

Germany 1945 – 2015**A Survey****Presentation to the American Council on Germany (ACG)**

1. The German catastrophe

Federal Germany accepts responsibility of Germany for WW II and the crimes committed as a result of NS policy on races and on nations of a “second rate significance” (Holocaust, Vernichtungskriege against Poland and the Soviet Union)

Families have a very complex and difficult relation with fathers and grandfathers – except for those who were raised in a different mode – or those whose fathers and grandfathers had already died when Hitler rose to power such as was the case with my family in Hamburg. I grew up without adult male advice or miss-advice –except of course in school and in the streets.

In 1943 German documents provide evidence that Hitler realized that the war is lost und that only still unknown fate could change the course of events such as by major strategic or operative mistakes of the Allies.

So was the conviction of a 15 year old young adult in Hamburg who experienced - like millions of other Germans in the central and western parts

of the country such as in Hamburg or others cities - the hell of devastating air-raids against the population.

In 1994 the NS-Party decided not to accept members of the vintage year 1928 to the party – because of defeatism dominating the thinking of the youngsters. I am one of the vintage year 1928. So the defeat of 1945 was not revelation of an ignored fact but confirmation of a fate anticipated. After the war we were overwhelmed by the evidence of massive crimes committed against mankind and in war. My mother quoted me later of having said: “I think we can do better!” But would there be an opportunity to do so?

So, I studied at Hamburg University 1947-51 – (5 000 students in dyed uniforms: history, philosophy and public law in order to find out what went wrong in Europe and in Germany.

(Disregard of strategic implications of your security policy among others)

2. The role of the USA in Europe after 1945

The USA and the impact of their material superiority decided in military terms WW I and II – in spite of the fact that in WW I France and Britain and Russia suffered the largest losses in man-power and in WW II the Soviet Union – 20 Million soldiers and civilian population or even more.

In case of WW I President Wilson – in order to bring about self-determination and the League of Nations where ever possible - left the definition of peace conditions to France that means demoralizing Germany and leaving the peace to an Entente control of Europe with independent nations in Central Europe where the Wilson doctrines were applied. The

Peace treaties ignored the Communist and Soviet challenge to peace and freedom in Europe.

The apocalypses of WW I created the social conditions for mass movements aiming at the destruction of bourgeois society that had lost their economic basis as a consequence of WWI and feared nothing more than extremism on the left and on the right.

In WW II President Roosevelt more or less ignored Churchill's advice and construed the post war world order based on an understanding with the Soviet leader Joe Stalin. However, F.D. Roosevelt died before the end of the war and the new President Harry Truman was left with the difficult task of winning still the war against Japan. But here was Winston Churchill again: He said in 1940 – “we Great Britain cannot win the war against Hitler on the continent. The involvement of the USA and of the SU is indispensable.”

In 1945 – Roosevelt had insisted on Stalin's support for the establishment of the United Nations concept, but left him a kind of free hand in Europe. That hit Sir Winston Churchill directly on the top of the head: he had to de-recognize the Polish government in Exile (London based) for which England had declared war on Hitler. He had to recognize the new Polish government put into power by Stalin on the basis of the so-called Lublin-Committee.

So, he wrote a letter to Harry Truman on May 12 - four days after the end of the most devastating war Europe had experienced in its history.

“You have to come to Europe and see with your own eyes, what the Soviet Union is doing to the nations under its occupation.”

That letter brought about the Potsdam-conference in July/August 1945

But Truman could only change his mind about withdrawal from Europe after the successful nuclear test in the desert of Nevada. This allowed the winning of the war against Japan without running the risk of a million US casualties.

The USAS did not leave Europe and that changed the course of history – in contrast to 1918 – in the assessment of the Soviet threat that had been ignored 1919 and had brought about a tactical coalition of Stalin and Hitler in order get to war – with different objectives.

Truman: Four 4 Program to safe: Greece, Turkey, and Iran

September 6, 1946 in Stuttgart: James F. Byrnes-statement in Stuttgart:

“Yes, we - the USA - can help to rebuild Europe - under one condition however: Germany has to be included.

This constitutes the strategic undercurrent for the relationship between the USA – Germany – also today – sometimes ignored, sometimes covered by clouds – but also in a position to re-establish the reality of a strategic alliance in the light of whatever strategic situation in the northern hemisphere may develop. And today we face this demand and challenge.

Churchill: Europe on the continent must be united (Zürich Statement 1946 and speech in Fulton/USA)

US: Uniting Europe economically (Marshall Plan, Monnet-Plan)

After 1945 Germany absorbed 15 million refugees and expellees. It rebuild its cities and its industry and turned the country into a model of co-) thus making it determination labor-enterprise (social market economy and

made it safe against Soviet and communist undermining. It developed the third largest economy on the globe at the time within less than 20 years. Because of LASTENAUSGLEICH- (“financial burden sharing”) refugees and expellees could start their new business on the basis of privileged credit conditions. In 1990 - after establishing German unity again - Germany repeated the assistance of the decade after the end of WW II for the impoverished East German economy with an investment program for the rotten GDR of 100 Billion DM or 50 billion Europa annually – without losing its international competitiveness and recently regained a zero-deficit annual budget of the state, the federal states and the communities (not yet fully accomplished). The basis is co-determination, innovation, high quality and an elaborate international market system.

The EURO is fine for Germany but not for countries that based their state financing and the economy on a policy of deficit financing and state intervention in economic affairs such as France).

So it was a wrong concept and endangers the cohesion of the European Union and its further development. Something must be done to defuse the crisis – tactically and in substance. The softening of the international value of the EURO will not do it.

3. Security Policy

Russia finds itself in a crisis of self-perception and perspective for the future

During the Cold War Federal Germany maintained the second largest army in Europa – behind Russia – in order to cope with a real threat also perceived as such by the population.,

Western strategy was based on the doctrine Defense and Deterrence as well as readiness for detent in case of a change of direction in the Soviet Union that pursued an offensive, aggressive ideological and military foreign policy. The change in direction in Moscow occurred in the late eighties– the wall I Berlin collapsed by way of a private walk of thousands of East Berliner who tested the statement of Schabowski in his first ever press-conference on November 9, 1989. There was no power in the world ready to intervene in order to restore GDR power! Next morning Mr. Gorbatschow asked Chancellor Kohl to make sure that no body attacks Soviet barracks in East Germany.

The US and the Soviet Union had confidence in the political and cultural capability of West Germany to unite the country and build a new enlarged democratic and economically well doing re-united Germany. The EU was an important preconditions because it placed Germany into the jointly established peace order of a uniting Europe, although every one of the neighbors had headache about the united Germany – that is now the bulwark of economic success and worry in Europa and needs to be a manager of the European Security policy in the face of a new Russia threat, about which we have to speak now.

In the course of its cooperation with NATO – limited in substance, Moscow recognized that it was not considered an indispensable partner in decisive matters of NATO policy and took issue in particular with US decisions on Antibalistic systems.

In adaptation to the strategic doctrines of McKinder and MacMahon at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, Moscow seeks to establish strategic control over the Eurasian continent in order to challenge US world power – as feared by the British and US strategists at the time with a view to a German or Russian or a combined Russian-German domination of the landmasses. Indeed Russia seeks to break Germany away from NATO and the EU – built on the assumption of fundamental contradictions between the US and Germany of today and tomorrow.

The relationship of Russia with the European Union remained stagnant since Moscow did not wish to abandon its bilateralism with individual EU countries – notably with Sweden, Germany and Italy and resisted genuine agreements with the EU on Modernization of the stagnant Russian industry since such a modernization process would involve the need for independent judiciary institutions. Such independence of the judiciary was inconsistent with Russia and Soviet tradition.

In 2008 – in search of a new identity for Russia - Medvedev declared the doctrine of Russian interventionism in the affairs of the neighboring countries in order to protect Russian citizens and on the basis of strategic interests of Russia – irrespective of the international legal situation. Thus, Russia gave notice to the post-cold-war peace structure based on the respect for the existing borders and nonintervention by force in countries of the European subcontinent. As an excuse - reference was made to the military intervention by NATO-air-raids in Serbia following the breach of the Rambouillet-Agreement regarding the withdrawal of Serbian forces from Kosovo in 2000.

In 2008, Putin decided to abandon the EU-Russia project of industrial modernization and instead returned to the Soviet assets of armaments and outer space industries that should be revitalized. Indeed a number of Soviet systems were reactivated, modernized or produced in new series.

In addition the Russian leadership – the Putin party of Russian Unity - adopted nationalist positions such as “Russian Mir”, the collection of Russian soil and the defiance of the USA and of NATO as enemies of Russia and of legitimate Russian interests. – coming to the foreground in Russian pressure on Janukovich of Ukraine to withdraw his readiness to sign the association agreement with the EU and join the EURASIA concept of Russia in the fall of 2013.

In response to the agreement mediated by the Foreign Ministers of Germany, France and Poland in February 2014 in order to stop further bloodshed on the MAIDAN, Putin adopted a policy of forceful intervention Ukraine and annexed the Crimea as well as supported militarily the separatists in two of the East Ukrainian districts (Donetsk, Lugansk) thus creating the conditions for frozen conflicts supposed to bring down the Ukrainian reform process.

He could succeed in this regard if the European Union and NATO fail to provide Ukraine with the protection needed to allow the reform process taking roots in the Ukraine. As long as the war in East Ukraine determines the daily decisions of Kiev no meaningful reform process will be feasible in my opinion. Let me remind you of the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany enjoyed the protection of NATO long before it became a member on her own – namely since its establishment in 1949– from the days of NATO creation in April 1949 under the roof of the Allied countries FR, GB and USA as members of NATO and in Command in Germany until Germany’s entry into the Alliance in 1955. Such security roof is

indispensable also for Ukraine if you try to engage companies to invest in your country that is exposed to a threat.

Berlin, 2015

I wonder how long Russia will bear these set-backs of its current economic, financial and social conditions as a consequence of the Ukraine exercise and Western sanctions that do harm to the international standing of Russia as a political power, as an economic and financial actor.

Russia controls but six percent of the European GNP, of the US GNP and of the Chinese GNP.

4. Migration

Integration of 15-20 million after 1945, Lastenausgleichsgesetz – twenty years later the rebuilt country was the third largest economy on the globe – today the fourth largest (US, China, Japan, Germany)

1990: Integration of GDR socialist economy and socialist perception of the population. Today per capita income in East Germany round about 75 percent of that of West Germany. For 20 years around 50 billion (trillion) Euro each year invested into East Germany – rent, unemployment, infrastructure etc.

Nevertheless Germany runs today again an annual budget with no deficit – on the contrary.

Germany will integrate millions of non-Germans in order to compensate for the missing reproduction of the German population. The European basis is the source in the first instance – but also people from other countries. They are eager to acquire the technical knowledge in order to become highly paid specialists in Germany.

Please discuss details with the experts. I only know it will happen and it will be a success like after 1950, 1990.

Germany enjoys - because of several factors - a rather strongly developed sense of social responsibility. We do not accept the notion that those who failed in social integration have to be abandoned.