in the foundation of the European Movement and the Council of Europe. He became Honorary Secretary General of the European Movement. He organised the Hague European Congress in 1948. In 1954 he initiated the Bilderberg conferences.

gary, Britain, France, Prussia, Russia and the Ottomans). What is special about the German emperors of the XIth century is that they have adopted the Byzantine mode of thinking.

As I have written in my booklet “Civilisations at war in Europe” (2007) Byzantine thinking appeared in Germany at the time when Germans were Emperors were Holy Roman Empire (since 16th c. known as the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation). Emperor Otto II married a Byzantine princess Teofano in the year 972. It was her court that impressed the Germans and imposed the Byzantine style of statesmanship. As a regent during the childhood of Otto III she introduced a certain mode of political thinking. It is from this thinking that caesaropapism arose, the attempts to impose the will of the German emperor on the pope. Bishops were made vassals (the so called “lay investiture”). This is the source of the mode of functioning of the state created by the Order of the Teutonic Knights, who were the first to employ religion in the service of the state. They forced conversions with the sword and recognised no rights of the heathen. This position was condemned by the Church at the Council of Constance (1414–1418) thanks to the efforts of the Polish delegate Paulus Vladimiri. However, the spirit of the Teutonic Knights persisted in Prussia. Having stolen from the conquered, or rather exterminated, Prussians their name, and abandoning Catholicism (the first Catholic bishop to join the Protestants, in 1523, was a Teutonic Knight, bishop of Sambia, Georg Polenz), they adopted a “country religion” (Landeskirche), the principle of *cuius regio eius religio* (whose rule, his religion) in 1555, and became the main centre of Byzantine influence in Europe. It is interesting that adopting Protestantism in western Europe did not involve abandoning the Latin civilisation, while in German speaking countries even Catholicism became Byzantine, becoming a country religion, as for example in Austria. The meddling of the emperor in Church matters, even in such issues as liturgy (Josephinism), was generally accepted. It was Prussia of Frederic the Great (together with Austria and Russia) that led to the partition of Poland in the XVIIIth c., that is, to the annihilation of a neighbouring country. This was not a conflict over contested provinces or rights, but simple plunder, enrichment at the cost of the plundered.

The Byzantine way of thinking dominated the politics of the Order of the Teutonic Knights, the Prussian kings and the most famous Prussian chancellors. This mentality requires that the state be primarily successful and not necessarily ethical.

Bismarck's method of unification

The current concept of a united Europe starts with Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. After successful military operations against Austria and France the King of Prussia was proclaimed 'German Emperor' on 18 January 1871. The new German Empire had a federal structure with each of its 25 constituent states (kingdoms, grand duchies, duchies, principalities and free cities) retaining some autonomy. As Emperor (Kaiser), the King of Prussia, was not sovereign over the whole of Germany, but only first amongst equals. He presided over the Bundesrat where all the constituent states were represented, and which met to discuss policies proposed by the Chancellor, whom the Kaiser appointed. The individual currencies were gradually replaced by the Mark (Reichsbanknote). What originally started in 1834 as a customs union (Deutscher Zollverein) gradually coalesced into a single state under Prussian domination. In just 43 years this state was ready to start the Great War (1914–1918) with a clear objective to place all of Europe under German domination.

Bethmann Hollweg's proposal

At the beginning of World War I, on September 9th 1914, that is, at the time the battle of the Marne was being waged and Germans hoped to ender Paris soon (in a Blitzkrieg, "lightning war", as they did in 1870/71 and later in 1940), Chancellor Theobald Bethmann Hollweg presented a document to the Kaiser defining the aim of the war ("Ziel des Krieges"). This document is very enlightening. It defines the aim as follows: „To secure the German Reich from the West and from the East for as long as conceivable. For this purpose France must be so weakened that it would not be able to elevate itself again as a major power. Russia must be, as far as possible, pushed back from the frontiers of Germany and its rule over non-Russian vassal peoples must be broken. [...] It is necessary to achieve a central European economic union through common customs agreements encompassing France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Austro-Hungary, Poland¹¹, and possibly also Italy, Sweden and Norway. This union, while without a common constitutional superstructure, and while maintaining the external equality of its members, would in fact be under German leadership and would have to stabilize the economic governance of Germany over Central Europe.”¹²

This project looks familiar, doesn't it?

11. At that time according to the German usage "Poland" meant the "Congress Kingdom of Poland", the most western part of Russian Poland, where initially there was some Polish autonomy but with the tsar as king of Poland.

Next year, in 1915, this project of Bethmann Hollweg was spelt out more fully in a book by Friedrich Naumann entitled “Mitteleuropa”¹³ published in Berlin. It speaks of the “Central European people geared to economy building.”¹⁴ Naumann speaks of Bismarck as the initiator of the idea. “I believe I have demonstrated that he is the initiator of Central Europe. Our job is to continue his project.”¹⁵ This region was to be organised on the basis of the cooperation of Germany with Austro-Hungary, leading to a single great state (Großstaat) with many nationalities: “And above all, above German, French, Danish, Polish citizens of the German Reich, above the Hungarian, German, Romanian, Slovakian, Croatian, Serbian Hungarians, above German, Czech, Slovak, Polish and Yugoslav Austrians, we envisage once again the **overriding concept of a Central Europe**. This Central Europe will in its essence be German, will naturally be using the world known German language allowing mutual understanding. However from the very beginning it will show lenience and flexibility towards all the other neighbour languages composing it, because only in this manner will a great harmony develop, necessary for all the parts of a great state, which is confronted and pressurised from outside. [...] The new generation of youth, raised after the war, will have to do it better than we old people could, so that the type of a Central-European man can develop encompassing all the creative elements and forces, as carrier of the multiform, rich in content culture, growing around Germanness.”¹⁶ Naumann claims that in this way a “regulated national economy will grow from all sides

12. Fritz Fischer „Deutsche Kriegesziele. Revolutionierung und Separatfrieden im Osten 1914-1918” Historische Zeitschrift 1959. vol. 188(2), 249-310. On p. 255: „Sicherung des Deutschen Reiches nach West und Ost auf erdenkliche Zeit. Zu diesen Zweck muß Frankreich so geschwächt werden, daß es als Großmacht nicht neu erstehen kann. Rußland von der deutschen Grenze nach Möglichkeit abgedrängt und seine Herrschaft über die nichtrussischen Vasallenvölker gebrochen werden. [...] Es ist zu erreichen die Gründung eines mitteleuropäischen Wirtschaftsverbandes durch gemeinsame Zollabmachungen, unter Einschluß von Frankreich, Belgien, Holland, Dänemark, Österreich-Ungarn, Polen (!), und evtl. Italien, Schweden und Norwegen. Dieser Verband, wohl ohne gemeinsame konstitutionelle Spitze, unter deutscher Führung, muß die wirtschaftliche Vorherrschaft Deutschlands über Mitteleuropa stabilieren.“

13. Friedrich Naumann « Mitteleuropa ». 1915, Berlin, Druck u. Verlag Georg Reimer.

14. *ibid.* p. 102 „Das mitteleuropäische Wirtschaftsvolk“

15. *ibid.* p. 56 „Ich glaube aufgezeigt zu haben, daß er [Bismarck] der Anfänger Mitteleuropas ist. Unsere Aufgabe ist es, ihn fortzusetzen.“

16. *ibid.* p. 100-101 „Und über das alles, über deutsche, französische, dänische, polnische Reichsdeutsche, über magyrische, deutsche, rumänische, slowakische, kroatische, serbische Ungarn, über deutsche, tschechische, slowakische, polnische südslawische Österreicher denken wir uns nun nochmals den **Oberbegriff Mitteleuropa**. Mitteleuropa wird im Kern deutsch sein, wird von selbst die deutsche Welt- und Vermittlungssprache gebrauchen, muß aber vom ersten Tage an Nachgiebigkeit und Biegsamkeit gegenüber allen mitbeteiligten Nachbarsprachen zeigen, weil nur so die große Harmonie emporenwachsen kann, die für einen allseitig umkämpften und umdrängten Großstaat nötig ist [...] Hier soll die neue, nach den Krieg erwachsende Jugend es besser machen als wir Alten, damit der Typ des mitteleuropäischen Menschen mit Aufnahme aller Bildungselemente und Kräfte herausgearbeitet werde, der Träger einer um das Deutschtum herum wachsenden vielgliedrigen starken und inhaltreichen Kultur.“

on the basis of state or national socialism.”¹⁷ “The economic philosophy of Germans is to become in the future increasingly characteristic for the whole of Central Europe.”¹⁸ In other words Central Europe (Mitteleuropa) was to bring material benefits for the price of accepting German domination, accepting a German organisation. For those not liking this idea Naumann is very brutal: “... smaller nations have no possibility of leading a group [of states] in the global economic sense. They have only a choice between isolation or joining ... Sooner or later they will have to decide in which configuration [German, Russian or British] depending on geography, productivity and spiritual inclination, they can or are able to move forward together. This is a hard constraint, a difficult fate, but it is the overwhelming demand of the time, a categorical imperative for the development of mankind”. Territorially this program is almost the same as the current European Union, except that at the time (1915) the possibility of subjecting Britain, a great colonial empire, under German leadership was still unthinkable.

In 1916 a Working Committee for Central Europe (Arbeitsausschuß für Mitteleuropa) was established as a think tank financed by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It included not only Friedrich Naumann but also Mathias Erzberger, who later negotiated the Compiègne 11.11.1918 cease fire, the leading socialist politician Gustav Noske, the industrialists Robert Bosch and Albert Ballin, the future president of the Reichsbank and Hitler’s minister of the treasury Hjalmar Schacht, philosopher Max Weber and others. In 1917 the Committee started publishing the weekly “*Mitteleuropa*”.²⁰ The idea of a German dominated Central Europe was systematically studied and developed.

It is fair to point out here that Naumann, as a Christian democrat, did not propose a Prussian but a Habsburg mode of ruling over non-German nations. However, we do not need to speculate what the German Europe would have looked like had Germany won the war. In fact Germany did win the war in the East and it signed peace treaties in Brest-Litovsk with

17. *ibid.* p. 113 „... so wächst von allen Seiten der Staats- oder Nationalsozialismus, es wächst die <geregelte Volkswirtschaft>“

18. *ibid.* p. 114 “Die deutsche Wirtschaftskonfession soll in Zukunft immer mehr der Charakter von Mitteleuropa werden.“

19. *ibid.* p. 178 «...die kleineren Völker gar nicht die Möglichkeit haben, sich selbst als weltwirtschaftliche Gruppenführer vorzustellen. Sie haben in der Tat nur die Wahl zwischen Isoliertheit oder Anschluß (...) so müssen sie sich früher oder später sich irgendwie entschließen, mit welchem Verbands sie nach Geographie, Produktion und Geistesrichtung gehen wollen oder können. Das ist ein harter Zwang, ein schweres Schicksal, aber es ist der übermächtige Zug der Zeit, der kategorische Imperativ der Menschheitsentwicklung.“

20. <http://docserv1.bis.uni-oldenburg.de/publikationen/dissertation/2000/thogan00/pdf/kap05.pdf>

Ukraine (9.02.1918) and Russia (3.03.1918). These treaties established German rule in the region. Germany itself was enlarged by incorporating parts of the Polish Congress Kingdom (until 1914 under Russia) referred to as a “border strip” but in area larger than Alsace and Lorraine.²¹ A string of small countries was established, namely Balticum (today’s Estonia), Latvia, Lithuania and Poland (territorially similar to the Baltic States because the former Congress Kingdom was reduced by the “border strip”, the Chełm region ceded to Ukraine and the parts of Poland under Austro-Hungary and Russia were not included). In each of these states a pseudo-independent government was established (in Poland under a “regency council”) but in fact the actual rule was conducted by a German Governor General (in Poland gen. Hans Hartwig von Beseler). Such were the plans for the whole continent, were Germans to win the war.

Fortunately they lost it.

While victories continued, particularly in the East, there was popular support in Germany for the Prussian governance. When defeat came some anti-Prussian sentiments re-emerged. There were attempts to return to the idea of independence of the former German states, an idea supported by the supreme commander of the allied forces Marshal Ferdinand Foch and the French President Raymond Poincaré. Three different attempts were made, all in the Rhineland region, including the Pfälzische Republik covering the Bavarian owned Upper Rhineland, the Independent Rhenish Republic west of the Rhine and Hessen-Nassau further east. The idea was first introduced on Dec. 5th 1918 in Cologne under the patronage of Konrad Adenauer, the then mayor of Cologne, who was initially at the head of this movement. The French hoped that those independent republics would develop under French hegemony but of course they wanted to remain German. They wanted to shed Prussian domination but were not interested in French domination. They appealed to the Paris Peace Conference referring to the dominant political slogan of the time “self determination of nations.” However this emancipation trend did not last long because of the lost war, unconditional surrender, foreign occupation and imposed sanctions and reparations. Consolidating trends proved stronger in Germany. The French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau devoted in his memoirs²² a whole chapter to the topic of the emancipation movements in the Rhineland.

21. This territory was again incorporated into Germany by Hitler in 1939 together with the former Prussian part of occupied Poland. It was never a part of the German occupied General Government during World War II.

22. Georges Clemenceau „Grandeurs et misères d’une victoire”, 1930, Paris, Librairie Plon.

Hitler's plans

During Hitler's rule in Germany the imperial ambitions re-emerged. The whole region of the planned Central Europe (Mitteleuropa) was occupied by Hitler under the banner of national-socialism and with the idea of creating a major region without borders (keine Grenzen). There were systematic preparations for the organisation of the so united Europe after the war.

A study group was formed that produced a document called "Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft" (EWG) that translates into English as European Economic Community (EEC) – sounds familiar does it not? This document was published in Berlin in 1942.²³ One of the main authors was Walther Funk, Minister of Economics and president of the Deutsche Reichsbank (he was later convicted in Nuremberg for war crimes). The other authors were high ranking officials of the German political and economic establishment. The forward is provided by Prof. Heinrich Hunke, Economic Committee Advisor to the NSDAP (the Nazi party) and President of the Berlin Society of Industry and Commerce.

The aim of the study was to provide a program of macro development on a continental level (the term continent is used throughout in the sense of the whole of Europe but without Britain). The starting point is the belief that time for an economic union in Europe has arrived. The achievements of Germany deserve to be spread throughout the continent, particularly in the poorly developed east. Trade on a macro scale will enhance productivity and consumption, which require wise management as do money and credit supply. European cooperation must be achieved. "This demands a continuous effort to comprehend the major objectives and adapt to them, and a readiness to subject own interests to the interests of the European community; this is the ultimate goal we aim for and we demand of the European nations."²⁴ "Such a common order can be achieved only through voluntary cooperation of independent states, of course accepting the political leadership of one nation and state."²⁵

23. Funk Walter, Jecht Horst, Woermann Emil, Reithinger Anton, Beisiegel Philipp, Koenigs Gustav, Benning Bernhard, Clodius Carl, Hunke Heinrich. 1942. Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft. Haude & Spenersche Verlagsbuchhandlung Max Paschke, Published with a preface by Prof. Dr. H. Hunke, Economics Committee Advisor and the President of the Berlin Society of Industry and Commerce. 229pp.

24. *ibid.* W. Funk (p. 41) „Das bedeutet aber auch die Bereitschaft, die eigenen Interessen im gegebenen Falle denen er europäischen Gemeinschaft unterzuordnen; und das ist das höchste Ziel, das wir von den europäischen Staaten verlangen, das wir erstreben.“

25. *ibid.* H. Jecht (p.44) „Eine solche gemeinsame Ordnung ist auch durchaus möglich in Form der freiwilligen Zusammenarbeit selbständiger Nationen, freilich unter Anerkennung der politischen Führung eines Volkes und Staates.“

The document then goes on to propose transcontinental solutions in various fields. In agriculture a state support policy is needed to prevent dependence on food imports. "German experience in the food supply economy proved for some countries a model and stimulant ... the effort of Germany and Italy towards self-sufficiency in the supply of the most important food products needs to be extended over the whole continental European area."²⁶ The level of industrial development is very different in various parts of Europe. "First common European interests of all partners will have to be considered and interests of individual partners will have to be set aside in the interest of the most important European ones."²⁷ "While war continues on the frontiers and shores of the continent, within Europe it is necessary to establish foundations of the future structure of a European community of nations and a common economy."²⁸ To combat unemployment redistribution of labour was envisaged. "If a country is unable to assure an appropriate level of employment for its labour force at home it should place it in countries of the continent, where there is a shortage in this respect."²⁹ "One should hope and wish that Europe would accept the need for central state organisation of labour management and unification of the legal basis for it. This will facilitate the exchange of the labour force."³⁰ The report on transport envisages a trans-European network of water routes, motorways, and rails. The "«Verein Mitteleuropäische Eisenbahnverwaltungen» will become the leading force in the international rail self-management of the European Economic Community."³¹ The chapter on the European monetary block envisages that: "The geopolitical development of the 20th century is

26. *ibid.* E. Woermann (p.86) „...das deutsche Beispiel ... auf Anregung gewirkt hat ... auf Selbstversorgung mit den wichtigsten Nahrungsgrundstoffen gerichtete Arbeit Deutschlands und Italiens sinngemäß auf den kontinentaleuropäischen Raum zu übertragen.“

27. *ibid.* A. Reithinger (p. 106) „Dann erst können wir überlegen, welche gemeinsamen europäischen Interessen alle Partner haben und wo Einzelinteressen zugunsten des größeren europäischen Gesamtinteresses zurückgestellt werden müssen.“

28. *ibid.* E. Woermann (p. 116) „Während an den Grenzen und Küsten unsers Kontinent noch um die Entscheidung gefochten wird, müssen innerhalb Europas bereits die Fundamente des künftigen Neubaues der abendländischen Völker- und Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft gelegt werden.“

29. *ibid.* P. Beisiegel (p. 123) „Soweit es einem Staat nicht möglich ist, alle Volksgenossen im Lande den erforderlichen Lebensunterhalt durch angemessene Arbeit sicherzustellen, empfiehlt es sich, die überschüssigen Kräfte in solchen Ländern des Kontinents anzusetzen, in den Mangel an Arbeitskräften besteht ...“

30. *ibid.* P. Beisiegel (p. 138) „Es ist aber zu hoffen und zu wünschen, daß sich in Europa die Überzeugung von der Notwendigkeit einer zentral gelenkten staatlichen Arbeitseinsatzorganisation immer mehr durchsetzt und daß die Vereinheitlichung des materiellen Einsatzrechtes immer weitere Fortschritte macht. Die Arbeiteraustausch würde dadurch wesentlich erleichtert werden.“

31. *ibid.* G. Koenigs (p. 147) „... der ‘Verein Mitteleuropäische Eisenbahnverwaltungen’ zum Träger der internationalen Selbstverwaltung der Eisenbahnen in der europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft wird.“

geared towards the European Economic Community. The monetary order will be affected by this no less than other branches of the economy. ... As in the 19th century, following the Customs Union, the German economic area developed, thanks to the liquidation of the numerous inhibitive customs barriers and dividing frontiers, so now – on a political basis – the continental cooperation of European countries and the organic development of their economic forces will be prepared and enhanced, through modern instruments of financial clearings, the European economic order and the organisation of the European monetary block.”³² However the relation between big and small nations is made very clear: “Small European nations must know that they are always dependent on their neighbours and therefore have to reckon with them.”³³ The study ends with the conclusion that: “Prussia and eventually the Reich arose from the common colonisation of all Germanic tribes. And I believe that similarly the future common effort of European nations in the east of Europe will support and form nothing less than the European Economic Community.”³⁴

* * *

To summarize the German project envisaged a united Europe embracing: a customs union, a common industrial policy aimed at spreading the German know-how and efficiency throughout the region, an immigration policy favouring redistribution of labour, a special role for the German language, a fair degree of autonomy for regions and German domination over the foreign, military, monetary and economic policies. Smaller nations must accept this German domination even when it is against their interests and traditions. In other words the idea was to extend the model of the Federal Republic of Germany to the whole of Europe.

32. *ibid.* B. Benning (p.182) „Die geopolitische Entwicklung des 20. Jahrhunderts zielt auf die europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft hin. Die Währungsordnung kann davon ebenso wenig unberührt bleiben wie irgendein anderer ökonomischer Bereich. ... Wie im 10. Jahrhundert durch den Zollverein der deutsche Wirtschaftsraum allmählich unter Beseitigung einer Vielzahl von hemmenden Zollschranken und trennenden Schlagbäumen entwickelt wurde, so wird jetzt – natürlich auf einer politischen Ebene – die kontinentale Zusammenarbeit der europäischen Länder und die organische Entfaltung ihrer Wirtschaftskräfte durch die modernen Instrumente der Verrechnungsabkommen, der europäischen Wirtschaftsverträge und durch die Neuordnung des kontinentalen Währungsblocks vorbereitet und begleitet.“

33. *ibid.* H.Hunke (p. 224) „Genau so dürfen die kleinen Nationen in Europa sich nicht im unklaren darüber sein, daß auch sie immer ihre Nachbarn angewiesen sind und daher auch auf sie Rücksicht nehmen müssen.“

34. *ibid.* H. Hunke (p. 228-229) „Aus der gemeinsamen Kolonisation aller deutschen Stämme ist Preußen und damit das Reich erwachsen. Und ich glaube nun, daß ähnlich die gemeinsame zukünftige Arbeit der europäischen Nationen im Ostraum wie nichts anderes die europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft fördern und gestalten wird.“

Europe of regions

As all can see today one of the elements of building a European super-state (Großstaat) is the reduction of the authority of a nation state and transferring it either upwards to Brussels or downwards to regions. The regions in question are to be of a size more or less equivalent to the German Lands or states such as Denmark or Holland. Brussels does not want to have trouble with too large administrative regions, such as France, Great Britain, Spain or Poland. Wherever possible, old regional differences are being strengthened. The so called „devolution” of Great Britain, that is the transfer of a higher level of authority to Scotland, Wales and other regions, is an element of this programme. The separateness of Flanders, Catalonia, Normandy, Sabaudia, Carynthia etc is being recalled and advertised. All this leads in the same direction – towards regionalisation of Europe. Poland is a most difficult case. It is large, ethnically and religiously homogenous; the divisions imposed on it by the partitioning powers (Prussia, Russia and Austria) for more than a century (1795–1918) have been eradicated seven decades ago by the will of the people. The creation of new “nationalities” such as Silesians, Cashoubs (promoted by the Political Group Greens/European Free Alliance in the European Parliament) has no chance to develop into a sufficient force to support the regionalisation programme. In view of this there are attempts to obliterate the national frontiers by creating Euroregions, linking neighbouring provinces with two or three nationalities into multinational organisms with an ascending authority. On the other hand attempts are being made to elevate the natural divisions of each country (voivodships in Poland) by giving them wider authority, reaching even the sphere of foreign policy. Voivodships establish their own representations in Brussels, currently primarily to fight for EU funds for their regions. By sitting closer to where the real decisions are taking place the representations are expected to look after other interests of their regions. This is part of the programme of reducing the authority of EU member states. It is advertised as based on the subsidiarity principle, but this subsidiarity applies only to regions, not to member states. What is envisaged is a central federal government in Brussels (dominated by Germans) and regional governments taking care of local issues, functioning in the same manner as the Federal Republic of Germany functions now.

After the funeral of Jean Monnet, one of the founding fathers of a united Europe, at which the German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt was present,

there appeared in the magazine “*Le Spectacle du Monde*” the following text: “The Europe of Jean Monnet would have been a Europe in which there would no longer be any states but only federated regions; a Europe of regions, in which, according to Edmond Rothschild: ‘We shall no longer say that I am French, German or British, but we shall say I am a European and a Breton, a European and a Bavarian, a European and a Scotsman.’ In the Europe of Jean Monnet, between regions and the central federation there will be no room for national states. Under the formula ‘United States of Europe’, as in America, the States are no more than provinces with a real autonomy, but united under the iron rule of federal Law and Administration.”³⁵

Some politicians in Poland have also been promoting the idea of a Europe of regions. The liberal Prime Minister of Poland, Jan Krzysztof Bielecki, speaking on March 15th 1991 at the inauguration of the work of a committee called to propose a change in the territorial organisation of the State said: “To encourage local and regional Poland to activity – a veritable decentralisation policy is needed (...) What is needed is a new territorial division of the country, adapted to the new political system being developed now (...) Whence my proposal, presented in Poznań Feb. 16th, of a new division encompassing 10–12 units, corresponding in size to West European regions.”³⁶

Władysław Reichelt (Liberal Democratic Congress) speaking in the Sejm (Polish Parliament) on March 3rd 1992 said: “In the future Europe, after achieving a consolidation of the continent, national states will move to the background, bringing regions to the fore. Issues concerning Europeans will be decided almost at home – in Bavaria, in Wales, in Silesia, in Wielkopolska. Related regions will independently be undertaking trans-border cooperation in selected matters. In forming euroregions the intention is to build solid bridges of cooperation between nations (...) The political map of Europe, whether we like it or not, is not a finished project. Its future edition

35. *Le Spectacle du Monde* no. 205, Apr. 1979, p. 19, Editorial “*Sous le projecteur*”: “L’Europe de Jean Monnet serait une Europe où il n’y aurait plus d’Etats, mais des régions fédérées, une Europe des régions, dans laquelle, selon Edmond de Rothschild: ‘On ne dira plus je suis Français, Allemand, Britannique, mais je suis Européen et Breton, Européen et Bavarois, Européen et Ecossais.’ Dans l’Europe de Jean Monnet, entre les régions et la fédération centrale, il n’y aurait plus de place pour les Etats-nations. D’où la formule ‘Etats-Unis d’Europe’, car en Amérique les Etats ne sont en réalité que des provinces avec une réelle autonomie, mais unifiées sous la règle de fer de la Loi et de Administration fédérale.”

36. *Nasza Wielkopolska* 4(4), Nov. 1998, J.K. Bielecki „Polityka decentralizacji”: „Aby pobudzić do działania Polskę lokalną i regionalną - konieczna jest rzeczyczysta polityka decentralizacyjna (...) konieczny jest nowy podział terytorialny kraju, dostosowany do nowo kształtującego się ustroju państwa (...) Dlatego nie bez kozery przedstawiona przeze mnie 16 lutego w Poznaniu wstępna propozycja nowego podziału zakłada istnienie 10-12 jednostek, odpowiadających wielkością zachodnioeuropejskim regionom.”

will have Baskonia, Navarra and Catalonia in place of Spain; Mazowsze, Kujawy, Warmia, Mazury, Wielkopolska, Małopolska and two Silesias in place of Poland. Thus united continent will liberate itself from all conflicts that national states used to enter in the XIX c. The communal spirit will return together with colourful diversity. Such is the hard reality of our time and we should not lose it from our perspective.”³⁷

Prof. Andrzej Piskozub from Gdańsk University said when commenting on the emancipation movements of Scotland, Wales and Silesia: “The disintegration of European states is a healing process that will lead in the future to the integration of Europe as a whole.”³⁸

Recently Józef Oleksy, the former left wing Prime Minister of Poland, said: „I believe that in the foreseeable future nationality will cease to be the strongest anchor of identity. Instead of saying: I am Polish, we shall say: I am a European from Poland.”³⁹

Such ideas have been floating around Europe for quite some time and there is no doubt that Germany is behind them. Pierre Hillard devoted a book to the subject the title of which (“Minorities and regionalism. Investigation of the German plan which should outrage Europe”) clearly points at the German origin of the project.⁴⁰ It concludes: “For the reunited Germany, the first economic power of the continent, at the onset of the renovation of the East into black, red and gold colours, the road is open. This is more so, since Germany has imposed its political philosophy on the leadership of the European Union, its philosophy of federalism, as well as its ethno-cultural vision embodied in the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and in

37. [Stenographic Report from the Polish Parliament] Sprawozdanie Stenograficzne z 38 Posiedzenia Sejmu RP, 3.03.1993, p. 265. „W przyszłej Europie państwa narodowe doprowadziwszy do scalenia kontynentu, usuną się na dalszy plan, a pierwszy rząd zajmą regiony. Sprawy dotyczące Europejczyków będą rozstrzygane niemalże w ich domu – w Bawarii, w Walii, na Śląsku, w Wielkopolsce. Spokrewnione regiony w wybranych zakresach będą również samodzielnie podejmować współpracę ponad granicami państw. Przy tworzeniu euroregionów chodzi o budowanie trwałych pomostów współpracy między narodami (...) Polityczna mapa Europy, czy tego chcemy, czy nie, nie jest jeszcze tworem skończonym. Przyszłe jej wydanie będzie zawierać w miejscu Hiszpanii Baskonię, Nawarrę, Katalonię, w miejscu Polski Mazowsze, Kujawy, Warmię, Mazury, Wielkopolskę, Małopolskę i obydwie Śląski. Tak zjednoczony kontynent uwolni się od wszelkich konfliktów, w jakie popadały narodowe państwa zrodzone przez XIX w. Powróci poczucie wspólnoty i barwa różnorodności. Takie są twarde realia współczesności i nie możemy tego tracić z pola widzenia.”

38. Andrzej Piskozub: „Dezintegracja państw Europy jest procesem ozdrowieńczym, który w przyszłości doprowadzi do integracji Europy jako całości.” *Dziennik Bałtycki – Magazyn Rejsy* 3.10.1997.

39. *Wprost* 28.09.2008. Interview with Józef Oleksy: „Sądzę, że narodowość przestanie być w dającym się przewidzieć czasie najsilniejszą kotwicą tożsamości. Zamiast mówić o sobie: jestem Polakiem, będziemy kiedyś mówić jestem Europejczykiem z Polski.”

40. Pierre Hillard – „*Minorities et regionalismes, Enquete sur le plan allemand qui va bouleverser l'Europe*”, editions Francois-Xavier de Guibert, 2002.

the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. These measures condemn the nation-state to death.⁴¹ Hillard also publishes a map entitled “L’Europe des ethnies” which has been prepared by Waffén–SS in 1945 and which divides all European countries into regions.⁴²

In 1958 when the European Economic Community was established there was only one country with institutionalised regions – the Federal Republic of Germany. Gradually countries were pressured into developing a regionalisation policy (devolution). By 1992 the treaty of Maastricht created the groundwork for the establishment in 1994 of the Committee of the Regions (CoR). Now the CoR has 344 members. The Assembly of European Regions publishes a map of Europe divided into all these regions (*Tabula Regionum Europae*), the latest in 2008⁴³. It is much more detailed but in fact quite similar to the one proposed by Waffén-SS.

It was originally hoped that the CoR would develop into a second chamber in the European Union (second to the European Parliament), equivalent to the Bundesrat in Germany where the Lands are represented. So far this has not materialised because of the very natural opposition of member states. They are not interested in becoming redundant.

German domination

Is it really true that there is such a thing as German domination in the European Union? Of course if there is, it is done in a very subtle manner so as not to raise objections. Before 1990 the main policy objective of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was to achieve reunification with the German Democratic Republic (GDR). This was understandable. Discrete help came even from the Polish Pope John Paul II, when he nominated Cardinal Joachim Meisner archbishop of Köln in 1988. Before that Meisner was an auxiliary bishop in Erfurt and bishop of Berlin in the GDR. By nominating him for Köln the Pope has indicated that Germany is one.

41. *ibid.* (p.269): “Pour l’Allemagne réunifiée, première puissance économique du continent, l’aube du renouveau à l’Est prend des couleurs en noir, rouge, or. La voie est libre. Elle l’est d’autant plus que, dans le cadre de l’Union européenne, l’Allemagne a su imposer sa philosophie politique, c’est-à-dire le fédéralisme, ainsi que sa vision ethno-culturelle incarnée dans la Charte des langues régionales ou minoritaires et la Convention-cadre pour la protection des minorités. Ces mesures condamnent à mort l’État-nation.”

42. Hillard reproduces it after Saint-Loup “Les S.S. da la Toison d’Or. Flamands et Wallons au combat 1941-1945”. Presses de la Cité, Paris 1975.

43. <http://www.aer.eu/publications/tabula-regionum-europae.html>

When the Berlin Wall fell and reunification came in October 1990 the GDR immediately became a part of the European Union, the first of the Soviet block countries to do so. Before that FRG was only slightly larger than Italy, UK or France. After reunification Germany became decidedly the largest country of the EU, with more than 80 million people compared to Italy, UK and France each with about 60 million people only.

German reunification took some time, money and effort, both for Germany itself and for the European Union. Transformation from a socialist to a free market economy is not easy. During that time Germany did not manifest its increased weight markedly. Gradually however the transformation difficulties were overcome with substantial help from the EU. No other post-Soviet country received as much as former GDR did, which reflected to some extent the growing role of Germany in EU management. However the plans for integration of the Central European countries with the EU were drawn up in a spirit of political generosity, as evidenced by the Treaty of Nice signed in February 2001. It gave considerable voting strength to smaller countries.

Then came work on the European constitution. By that time Germany felt strong enough to demand a change in the voting system to reflect its numerical strength. The project of the “double majority” came to be. It is part of both the European Constitutional Treaty rejected by France and Holland and of the Lisbon Treaty rejected by Ireland. It is interesting that when the European Convention was preparing the constitutional project, the European Parliament was represented in its presidium by two of its Members (MEPs), one each from the two main political groups, the European Peoples Party (EPP) and the Party of European Socialists (PES). Both of them were German, one from CDU (Elmar Brok) and one from SDP (Klaus Hänsch). Speaking in the European Parliament 19th Nov. 2003 this decision was contested by two French MEPs, Pervenche Berès from PES and William Aitbol from EPP, but with no effect.

When I entered the European Parliament in 2004 the most important committees, Foreign Affairs and Constitutional, were headed by Germans Elmar Brok and Jo Leinen respectively. The leaders of the two main political groups, the EPP and the PES were also Germans Hans-Gert Pöttering and Martin Schulz respectively. Whatever has support of these two groups gets voted in. At mid-term (in 2007) Hans-Gert Pöttering became the President of the Parliament. In the EU Commission the German Commissioner Günter Verheugen is vice-president and handles the very important Enterprise and Industry portfolio.

The common currency euro is administered by the European Central Bank located in Frankfurt am Main. Obviously German influence there is paramount.

During my term as MEP I have witnessed various presidencies, including the Italian, British, French and German. Compared to the others the preparation, efficiency and effectiveness of the German presidency were outstanding. Before the German presidency started, there was a Cabinet Statement on the German EU Presidency⁴⁴ which included such a sentence: *“Germany will use its weight and the confidence it enjoys in the world to help shape a common foreign and security policy that is developed as far as possible.”* And use that weight they did. Not only did Germans achieve most of what they planned, but they also managed to streamline the two following presidencies (Portuguese and Slovenian), effectively dictating these smaller states what they should do. The preparation of the Lisbon Treaty is a good example here. Chancellor Angela Merkel in a letter sent out in April 2007 to all Governments of Member States proposes “to use different terminology without changing the legal substance, for example with regard to the title of the treaty, the denomination of EU legal acts and the Union’s Minister for Foreign Affairs.” This was a planned deception. Promptly the constitution was reworded to be presented as amendments to earlier treaties. The word “constitution” was gone. The Minister for Foreign Affairs became the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy etc. The substance however was the same as in the rejected constitution. Germany assured the wording of the Treaty, Portugal was to oversee its signing and Slovenia its ratification. The efficiency of the project was truly impressive. If it were not for the courageous Irish this would now be implemented. The presidency of the Union was to be mainly ceremonial (like in the Federal Republic of Germany), but the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy was to be truly an important function. The gossip in the European Parliament was that Joschka Fischer, the former German Minister of Foreign Affairs, was being groomed for the job.

The very visible presence of President Nicolas Sarkozy during the recent French presidency was nothing more than haphazard reacting to events (the Irish ‘no’ to Lisbon, the Georgia-Russia encounter, the financial crisis), often changing stance and generally quite ineffective. There was no pro-

44. Press and Information Office of the federal Government. Press Release no.: 387 Cabinet statement on German EU Presidency Sun, 05.11.2006 http://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/EN/Pressemitteilungen/BPA/2006/11/2006-11-05-eu-ratspraesidentschaft_en.html

gramme, no plan, no long term effects of that presidency. Even an attempt to streamline the following presidencies (Czech and Swedish) failed. As the *London & Oxford Group* put it: „He [Sarkozy] can huff and puff all he likes, but he knows his own true weight in the world is limited to the number of policies on which he can agree with Germany – which at the moment is not at all much.”⁴⁵ *Newsweek* put this thus: „Hardly a day seems to pass in which Sarkozy, who currently holds the rotating EU presidency, announces a bold new plan, only to find himself rejected by Berlin.”⁴⁶ As *Stern* wrote: “Generally, for several weeks now, the EU summits followed the same scenario. European leaders waited with fear to see what new proposals will Sarkozy throw upon them. Then they go straight to Merkel and tell her: we need to talk him out of it.”⁴⁷ The same is contained in the title and subtitle of an article in *Die Welt*: “Merkel enforces a ‘No’-policy against Sarkozy. As regards isolation: At the EU-summit Angela Merkel pushed through many of her views – on climate protection and the economy package. Madam Chancellor with her vision of the financial crisis is in no way alone. On the other hand Sarkozy’s plans drowned in Brussels.”⁴⁸

The arrogance with which Germans try to dominate European institutions was best seen when a delegation of political group leaders met with the Czech president Vaclav Klaus in Prague before the onset of the Czech presidency of the Union. The incoming EU presidency was simply told by Germans in the delegation what is expected from it as regards ratification of the Lisbon treaty. President of the Parliament Hans-Gert Pöttering, Martin Schulz for the PSE and in particular Daniel Cohn-Bendit for the Greens all spoke to the Czech president in an imperative manner.

Obviously the constitutional rejections are not the end of attempts to create a legal basis for the takeover of governmental responsibility for the Union from Member States to a centralized federal structure. Following the failed Lisbon Treaty some other solution will be tried, possibly through piece meal introduction of its content.

Germans are also preparing at the grass roots.

45. <http://news.londonandoxford.com/html/news/article.aspx?articleId=276>

46. <http://www.newsweek.com/id/166912?tid=relatedcl>

47. Quoted after *Dziennik* (Poland) 29.10.2008.

48. <http://www.welt.de/politik/article2870012/Merkel-setzt-Non-Politik-gegen-Sarkozy-durch.html?nr=1&pbpnr=0> „Merkel setzt ‘Non’-Politik gegen Sarkozy durch. Von wegen Isolation: Angela Merkel hat beim EU-Gipfel viele ihrer Vorstellungen durchgesetzt – beim Klimaschutz und beim Konjunkturpaket. Denn die Bundeskanzlerin ist mit ihrer Besonnenheit in Sachen Finanzkrise keinesfalls allein. Sarkozys Pläne dagegen gingen in Brüssel unter.“ Von H. Croll und C. Schiltz 12. Dezember 2008, 17:59 Uhr.

It was reported on the 29th of September 2008 that a training course called “Akademie Mitteleuropa” started in Bad Kissingen near München. “The ‘Academy’, being from the environment of expellee unions (Bund der Vertriebenen (BdV)), trains future managerial personnel of Eastern Europe descent, from the point of view of German plans to bring order in the countries of their origin ... ‘Russia and Mitteleuropa’ is the theme of one of the sittings of the ‘Akademie Mitteleuropa’”⁴⁹

In Poland today almost all daily papers, including local ones, are German owned. They never dare promote a policy contrary to German interests. Possibly the same is true in other East European countries.

Byzantine influence

One could ask the question: “Why object to the German project? After all Germany is economically the most efficient European state, so the expansion of its model over the rest of Europe should be of benefit to all.”

However the problem is that the German model stems not from Latin Germany of Adenauer and Benedict XVI but from the Byzantine mentality of Bismarck and Bethmann-Hollweg, the mentality of Prussia. What are the differences? I explained this briefly in my booklet “Civilisations at war in Europe”. Here I wish to give a fuller listing of these differences in a tabular form so as to make it as easy as possible to comprehend that no synthesis is possible between these mentalities. I rely here of course on the teaching of Feliks Koneczny whose book on the Byzantine civilisation⁵⁰ is the basic reference for me in this work.

Latin civilisation	Byzantine civilisation
Ethics is obligatory always, in all walks of life, including national and international politics.	Ethics is obligatory in private life. Politics is judged by success, not by morality.
Ethics is the source of all laws, the primary criterion all lawmakers should consider.	Interest of the State is the source of all laws, a primary consideration for all lawmakers.
All should strive towards perfection. There is an obligation to follow one’s conscience. Ethics develops. Saints elevate norms for all.	Striving towards perfection is left to the elite (e.g. monks). No saints as role models for all to follow.

49. <http://www.german-foreign-policy.com/de/archive/> 25.09.2008 Bad Kissingen/München (Eigener Bericht) – Eine „Akademie“ aus dem Dunstkreis der „Vertriebenen“ - Verbände schult künftige Führungskräfte aus Osteuropa in deutschen Ordnungsplänen für ihre Herkunftsländer ... Rußland und Mitteleuropa lautet das Thema einer Tagung der Akademie Mitteleuropa“.

50. Feliks Koneczny „Cywilizacja bizantyńska“. 1973. London, Towarzystwo historyczne im. R. Dmowskiego, no. 8.

Latin civilisation	Byzantine civilisation
Learning and science are to serve truth.	Learning and science are to serve the needs of the State.
Church is absolutely independent of the State.	Church is to serve the needs of the State.
Sacralization of marriage and family.	State regulation of marriage and family.
Primacy of spiritual forces.	Primacy of physical forces.
Uniting through cooperation.	Uniting through domination, regulation.
Readiness to criticize the State.	Obedience to the State.
Minimalization of the role of the State. Importance of the individual and his freedom.	Tendency to regulate everything from above. State is everything, the individual is nothing.
It is the role of citizens to make sure that the State serves their needs.	The role of the State is to make sure citizens obey it.
Unity of aim but diversity of social life forms adopted through experience and imitation. Trials and errors. Self-rule. Self-organisation.	Uniformity is imposed from above and this is accepted. Whence tidiness, functionality and order. All organisations dependent on the State.
Political strength derived from social forces.	State determines the strength of society.
Development of provinces supported on the principle of subsidiarity.	Development of centre at the material and intellectual cost to the provinces.
Community life organic, developed from below, based on the will of the people.	Organisation of life is mechanical, centralised and bureaucratic.
Personal responsibility of everyone.	Only the one giving orders is responsible.
Superiority of aim, sense and substance over form. Form is of little importance.	Form more important than content because form is common and aim is not.
Duality of law. There is both public and private law.	Monism of law. There is only public law.
Nations develop as a product of a common bond around a culture, a history, a literature and a land.	There is no concept of a nation separate from the State or an ethnic group.
Consciousness of common responsibility for the past and the future exists (historism).	Only the present and responsibility for it counts.

What Europe should be like?

By analysing the above table everyone can individually judge, which side he or she finds spiritually closer to his or her own way of thinking. In other words, one can define to which civilisation one belongs and in which civilisation one wishes ones children to be brought up. I believe that most Polish or British people are conscious of their adherence to the Latin side of the table. Germans will be divided on the issue, with the majority on the Byzantine side.

It is obvious that the differences listed in the table above are irreconcilable. No synthesis, merger or melting pot will produce a middle ground. All attempts in this direction will prove futile. They will lead to chaos, to what Koneczny calls a vicious circle. It is this kind of chaos that we are observing in the European Union. Things will get even worse when states from the Turanian civilisation (such as Turkey) join it.

The union of Poland and Lithuania (in 1386) was possible because from the very beginning it was clear under what method of communal life the Union will function. A Lithuanian became king of the Union, but he was to rule in the Polish manner. The king's power was being restricted by the rights of the citizens. He had to agree to the principle of *neminem captivabimus nisi iure victum* (we shall not imprison anyone unless convicted by law). It was Latin Poland that imposed its method of communal life on the peoples of the eastern territories (Lithuanians, Latvians and Ruthenians, now known as Byelorussians and Ukrainians); it taught them the Latin civilisation; it civilised them according to the norms of Western Europe. The alternative there was the Turanian civilisation, the Mongolian method directed from Muscovy. Lithuanians and Latvians Latinized. Over centuries Ruthenia struggled between Latin and Turanian influences and even today both Belarus and Ukraine are civilisationally torn.

Western European countries that had colonies acted similarly. They did not go into synthesis with the civilisations they met, but brought their own. The Latin civilisation became fixed in both South and North America, in Australia, New Zealand, in the Philippines. After decolonisation the newly freed countries attempted a synthesis between what Europe has brought them and what they consider as civilisationally their own, but in fact a struggle developed between the local and the European mode of communal life organisation. In many places such as India or Malaysia the civilisational

struggle continues. Obviously the native civilisation won in China, Indonesia, in the Arab countries. In Africa, as a rule, chaos develops from which the postcolonial countries are unable to extract themselves. Own traditions are weak. In the name of rejecting everything that the colonialists brought, there was an attempt to borrow socialist norms from the Soviet Union. This only additionally complicated an already difficult situation, by introducing Turanian solutions (one man rule). Stabilisation comes when there is primacy of one civilisation only.

According to what model will Europe function – Latin or Byzantine? This is the key question of our times. Our future will depend on the answer to this question. This concerns also the ways in which we are going to tackle such issues as the current economic crisis, the demographic crisis, the Islamic challenge and others.

Civilisational conflicts are not won by concessions. One has to be strong oneself and ready to defend one's identity. In Europe ecumenical tendencies, which have developed into syncretism, have weakened the awareness of differences, not only religious but also civilisational. It is possible to cooperate and one should cooperate with various partners on various issues. For each issue the choice of partners may be different – as is the case with coalitions in parliaments and in the United Nations – but this must not be at the expense of one's own identity. Lukewarm religiosity in Europe led to lukewarm civilisational awareness. And when one's own civilisation is not being defended, one succumbs to another, more determined in its drive towards victory. At the moment it appears that the Byzantine civilisation is winning in the way the European Union is functioning. Whether it will prove similarly victorious in a confrontation with Islam, and in particular with Turanian Islam, remains to be seen.

Not all manifestations of the functioning of the European Union are of Byzantine origin. Byzantine civilisation never attacked the family. Today the European Union is doing this. Byzantine civilisation was never missionary, at least not since the times of Cyril and Methody. And even they were more Latin than Byzantine. On the other hand the European Union is imbued with a missionary spirit, unfortunately however not only in good causes, such as democracy, tolerance, or rule of law, but also in bad ones such as life on credit, religious indifference, accessibility of abortion and contraception, etc. On the other hand in the German dominated European Union the regulation of everything, requiring identical behaviour in thousands of minor issues, transferring authority from member states to the

centre, restriction on self-government, growing bureaucracy, attempts at containing the Church and eliminating its influence on public affairs, the writing of laws without ethical constraints, coercing political correctness, science at the service of the economy and not necessarily of truth, reduction of the role of nations, erasing memory of the past – these are all elements of the Byzantine civilisation.

We can pose the question therefore: when confronted with various problems are we primarily seeking solutions that are effective or primarily solutions that are ethical? Let us look at a few examples.

The economic crisis

The current economic crisis is being tackled in a typically Byzantine manner. Ways are sought of converting the private debt of banks into a public one, to be paid in the future by taxes. Fictitious money is being created, only to abolish it later by inflation. In the deluge of comments and expertise we are being fed by the media, there is little attempt to look at the causes of the crisis and less still to propose solutions that would deal with the causes. Instead only stop gap remedies are proposed.

As Pope Benedict XVI rightly said: “The one who builds on sand builds only on visible and tangible things, on success, on career, on money. Apparently these are the true realities. But all this one day will pass away. We can see this now with the fall of large banks: this money disappears, it is nothing. And thus all things, which seem to be the true realities we can count on, are only realities of a secondary order. The one who builds his life on these realities, on matter, on success, on appearances, builds upon sand.”⁵¹

And what are the true realities? Where is the truth on which one should build? Is morality ever brought into the argument? How often do we hear about the immorality of greed, both on the part of borrowers and lenders, the immorality of living on credit, at the expense of future earnings or earnings of future generations? How often do we hear about the immorality of consumerism? Have we not forgotten altogether about the immorality of usury? We often hear about the need for the Haves to share their wealth

51. Benedict XVI 6th Oct. 2008, Meditation at opening of the Synod of Bishops. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2008/october/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20081006_sinodo_en.html

with the Have-Nots. That is true indeed, but it should be based on charity and the will to share and not on the forceful transfer of the fruits of work to those who do not wish to work. Is it not that the whole economic system is based on unethical principles that need correcting?

The current economic system is based on making money solely from the fact of having money. When the lender demands from the borrower both a collateral and an interest on the sum lent, then this is usury. The lender is entitled to an interest if he participates in the risk of the enterprise he supports with the money lent. But if no risk is involved due to the collateral, the highest morally acceptable interest is such that covers the cost of insuring the transaction and the loss of potential interest on bank deposits. The almost zero interest rates currently offered in the US are approaching this ideal. This proves that such borrowing is possible. However it has become a common practice for credits to carry a much higher interest in spite of having security in the form of the collateral. Traditionally, interest was permissible on loans supporting enterprises, but not on consumption loans.

Furthermore banks usually give credit on money they do not have. Usually only about 10% suffices to guarantee required cash payouts. Thus banks offer credits for sums tenfold of what they have in deposits. When they do this they in fact create money out of nothing, only to collect interest on it. But credit is a moral concept. It is based on confidence. It is something that can disappear. When people stop trusting the bank they come for cash, and then bankruptcy ensues, because there is not enough cash there. The small depositors become the losers.

To save the banks, states enter with guarantees of deposits (to some limited level) and mortgages. They buy up from banks collateral, which is difficult to cash. They buy shares in distressed banks. In fact they nationalize or partially nationalize banks. All of these are stop gap remedies, dealing with symptoms, not causes. The construction is still on sand. To build on rock, a return to truth and morality is needed.

It is interesting that in the USA when the Henry Paulson plan of injecting 700 bn \$ into the financial system was first debated in Congress, it was rejected on moral grounds. It was then reintroduced with some modifications, debated again and finally adopted. One can agree or disagree with the decision, but the decision was arrived at after a debate on its morality. Arguments about the morality of the operation were used and played a significant role. Speaking in Congress on 3rd Oct. 2008 Congressman Ron Paul said: „True wealth can only come about through savings, the deferral of pre-

sent consumption in order to provide for a higher level of future consumption. Instead, our government through its own behaviour and through its policies encourages us to live beyond our means, reducing existing capital and mortgaging our future to pay for present consumption. The money for this bailout does not just materialize out of thin air. The entire burden will be borne by the taxpayers, not now, because that is politically unacceptable, but in the future. This bailout will be paid for through the issuance of debt, which we can only hope will be purchased by foreign creditors. The interest payments on that debt, which already take up a sizeable portion of federal expenditures, will rise, and our children and grandchildren will be burdened with increased taxes in order to pay that increased debt.”⁵² These and similar arguments were countered by the claim that massive unemployment and loss of homes due to irredeemable mortgages have to be prevented. In the first vote most republicans rejected the Paulson proposal on moral grounds (unfortunately senator John McCain sided with President Bush and supported the Paulson plan, thereby losing the confidence of the conservative wing of his party and the presidential election). The whole world waited for the decisions of the representatives of the American people. They made history. Eventually ethical considerations lost in the voting, but at least they were considered.

In the UE, dealing with the same crisis (let us note that it is not smaller in countries with euro than in those without it), political leaders of the euro-zone countries met with their finance ministers and bankers. They met behind closed doors in Paris and decided on solutions and ways to implement them, without any public debate on the morality of the decisions taken. The Paris meeting on Sunday Oct. 12th 2008 produced a rescue package for European banks that was threefold larger than the Paulson plan in USA; they announced it and that was it. The European Parliament was not involved. National parliaments were to rubber-stamp these decisions. Germany itself produced a package similar in size to the US one. Needless to say the business community was happy as is evidenced by this communiqué: „BUSINESSEUROPE highly appreciates the outcomes of the emergency summit held in Paris on 12 October, where euro-area leaders were able to agree on a comprehensive and coordinated approach to alleviating the financial crisis. The 15 euro-area governments, the European Commission and the ECB [European Central Bank] have demonstrated collective responsibility

52. <http://www.house.gov/paul/congrec/congrec2008/cr100308h.htm>

and leadership at this defining moment, boding well for the future governance of the European Economic and Monetary Union.”⁵³

Here is an example where the difference between a Latin and a Byzantine way of dealing with a problem is clearly demonstrated. It is very likely that the proposed measures will not suffice. The rescue packages are already being doubled under president Obama. But this is not possible *ad infinitum*. Randy Brogdon, state senator in Oklahoma, does not wish his state to receive any of the rescue money. In fact his state has just passed a bill strengthening the sovereignty of the state relative to the federal government. Several other states (Alaska, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Nevada, Maine and Pennsylvania) are in the process of preparing such bills⁵⁴. On Feb. 3rd 2009 legislation was introduced in the US Senate aimed at abolishing the Federal Reserve.⁵⁵ Sooner or later a solution will have to be arrived at, that will tackle the causes as well as the consequences. I am sure countries of Latin civilisation will find them sooner than the Byzantine European Union.

The decisions and big smiles of the G20 summit in London (Apr. 2nd 2009) were aimed at generating confidence that a solution has already been found. Yet all it did was to give us more of the same – a further increase of the public debt.

I am not an economist, so I do not pretend to have any solutions to the world financial problems. However I would question the idea that giving public money to selected sectors of the economy will solve the problems. Why should banks or car making industry be more important than small and medium businesses losing clients and therefore also firing employees? How will the salvage packages be spent is an issue for public debate and it is only in the USA that such debate is taking place. It may result in a change of policy, if the pressure of the electorate is strong enough. In Alaska State there is a policy that all excess money, earned by the state, is distributed among the population. Each family regularly gets a cheque from the state. Of course people spend or invest the money as they wish and this helps the overall economy. Could not this procedure be extended to the whole country? The Paulson package is worth about \$ 2000 per citizen, who will eventually have to pay it back through taxation. Why not give this money

53. <http://www.businesseurope.eu/Content/Default.asp?PageID=524&articleid=444>

54. <http://www.randybrogdon.com/content/d7265/OklahomaHousepassessovereigntybill20090224.pdf>

55. Federal Reserve Board Abolition Act. (www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h110-2755)

to the people? This would invigorate the economy, by increasing consumption and investments, but this would happen according to the decisions of common people and not of politicians, industrialists or bankers. Such a policy is referred to as “distributionalism”, at one stage strongly promoted by G.K. Chesterton. He was a wise man, and today people are returning to many of his ideas.

Finally one more point. When banks in Zimbabwe go bankrupt hardly anybody cares. Should there be a crisis in China or India, some small perturbations would result, but on a regional level. However the bankruptcy of a large bank in the USA provokes a world crisis. This only indicates that America is still the most important player in the world economy. The crisis came from there and it is from there that a solution will come.

The demographic crisis

After decades of Malthusian overpopulation scares suddenly we are faced with a demographic crisis. Not enough children are being born. The net effect of reduced childbearing was an increase of the work force and the consequent economic boom. This is now being experienced by China and India. Those in employment have fewer dependents, fewer children to be exact. But time flies quickly. The employed eventually become retirees and expect support from the generation still in employment. But that generation is declining in size and the population of retirees is steadily on the increase, also due to advancements in medicine. Initially the problem was being solved by immigration. On a massive scale this happened first in Germany, where the *Gastarbeiter* from Yugoslavia or Turkey dominated the unqualified work force. Now the whole of the European Union experiences this phenomenon. But the world village is becoming smaller. This is not a long term solution. The immigrants eventually bring their own dependents into the country of immigration, not only their children, but also their elders. The declining work force becomes an acute problem.

Suddenly policies supporting child bearing are needed. Countries are introducing child benefits, tax exemptions for children, cheaper city transport tickets for children of large families etc. Various solutions are proposed. At the beginning of the German presidency in the European Union, on January 23rd 2007, Ursula von der Leyen the Federal Minister for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women, and Youth, herself a mother of 7 children, visited

the European Parliament to tell us about the programme for the German EU Presidency in the areas of gender equality, family affairs, and demographics. She spoke of paternity leave, day-care centres, job continuation guarantees for pregnant women and similar measures. Jugendamts, the German youth offices, decide that when mixed marriages break up the children stay with the German parents and the foreign parents can communicate with their children only in German. There are hundreds of protests about this placed with the European Parliament Petitions Committee. The size of a nation will not increase by such practices. All of these are only “stop gap” measures.

How little do we hear about the root causes of the demographic problem! What about the morality of the measures that have led to this situation? Is it moral to remove the mother from the child and place her in the work force for a major part of the day? Destabilisation of the family, has it not contributed to the decline in childbearing? Perhaps abortion has something to do with this demographic crisis? Maybe the practice of contraception is also a cause? What about the morality of abortion and contraception? Throughout the living world, from butterflies to elephants, from daisies to oak trees, the beginning of sexual activity is concurrent with the beginning of reproduction. We seem to be the only species in this world to have dissociated these functions, and this only started in the 20th century. Was it moral to do so?

Career, success, money, leisure, comfort, convenience – these are the current criteria of happiness. Yet the traditional joys of having a loving, multigenerational family, of having parents and grandparents, children and grandchildren, of seeing them grow and develop, of working for their needs and their happiness, are in decline.

Unless we return to judging problems from the point of view of the immorality that caused them, we shall not arrive at proper solutions.

The Islamic challenge

Islamic expansion

Throughout the world we are observing today a clear expansion of Islam. On the one hand there is the expansion from North Africa to sub-Saharan Africa, and on the other northwards to Europe. There is also restitution of Islam as the dominant religion in the central Asiatic republics and on the Caucasus, which was rather suppressed under the Soviet Union, but currently is liberated and increasingly conscious of its identity and strength. Also in the

post-colonial countries of Asia such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Malaysia the political importance of Islam is on the increase. In the Islamic countries of the Middle East we observe growing isolationism. In such countries as Saudi Arabia there is no room whatsoever for any religious tolerance, for Christian missionary activity, for even the tiniest manifestation of any religious cult other than Islamic. Iran and Syria are not far behind.

Islam is a missionary religion. It constantly works for its expansion. It gains converts. On the other hand it punishes its own apostates as for the most heinous crimes. Currently this missionary activity is plentifully supported by petrodollars. It so happens that the largest oil fields in the world are located in Islamic countries (Saudi Arabia, Iran, the Emirates, Kuwait, Nigeria, Algeria, Libya, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan), thus they can afford to finance their missionary activity in other countries. The converts are being enticed by material benefits, particularly effectively in sub-Saharan Africa. Mosques are being built for petrodollars wherever even a few Muslims appear, also in the Balkans and throughout Western Europe.

This missionary activity is being accompanied by demographic expansion. In the Islamic communities children are still being born, many children, and this is so not only in the Islamic countries. Muslims migrate *en masse* to Christian countries, and there they continue to have many children in spite of the fact that they live among people who deliberately restrict their fertility. They do not accept the European habits. They stick to their own. Not only do they give birth to Islamic citizens of western countries, but they continue to bring them up in the Islamic faith and norms.

This religious and demographic expansion is accompanied by an increase in behaviours that terrify the Christians surrounding them. Today instead of inter-state wars we have terrorist attacks (World Trade Centre in New York, trains in Madrid, the Underground in London), riots (car burnings in France), the training of children for sacrificial readiness to participate in holy wars (suicide bombers), threatening any criticism of Islam with the most severe consequences (the issue of Salmon Rushdie, the film *Submission* by Theo van Gogh, the Danish cartoons, Pope Benedict's speech at Regensburg University) and other challenges.

The western world stands helpless in face of these challenges.

What is Islam like in Europe today?

Of course Islam is not shaping the European Union today, but this will change should Turkey join the Union. I suspect that even Muslims living in

Europe are themselves not aware that they represent two different civilisations, the Arab and the Turanian. There are more difficulties with the latter. It is in that environment that terrorism is born, yet as a remedy European states attempt to cooperate with Arab clergymen. This does not help much.

The real problem is religious fanaticism. A fanatic differs from an enthusiast in that he hates something, while an enthusiast loves something. An enthusiast is creative. He can even be a zealous missionary of his faith, Islam for example. A fanatic hates something or someone and attempts to destroy what he hates. He is destructive, not creative.

One should admire the attachment of Muslims to their faith. One should admire their readiness to manifest it publicly. The regulation by French authorities that girls should not wear head scarves in schools, functions only in schools. As soon as they leave school the scarves are back on the heads of Islamic girls to protect their modesty. They do not assimilate. They remain themselves. Today in Western Europe more people know what Ramadan is than what Lent is. In secularized Europe Muslims remain spiritually strong.

Fanaticism cannot be admired, and it should not be tolerated either. What is needed is a strong will of the society to effectively eliminate it. Is Europe capable of generating such a common will? Does it have enough spiritual strength and consistency to do it? On the one hand we lament over burnt cars, and on the other, for no reason at all, we recognize the independence of a Turanian, Islamic part of Serbia (Kosovo) that is not capable of independent existence without foreign economic, military and political help. We have lost our bearings.

We see the demographic collapse in Europe, but this does not concern Islamic immigrants. Remedies such as pro-natalistic assistance are being utilised by Islamic immigrants, while native Europeans still have few children. The mechanisms developed in Europe of health care, social help, education and retirement arrangements reach also the Islamic immigrants, yet at a much larger cost relative to their contribution to the budgets and insurance systems of the countries of settlement.

Civilisational geography

To understand the nature of conflicts within Europe it is not possible to bypass the civilisational aspect. Europe is not civilisationally uniform. Various civilisations function within it. Some time in the past there was also the Arab civilisation on the Iberian Peninsula, in southern France and sout-

hern Italy. But that is gone. I wrote in more detail about the civilisational issues in my booklet “Civilisations at war in Europe” (the full text is available in English, Polish, French and Spanish on my web page www.giertych.eu). Here I only wish to indicate the civilisational geography.

Within the Turanian civilisation, in Russia, there is a conflict with the world of Islam on the Caucasus. The Russians are dealing in a typically Turanian, barbaric, manner with the Chechen problem – successfully one must admit. In Central Asia Russia competes with the West for influence in the Islamic post-Soviet republics. They are still economically and organisationally weak. Also Islam is not very strong there due to the legacy of Marxist atheism. The West naively believes that it shall teach these republics democracy, tolerance, personal freedom and human rights. Russia hopes that it shall pick them up again under her wings. They themselves hope for development according to their own models and I suspect that this option will win.

Also Turkey belongs to the Turanian civilisation. With a fragment of its territory lying in Europe it hopes to enter the European Union. However, fearing Kurdish secession, it handles its own Kurds striving for independence and the proposal of a Kurdish autonomy in northern Iraq in a typically Turanian manner. The fact that the Kurds are also Muslims is of no significance. Contrary to what recently deceased Samuel Huntington believed⁵⁶, civilisations and religions belong to different categories. In the Turanian world there is no readiness to share power with anyone. The Turkish hopes of entering the European Union are linked with the prospect of dominating Europe due to their population size, the possibility of cooperation with Muslims from such countries as Bosnia, Albania and Kosovo and with the numerous Muslim immigrants in Western Europe. The growth of Islam in Europe generally brings more Turanian influences than Arab ones, but this is perhaps difficult to judge at the moment.

The Byzantine civilisation appears to be dominant in Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, some post-Yugoslavian republics (Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina), the Czech Republic, Sweden and, what is particularly important, in most of Austria and Germany.

The rest of Europe includes countries where Latin civilisation dominates.

56. Samuel Huntington, profesor at Harvard, wrote the famous book „The Clash of Civilisations” in which he describes 7 civilisations functioning in the world today. He identifies these civilisations with religions.

There are countries in which there is an ongoing struggle between civilisations. In Germany and Austria this is between the Latin and Byzantine. To some extent this same conflict is present on the Balkans and in the Czech Republic. In Ukraine and Belarus it is between the Latin and Turanian civilisations. In B&H between Turanian and Byzantine. What will be the final outcome of these struggles will profoundly influence the future of Europe.

Historical experience

In the past not only Turanian Europe but also Latin Europe proved capable of dealing with the Islamic challenge. However Byzantine Europe proved incapable of doing so. Spain, after many centuries of struggles, managed to get rid of the Moors (reconquista). Also southern France and southern Italy managed to eliminate the Saracen influences. On the other hand Byzantium always succumbed to the Ottomans. However western European crusades managed to conquer the Turks and establish the Jerusalem Kingdom. In a joint effort (Holy Alliance) Christian Europe conquered the Turks near Lepanto (1571). When the Turkish expansion onto the Balkans reached Vienna, again a combined effort of Christian Europe came to the rescue under the leadership of the Polish king John III Sobieski (1683). As we remember the World War I started on the Balkans, with a terrorist attack in Sarajevo. It is the victory of Latin Europe (France, Britain) and America over Byzantine Prussia and Austria, who were in alliance with Turkey, which resulted in the defeat of Turkey and the final liberation of the Balkans from Ottoman rule. Also the further action of France and Britain (T.E. Lawrence of Arabia) in the Middle East liberated the Arabs from the Turanian Ottoman Empire and led to a division of the region into separate countries that exist there until this day. Latin Europe, when it was strong in its Latin identity, was able to be victorious over Islam. Byzantine Europe was always on the defensive.

Meeting the Islamic challenge

Of course we shall not combat Islam by the Turanian method. The Russian model will not be acceptable in Central and Western Europe. The question remains whether Europe will undertake this challenge by the Byzantine or by the Latin method. Which of these two methods of communal life will dominate in Europe, and more precisely which will dominate in the European Union? I fear that Byzantinism grows in strength at the expense of Latinity and this may indicate weakness in facing the Islamic expansion.

German youths have been protesting against the building of a large mosque in Köln. They demanded administrative decisions prohibiting it. Centuries ago, the citizens of Köln, were able to build one of the most magnificent gothic cathedrals in the world. Today, with the population of the city many-fold larger, religious activity within the cathedral is minuscule. It serves primarily as a tourist attraction. The planned mosque will serve the religious needs of the Köln Muslims, not tourists. The German protests are futile if they can only fill their own cathedral when the Pope comes. Only by building one's own religious strength can the Islamic growth be contained.

Today the role of Germany in the European Union, and in particular of Germany that is Prussian in mentality, is colossal. Will they be able to dominate Europe according to the plans of Bethmann-Hollweg, Naumann and Funk? This is the key question concerning the future of Europe. It is also strictly connected with the question whether Europe will be able to defend itself against the Islamic surge. Will it be able to generate enough strength to successfully contain it?

What can we do?

The spiritual strength of Islam can only be confronted by the spiritual strength of Christianity. However Christianity today is not very strong spiritually. Just as before the reconquista a spiritual renewal of Spanish Catholicism was needed (rule of Isabella of Castile and of her husband Ferdinand II of Aragon – rulers whom history credited with the adjective Catholic), so today the whole of Europe needs such a renewal. We must combat profanities insulting our faith with such passion as Muslims do when their faiths are being smeared. We must demand a respect towards Christianity and we ourselves must respect it.

This does not mean that I propose expulsion of infidels from Europe as was done under Isabel la Católica in Spain, but I believe that we should remind all – natives and immigrants alike – that this is a continent in which Christian, Latin principles rule. The immigrants must know their place, their status of guests, who will either abide by the norms obligatory here or will be expelled.

I do not know of a better system than the one which functions in Poland since Mediaeval times. Throughout history we have had many immigrants – protestant Germans persecuted by Catholic rulers, Jews, Karaims, Muslim Tartars, Scots, Armenians. When the Polish state was strong and rich, it attracted many seekers of asylum. It still does. There is complete toleran-

ce. It was our concept of tolerance that got universal European approval at the Council of Constance in 1418. This Polish tolerance towards the immigrants depends on the availability to of two options. It is possible to fully integrate with the Polish nation, accepting our way of life and it is also possible to remain different, living a separate life, even for centuries. However in this latter case the guests have no right to interfere in the way we Poles settle our own issues. Of course all intermediate stages between these two options are open, but participation in decision making comes only after the full acceptance of our norms.

It is not likely that the Islamic immigrants in Europe will easily assimilate. They do not wish to do so and we should not demand this from them. They can, but they do not have to integrate. However, if they prefer to remain different they must accept the status of guests, for generations if necessary. They can live a separate life, besides the main current of public affairs. They should not be allowed to transgress the laws of the land of settlement nor should they have any influence upon it. They should have the right to establish their own private laws, for their own use, within their own communities. They can establish their own insurance schemes, collect their own additional taxes, pay their own family allowances, own retirement pensions. They can live according to their own family laws, have their own jurisdiction, own schools, own medical service etc. Should all of this develop according to their own wishes, the state should not collect taxes from them for services it will not provide. The only requirement is that they should abide by the law of the country of settlement, and of course they must be subject to the courts of the country, particularly on issues pertaining to contact with the native population. In fact this is the way in which the Roma (Gypsies) have lived among us – for centuries.

Of course such a solution is not possible with the Byzantine uniformity. It is not possible in the presence of government bureaucracies interfering into all walks of life, where everything is of concern to the state. It is not possible with legal monism of state law only, without tolerance of private law. To withstand such long term presence of aliens the state must be strong, but this must be primarily a spiritual strength, resulting from grass root desire to live in a given way and to empower the state to forcefully make sure that the immigrants do not transgress the laws of the country. Also there must be common tolerance of differences.

In the European Union much is said about tolerance to various cultures, but what is understood under this term are differences in attire, eating

habits, sports practiced, games played and similarly trivial matters. When it comes to arranged juvenile marriages, female circumcision, moral obligation of vengeance for a harmed relative (vendetta), polygamy and other matters of substance, tolerance disappears. This is hardly surprising. Obviously we require that in such matters our norms should be obligatory and the immigrants must comply.

Thus communities that wish to maintain their own separateness should be allowed to do so, but to certain limits only. At no time however should they be allowed to participate in the decisions about how our life is to be organised. They have to respect our laws. Who does not, should be severely punished, if necessary with expulsion.

On the other hand those who want to integrate are welcome to do so, but then they have to accept our moral norms. **However for this we must have them ourselves!** Islam is strong spiritually and Christianity is weakening. Attempts at creating a new ethic, rejecting Christian norms, based on the freedom to choose a style of life, on the „right“ to abortion, to euthanasia, to sex without consequences, to equal benefits without equal contributions etc. are doomed to failure. Only a return to traditional European values, based on natural law, on Roman law and Christian ethic, can ensure a capacity to face the challenge of Islamic influences in Europe.

I appeal for a return to these values.

* * *

The WASPs (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants) made the USA. The Turanian Muscovites made transcontinental Russia. Latin Spain failed to make Hispaniola (Union of Latin America). The attempts by Byzantine, Prussian Germany to make a Federal Republic of Europe shall fail. Proud European nations shall defend their separate identities in spite of all the material benefits the German project promises.