

Craig White

A TWO THOUSAND YEAR ANALYSIS OF THE
GERMAN CHARACTER

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

Ambassador College

Pasadena, California

In Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Gerhard O. Marx

June, 1969

AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Pasadena, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE GERMAN CHARACTER	1
II.	ROMAN DESCRIPTION OF THE GERMAN CHARACTER	5
III.	HISTORY OF GERMAN WARFARE	11
IV.	THE GERMAN PHILOSOPHY OF WAR	21
V.	REASON FOR GERMAN SUPERIORITY	32
VI.	GERMANS AND NATURE	58
VII.	GERMANS AND THEIR "DIVINE MISSION"	89
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	102

PREFACE

"The Germans combine in the most deadly manner the qualities of the warrior and the slave. They do not value freedom themselves, and the spectacle of it in others is hateful to them. Whenever they become strong, they seek their prey, and they will follow with an iron discipline anyone who will lead them to it!"

So stated Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on December 11, 1941. Is his appraisal of yesterday still true of the Germans today? Or have they lost those character traits?

And what about the Middle Ages? Or even the Roman times? Were the Germans even at that early stage likewise the "deadly warriors" they so tragically portrayed during this century?

Have the Germans changed during the last two thousand years? Is their mentality now Western and democratically orientated? Or do they continue to possess the qualities which have always made it easy for dictators to lead them to new and deadly glories?

"The German character has remained unchanged through the ages!" states Ernest Hambloch in Germany Rampant, p.11.

To show conclusively that the German character has

remained unchanged through the ages is the purpose of this
thesis.

CHAPTER I

THE GERMAN CHARACTER

During the course of her history, Germany has done her share ⁱⁿ ~~at~~ contributing to the progress of mankind. Whether in the field of inventions, in the arts and literature, in education and culture, and other related fields of endeavour, the German people have proven themselves to be a gifted, literate and often-admired people.

"The Germans," states a mid-20th century report about them, "from ancient times up to the modern era, have always possessed tremendous capacities for good as well as evil. Their courage, industriousness, orderliness and regard for family life have been exceptional. In their poets, philosophers, musicians and artists, they have produced men of brilliant attainments, and they have produced ordinary citizens who, if left to get on with the business of living, are as sober, honest and dependable as any in the world." (GERMANY, The Sunday Times World Library, p.4, London 1962.)

A thousand and one pages could be written, showing the benefits German inventiveness and industriousness have bestowed on mankind. In the field of medicine, research, engineering, technology and many other related fields, the German people have made vast contributions.

This is to their praise--to their glory. This is something Germans can take pride in.

But there is another side to the story--a dark and tragic one. That also is part of Germany's contribution to the world. History is not deplete with these dark chapters in her history. The latest chapter, a few decades ago, was perhaps the darkest.

And so, many will ask how it was possible for such an intelligent and talented people like the Germans to have wrought so much havoc and destruction upon Europe, as we have so tragically witnessed this century.

Was it a mere accident, never again to be repeated? Or was the Germany of Hitler's day true to her past. And if so, should we expect another tragedy to befall the Western world at the hand of Germany?

In checking into the history of Germany from Roman times till the present, we see how plain the evidence is that as far as World War II is concerned, Hitler was no accident. Rather, he was someone who truly represented the desires and symbolized the ambitions of the average German.

We will also see later, that Hitler understood the Germans well--their weaknesses and their points of strength. And he used both the negative and positive points of their character to his deadly advantage. So it

should be of interest what this man had to say about these people.

We aim to trace the beginnings of German history from the time of the Romans, through the Middle Ages, and finally down to present times. Much stress will be laid on contemporary accounts relating the character of these talented people.

There will be no room for romantic sentimentality. No space for prejudicial and biased assessments. No need to perpetuate on one hand or necessarily destroy preconceived ideas and cherished beliefs.

The best and most objective way of attaining the truth of the matter--of giving an accurate portrayal of the German character--is by reading what contemporary writers have recorded about the Germans during the last 2000 years. It is the only way of attaining a true and accurate assessment of the topic at hand.

We will--in the following chapter--see what the Romans, who, probably more than any other people, came into constant contact with the Germans, said about the Germans. We will find that their character portrayal of them is identical with that of contemporary writers throughout the Middle Ages. Subsequently, we will also see that the German character of the Middle Ages is typical of what Germans are like today.

These contemporary records--spread over a period of 2000 years--show that essentially the character of the Germans has not changed. The positive traits of yesterday are still with them today. But so are the negative traits--those character weaknesses which have led these people down the path of destructive adventures.

CHAPTER II

ROMAN DESCRIPTION OF THE GERMAN CHARACTER

The Roman who gave us a substantial portrayal of the early Germans is the first century historian, Tacitus. In his book, Germania, he contrasts the Germans with the Romans and other neighbouring nations.

The Germans impressed Tacitus. He saw many virtues. Despite the fact that the Romans tended to prejudicially label them barbarians, this Roman writer speaks highly of them.

He likes their sanctity of family life, their rejection of a plurality of wives, their hospitality to strangers, their just laws, and their chaste conduct-- something that could not be said of the Romans of that time. The Germans had what the Romans lacked -- a pure morality. "They are almost the only barbarians who are content with a wife apiece," Tacitus states (Germania, p.289, Loeb. ed.).

Tacitus' complimentary description of these people is essentially justified. Romans could learn from the Germans and of course the other way around, this Roman historian felt. Germany remained both a constant challenge and a constant threat to Rome! "The German people in the time of Tacitus was already a force to be reckoned

with in Europe," states H. Mattingly in his Tacitus on Britain and Germany, p.27, (1967 ed.). And as we know, she has never ceased being a force to be reckoned with down to our times.

Tacitus mentioned several aspects of the Germans' character. And when we compare it with the Germans of the Middle Ages and of the 20th century, we will see little character differences.

Notice some examples. Germans have a reputation of being very hospitable. This becomes obvious to anyone travelling through their country. But then they have always been hospitable to strangers. Note Tacitus's description. "No race indulges more lavishly in hospitality and entertainment: to close the door against any human being is a crime. . . . Stranger or acquaintance, no one distinguished them where the right of hospitality is concerned." (Tacitus, Germania, Section 21, p.295, Loeb ed.)

A century before, Julius Caesar mentioned this same virtue. "To wrong a guest is impious in their eyes. They shield from injury all who come to their houses for any purpose whatever, and treat their persons as sacred; guests are welcomed to every man's home and table." (Julius Caesar, The Conquest of Gaul, Ch.1, Section 2.)

So we begin to see that in the character trait of hospitality, Germans haven't changed.

Now take another example. A less commendable one-- drinking. That Germans love to drink is no secret. But so it has always been. During the Thirty Years War in the 17th century, the French said about the Germans' thirst, "Oxen stop drinking when they are no longer thirsty, Germans only begin." (See C.V. Wedgwood, The Thirty Years War, p.45.)

This report might have been exaggerated somewhat; nevertheless, it shows the Germans' immense consumption of alcoholic beverages at that time. As an interesting side-line, it must be mentioned that the Landgrave of Hesse at this time founded a Temperance society. Unfortunately it was short-lived; its first president died of drink.

Tacitus, referring to the Germans, records for us, "To outdrink the day and night is a reproach to no one." (Tacitus, Germania, Section 22.)

It becomes plain that inherent characteristics of a people do not change over the centuries. They might be modified, periodically restricted, but essentially they remain unchanged.

What Germans Excelled In

If there was an overriding German character trait that struck the Romans especially, it was the cruel, aggressive, warlike nature of theirs. About this trait the Romans wrote considerably.

We must keep in mind that the Romans, who are our first contemporary observers of the Germans, were themselves militaristically inclined. They were trained in the art of war-making and could never describe them as benevolent, peace-loving and tenderhearted people. We must remember that Rome, during the time of the early Caesars, set out to conquer the known world -- and succeeded with but a few doubtful exceptions.

For the Romans, themselves no doves, to describe the Germans warlike, shows that they excelled the Romans, the Gauls, the Celts and all other surrounding nations in war-making.

Some scholars will claim in admitting that the Germans' desire for war, that all nations of old were warlike. That is correct. All nations have warred--but not all nations have warred to the same extent as have the Germans. The Germans, through the ages, excelled all others in aggressive war-making.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF GERMAN WARFARE

"The ancient Teutonic nations breathed nothing but war, which was at once with them the source of honour, riches, and safety. Their education, laws, prejudices, morality and religion all concurred to make that their ruling passion and only object!" states French historian M. Mallet, Northern Antiquities, p. 136.

How accurate is that description? We shall see shortly. Next note another historian's description of the ancient German passion for war. "The fact that they were all warriors was the only thing that remained common to the Teutonic tribes. Their heavens were battle-fields, their gods warrior-heroes, their popular assemblies army reviews. Political rule found expression solely in war command." (Emil Ludwig, The Germans, p. 17.)

Henrich Heine, 19th century German writer, in his History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany, refers to "that ancient German eagerness for battle which combats not for the sake of destroying, not even for the sake of victory, but merely for the sake of combat itself."

Notice now some contemporary reports given to us by Tacitus. In describing the warlike nature of the German tribes, this Roman historian laments the fact that in his

day already two hundred and ten years of fighting had transpired and Rome had not yet succeeded in the conquest of Germany. The Germans, says Tacitus, have inflicted more damage on Rome than any other people during that period.

The most warlike of German tribes Rome had to contend with were the Chatti (Hessians). "The Chatti were among the most fierce and most invincible. . . . Their audacity in war and indifference to death . . . were conspicuous among the nations that had these qualities in common." (John Ridpath, With the World's People, v.6, p. 680.)

About the Chatti, Tacitus states that it has become a custom "to let the hair and beard grow when a youth has attained manhood, and to put off that facial garb which is due and dedicate to manliness only after an enemy has been slain: standing above the sanguinary spoil, they dis-mantle their faces again, and advertise that then and not before have they paid the price of their birthpangs, and are worthy of their kin and country. Cowards and weaklings remain unkempt. The bravest also wear a ring of iron . . . in token of chains, until each man frees himself by the slaughter of an enemy . . ." (Tacitus, Germania, Section 32, p. 309, Loeb ed.).

This German tribe led the other tribes in warring like no other people. Their warlike conduct exceeded that

of any other nation.

In their constant battles, their women took a direct part. They would usually incite the men to war. If the men failed, then the women would do the literal fighting. The entire German society, in those early days, was geared for war.

It was something the Romans and other nations surrounding these German tribes dreaded. The Romans coined the word "Furor Teutonicus;" and had good reasons for so doing. It happened often, whenever German warriors were charging, that they would collectively chant in a shouting manner a war song to terrify their enemies. They would also, Tacitus tells us, charge the enemy with lightning-like speed, something that we in the 20th century know as Blitzkrieg.

It is further written of them that they hated agricultural pursuits, lest they would become "domesticated" and so lose the art of war-making.

It is interesting to note that the common German word for to get or to acquire--"Kriegen"--is synonymous with warring. Also, the German word "Leute," meaning people, originates from the Latin, "Laeti," and means "people of war" (See Ozanam's Les Germains avant le Christianisme, p. 346).

The Middle Ages

We have seen that the descriptions of Julius Caesar and Tacitus--comprising a time element of about one hundred and fifty years--show that the early Germans were extremely warlike. Next we will cover the Middle Ages to observe whether this negative character trait of the Germans has been erased or at least modified.

Another German tribe which had a propensity for war were the Franks. They appear in central Germany under that name from the third to the fifth centuries, settling in an area surrounding today's Frankfurt.

"The Franks were a particularly warlike people," states Frederick Hertz in The Development of the German Public Mind, p.23. Note his choice of words. Obviously, during the early Middle Ages, many nations warred--but no Western nation had this propensity to the same degree as the German tribes. The aggressive war-making of the German Franks was conspicuous to other warring peoples.

So we see that, after the passing of several centuries, the Germans--now embodied in the Franks--still retained this destructive trait.

One point not to overlook in this regard is that many Germans were acting as mercenary soldiers in the Roman army; and as far as fighting goes, the Romans were pleased with these "employees."

Referring to the German mercenaries, "Young nobles were educated in the capital of the empire and trained in the army . . . which thousands of Germans joined, satisfying in that way their thirst for war and glory as well as their desire for monetary gains. Thus Rome itself trained the officers and military leaders of its subsequent foes and final destroyers . . ." (The Historians' History of the World, Ed. by Williams, v. vi, p. 619). "For centuries," continues this source, "the Roman army had consisted for the most part of foreigners, chiefly Germans" (Ibid., p. 622).

So great was the influx of Germans into the Roman army that "a great number of Germans were in both armies fighting for and against each other." (Ibid., p. 620.)

Even as early as the time of Julius Caesar, Germans were assisting in the Roman army. Caesar, seeing their ability in the military sphere, used many Germans in creating the elite of the Roman military. "One finds them in all the outposts of Africa, Phoenicia, Arabia and as far as the Persian border." (Les Germains avant le Christianisme, A.F. Ozanam, p. 349.)

Several centuries later, Charlemagne appears on the scene. No one will deny that this German (Frankish) king did a lot of good in the field of education, etc. On the other hand, he would never have won the Peace Prize. Aided by his religious zeal, Charlemagne set out to

ruthlessly attack and enforce Christianity on the unwilling Saxons. Contemporary reports exist telling us that he slaughtered thousands of innocent victims. All this for the greater glorification of an enlarged empire.

In the tenth century, it was Otto the First who expanded his empire into the areas of the Slavs in Eastern Europe. The heathen Slavs were treated in a very ruthless manner and considered as less than human.

As we enter the 13th century, we see again from contemporary records that the warlike character trait was still an intrinsic part of the Germans.

Notice what the Chronicler Burkard, Prior of Ursberg, said at the beginning of the 13th century. "The Germans are described by him as warlike and invincible in battle, loyal to their princes unto death and trusting only men of their own tribe." (Frederick Hertz, The Development of the German Public Mind, p. 136.)

The learned English Minorite Bartholemew, who came to Magdeburg in 1230, noticed that "Germany appeared to him as a populous country, rich in towns and mines, and the people tall, fair, fierce and warlike" (Ibid., p. 136).

According to this English man, the Germans--despite their contemporary wealth--still retained this destructive trait. This factor contributes little to the argument that Germany would not be warlike or aggressive if they

were to constantly experience a condition of prosperity.

Contrasting the traits of the French with those of the Germans, Alexander of Roes, a canon of a church in Cologne in the 13th century, mentions that while the French lay more stress on the finer things in life, the Germans "like serious things, such as fighting and war . . ." (Ibid., p. 153). Continues Alexander, "the French have recently assumed traits otherwise characteristic of the Germans, namely a warlike, hard and rapacious mind . . ." (Ibid., p. 155).

So we see that during the Middle Ages this dangerous character trait in question was still typical of Germans.

Antonio de Beatis, an Italian who travelled in 1517-1518 through Germany, says of German men, "All of them wear arms from boyhood, every town and village has a place where the people on holiday practice shooting with cross-bows and guns, and the use of pikes and every other sort of arms." (Ibid., p. 356.)

In the year 1527, General Georg von Frundsberg with his German mercenaries sacked Rome. "The most awful outrages were perpetrated. Prelates were tortured after being paraded through the streets of the eternal city, dressed in their sacred pontificals and mounted on donkeys. . . . For nine months the orgy continued, the

inhabitants being tortured . . . in their effort to find hidden treasure" (Face to Face with Kaiserism, James W. Gerhard, p. 106).

Dr. Martin Luther, encouraging the princes in Germany to quell the peasant rebellion, shouted, "Kill them all. If there are any innocent among them, God will see to it. . . . A prince can win to Heaven by spilling blood." (Ernest Hambloch, Germany Rampant, p. 52).

In the 17th century, during the Thirty Years War, Frederick of the Palatinate advised Prince Bethlen in a letter "Not to let the war die down, but entirely to devastate Austria, Styria, and Carinthia, annihilate Moravia, and ruin and burn to ashes Silesia and the neighbourhood." (Frederick Hertz, The Development of the German Public Mind, p. 502.)

The belief in the principle of war was firmly instilled in the mind of Frederick the Great in the 18th century. Says he, "He is a fool, and that nation is a fool, who having the power to strike his enemy unawares, does not strike and strike his deadliest." (Robert Vansittart, Black Record, p. 29). "Frederick the Great is rightly looked upon as the founder of modern German militarism, not merely as a state policy, but as a worship of destruction for its own sake." (Germans' National Vice, Samuel Igra, p. 19.)

Modern Times

Referring to the war campaigns of Frederick the Great in the 18th century, Heinrich von Treitschke, Professor of the University of Berlin in 1874, states that these campaigns "have impressed their own stamp forever upon the warlike spirit of the Prussian people and the Prussian army; even today the North German, when war is discussed, involuntarily adopts the expressions of those heroic days." (Heinrich von Treitschke, German History in the Nineteenth Century; English translation, New York, 1915-19, 72-37.)

Otto von Bismarck was called the Iron Chancellor; and there were reasons for this appellation. This leader of Prussia coined the phrase, "Might makes Right!" Any study of his policies during the last century will show how much of this German quality of war-making was part of his character.

After only three years in office, he crushed Denmark. Two years later, Austria followed. France was next. "All problems must be solved by blood and iron!" was his firm belief. "It is the destiny of the weak to be devoured by the strong," Bismarck said. (See "The Sunday Times World Library," GERMANY, p. 38, London, 1962.)

At the turn of the last century, when Germany had

a foothold in Asia, Kaiser Wilhelm was highly enthusiastic of establishing a German Empire in China.

Thousands of German Christians will breathe again when they see the ships of the German Navy in their vicinity, hundreds of German merchants will shout for joy in the knowledge that the German Empire has at long last set foot firmly in Asia, hundreds of thousands of Chinese will shiver if they feel the iron fist of the German Empire lying firmly on their neck, and the entire German people will rejoice at the firm action which their government has taken. I am ~~determined to show~~ once and for all that the German Emperor is a bad person with whom to take liberties or have as an enemy. (Michael Balfour, The Kaiser and His Times, pp. 209-210.)

Continues the Kaiser,

The tasks which the newly established German Empire has to undertake overseas are onerous, more onerous than my countrymen have expected. . . . Show yourselves Christians, happily enduring in the face of the heathen. May honour and fame attend your colours and arms! Give the world an example of virility and discipline. You are well aware that you have to face a brave, well-armed and savage foe. . . . No pardon will be given, and prisoners will not be made. Anyone who falls into your hands falls to your sword. Just as the Huns under their king Etzel created for themselves a thousand years ago a name which men still respect, you would give the name of German such a cause to be remembered in China for a thousand years that no Chinaman . . . will dare to look a German in the face.

The Kaiser concludes his advice by encouraging his subjects to:

Carry yourselves like men and may the blessing of God go with you; each one of you bears with him the prayers of an entire people and my good wishes. Open the road for CULTURE once and for all. (Ibid., p. 226.)

World War I was the next outlet for Germany's war spirit followed a generation later by World War II. We will discuss these wars at a later stage. However, notice a few statements, uttered by Germans themselves before and during World War I.

"We must always consider war as our supreme political mission," is the sage advice given in the German newspaper, Deutsche Tageszeitung, January 17th, 1912. And the editor of Die Zukunft, Herr Harden, states on October 7th, 1910, "We are made for war. Let us make war, before it is too late."

Comments like these appeared in respectable newspapers in Germany prior to World War I. These are Germans themselves speaking; and they ought to know how they feel. It becomes obvious that the same spirit that led the ancient German tribes led the German nation as a whole into two world wars. But let's hear a few more Germans speak.

Professor Oberhofen, writing in the Vissische Zeitung, June, 1913, states, "War is the supreme educating factor of civilization."

"We love war, and could furnish to a capable leader all the elements he could desire," stated the Rheinisch-Westfalische Zeitung, September, 1913.

As is known, after World War I, Germany did not eradicate this negative character trait; and as a

consequence, the Second World War ensued.

Franz Josef Strauss stated recently, "We must destroy the widespread legend found in many Western nations, that Germany is a land with an inborn inclination for aggression!" (Herausforderung und Antwort -: (A Challenge and Solution) p. 198).

If we trace the history of warfare as far as Germany is concerned from the very beginning--which we have done--we must come to the conclusion that the Germans as a whole do have an inborn inclination for aggression. If not, it would mean that the Germans have suddenly quickly lost this negative character trait since the end of World War II. But more of that later.

CHAPTER IV

THE GERMAN PHILOSOPHY OF WAR

The German philosophy of war in past times has been--to sum it up in one sentence, exactly what the Prussian General Clausewitz stated in the early part of the 19th century. According to him, war is the continuation of politics through other means. (See Walter Goerlitz, History of the German General Staff, p. 62.)

Tacitus records for us how a first century German felt about war. "Valour is the only proper goods of men The gods range themselves on the side of the strongest" (Ancient German Warrior; Tacitus, Hist. lib. iv, c. 17). Almost two thousand years later, "The Diocese paper of Freiburg (1940) hailed the great successes of the courageous German soldiers as proof that God guided history . . ." (Guenter Lewy, The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany, p. 228).

That is the crux of the philosophy. This we will exemplify primarily by what Germans themselves have said throughout history.

It is no exaggeration to say that all the Teutonic nations . . . looked upon war as a real act of justice, and esteemed force an incontestable title over the weak, a visible mark that God had intended to subject them to the strong. (M. Mallet, Northern Antiquities, p. 138.)

This philosophy of war continued when Charlemagne conquered the Saxons and when Otto the Great enslaved the Slavs in the tenth century. Especially during the late Middle Ages do we have numerous contemporary records revealing the German philosophy of war.

It is interesting to note in this connection how Pepin of the Franks, father of Charlemagne thought along this line. Of him it is recorded that he:

. . . spoke straight from the heart of his people, giving them the ideal pretext to justify violence. . . . Even when robbing alien peoples, he will believe his mission to be highly moral. With this psychology Pepin became the forerunner of a thousand years of moral conquest. (Emil Ludwig, The Germans, p. 20.)

"The Prince holds the sword, therefore he is of God!" stated Dr. Martin Luther in the 16th century. General von Bernhardi, in his book, Germany and the Next War, quotes Luther as saying,

In the business of war we must not regard the massacres, the burnings, and the battles. Why these murders and horrors? It is a business Divine in itself, and necessary to the world as eating or drinking or any other world.

In a political testament of 1667, we read,

Alliances, to be sure, are good, but forces of one's own still better. Upon them one can rely with more security, and a lord is of no consideration if he does not have means and troops of his own. (As quoted in G. Kuntzel and M. Hass, Die Politischen Testamente der Hohenzollern, i, 56, Leipzig, 1919.)

Coming down to the 18th century we see Frederick the Great giving his answer on how to overcome the weakness of the Prussian State of his time, "Consolidation was necessary but could be effected only by new acquisitions; and new acquisitions would necessarily involve resort to force." (G.P. Gooch, Frederick the Great: The Ruler, the Writer, the Man, p. 12.)

The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, late in the 18th century stated, "No aim is absurd, much less wrong if there are means of obtaining it." (Ernest Hamblach, Germany Rampant, p. 32.)

This philosophy of war was one century later an integral part of Prussian militarism. To the Prussians, diplomacy was despicable and effeminate--unworthy of a great race. German will must be imposed by force of arms, was the doctrine of that society.

In Prussia, with but one exception, "all educational institutions served purely military purposes." (Walter Goerlitz, History of the German General Staff, p. 4.)

It was war which laid the foundations of Prussia's power. . . . War, forged that Prussia, hard as steel, on which the New Germany could grow up as a mighty European State and a World Power of the future. Hence once more, war showed its creative power, and if we learn the lessons of history we shall see the same result again and again. (General Friedrich von Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War, p. 34.)

No wonder then that Bismarck firmly believed that "Might makes Right," and that it is quite in order to enforce one's way upon others.

"The great questions of the day will not be decided by speeches and the resolutions of majorities . . . but by iron and blood" stated Bismarck as Chancellor. (Bismarck, The Man and the Statesman, A.J.P. Taylor, p. 44.)

The German philosophy of war is further elaborated by a late 19th century philosopher, Heinrich von Treitschke. Professor of History at the University of Berlin, 1874, this German philosopher stated bluntly, "War is both justifiable and moral, and the idea of perpetual peace is not only impossible but immoral as well." (Heinrich von Treitschke, Politik, v.11, pp. 396-397.)

According to him, and many other German philosophers and military men, the end has always justified the means. This philosophy has been a part of German society for two thousand years. So convinced was Treitschke of war being moral and justifiable that he added, "The God above us will see to it that war shall return. . . ." (Ibid.) "What moral perversity it is to wish to strike militarism out of the heart of man," stated Berlin's most distinguished professor a few years after the Franco-German War of 1865-70. (McCabe, The Soul of Europe, p. 88.)

Of course there have been periods in the history of Germany when there was no war. Continues Treitschke, "The army is not always upon active service, but the silent labour of preparation never ceases." (ibid.) "War is an eternal and beneficent part of human life: Germany has a divine mission . . . to carry its arms and its KULTUR," Treitschke taught. This is nothing new. It has always been so in German society.

Gustav Freytag, Germany's greatest novelist at the time of Bismarck, urged that "blood should flow freely in the sacred cause of uniting Germany." (Joseph McCabe, The Soul of Europe, p. 65.)

The philosophy that war is just if waged by Germany was very prevalent prior to World War I. General Friedrich von Bernhardi, writing just before the First World War speaks of "the duties and obligations of the German people," and that these "cannot be fulfilled without drawing the sword." This, he continues, is morally and politically justified." (Germany and the Next War, p. 15.)

Bernhardi continues in stressing the value of war for the political and moral development of mankind. He is afraid lest Germans shed their militaristic spirit. Says he, "The Germans were formerly the best fighting men and the most warlike nation in Europe. For a long time they have proved themselves to be the ruling people of the

Continent by the power of their arms and the loftiness of their ideas. Germans have bled and conquered on countless battlefields in every part of the world, and in late years have shown that the heroism of their ancestors still lives in the descendants." (Ibid., p. 10.)

There are times, as Bernhardt mentions, when the Germans have "temporarily shed" their warlike and militaristic outlook. But whenever an effective Fuhrer comes along, to whip up this often latent war spirit in them, then the German will again reveal his true colour. Notice what Bernhardt says about this latent aggressiveness of his people. "In striking contrast to this military aptitude they have today become a peaceloving-- and almost 'too' peaceloving nation." (Ibid.)

It is interesting to note what he is saying in particularly this context. Today the German people as a whole are "peaceloving." In fact, their military behavior since the end of World War II is extremely commendable. But have they really changed over completely from a formerly "warlike" people to one which admires, defends and loves peace? Let General Bernhardt give us the answer.

At the time of his writing--a few years before the Great War broke out--the German people were "peaceloving;" --but what happened? They quickly shed their "peaceloving" nature and were whipped up to war. Read again

the quotation of General Bernhardt:

In striking contrast to this military aptitude they have today become a peaceloving--and almost "too" peaceloving--nation. A rude shock is needed to awaken their warlike instincts, and compel them to show their military strength. (Ibid., p. 10.)

Bernhardt is saying that whenever an effective leader appears on the scene and whips these people into line, then the warlike spirit of the Germans will be awakened and live again.

What is dreadfully, and demonstrably bad for the Germans, and thus for the rest of the world, is their exposure to a fiery fanaticism that, in a less capable people, would burn itself out with more modest consequences. (Milton Mayer, They Thought They Were Free, p. XIV.)

"That Might makes Right," as coined by Bismarck is furthered by this Pre-World War I author. "The struggle for existence is, in the life of Nature, the basis of all healthy development!" states Bernhardt. In other words, let's watch nature--there the strongest survive, and the weakest die. Let nature be our guide! is an axiom which has had a great say in the military and political affairs of Germany. War, consequently, is as necessary as the struggle of the elements in nature, according to this philosophy, "Struggle is therefore a universal law of Nature," according to Bernhardt on page 21 of his book. Therefore "The maintenance of peace can never be the goal" he adds.

That war is justifiable and even good if perpetrated by the right power is further stressed in Rosinski's The German Army, page 134. Trying to justify the reasons for German soldiers fighting and dying on the battlefields, he states:

It is in the letters and writings of students who died in Flanders and Poland, in their sober realism, in their faith in the spiritual heritage of the nation . . . that we can feel what the war really meant for the German nation and what immense spiritual forces were released by it.

"According to Christianity," states Bernhardt, "we cannot disapprove of war in itself, but must admit it is justified morally and historically." (p. 29.)

Waging war, according to this philosophy, releases spiritual forces. It is therefore something that is moral and good; and of course necessary.

When World War I broke out, Rosinski proclaimed joyfully:

It was something without parallel in the history of the German people. Spontaneously the 67 million Germans rose as one man. A wave of enthusiasm, carrying everything before it, swept aside all differences of political creed, class, religion, age. . . . This feeling of national unity came from the conviction of the essential righteousness of Germany's cause and of the defensive nature of her struggle. (Herbert Rosinski, The German Army, p. 140.)

It becomes very clear what Germany's philosophy of war has been. First of all there must be a good cause--a purpose--a mission which only Germany can fulfil.

In order to fulfil this commission, Germany can use any force, any power, any means at her disposal; because the end justifies the means.

It's again very significant that what Rosinski says about the "essential righteousness of Germany's cause and of the defensive nature of her struggle" are two justifications that the Germans gave two thousand years ago. Notice what Tacitus says about the "essential righteousness" of the ancient Germans to wage war.

"Valour is the only proper goods of men. The gods range themselves on the side of the strongest!" ("Ancient German Warrior"; Tacitus, Hist. lib. iv, c. 17.) In other words, if you are strong or have strong weapons to lord it over others, this means--according to this ancient German --that God is on your side. "Struggle is therefore," adds another German almost 2000 years later, "a universal law of Nature" (General Friedrich von Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War, p. 21.)

So we see that in this one point of the philosophy of war, nothing has changed since the time of Tacitus.

The other justification Rosinski gives--that Germany in World War I was fighting a defensive war--is also mentioned by Julius Caesar. Describing the Germans 2000 years ago, Caesar quotes a German warrior justifying himself concerning why the Germans had to invade Gaul:

We Germans are not taking aggressive action against the Roman people, but we are ready to fight if provoked. . . . We wish to say, however, that we have come into Gaul not from choice but because we were expelled from our homes. . . . (Julius Caesar, The Conquest of Gaul, p. 111, Chapter 4, Section 1.)

In 1902 Kaiser Wilhelm assured the world that Germans no longer needed "to extend the frontiers of our country." (Joseph M'Cabe, The Soul of Europe, p. 79.) The empire the Kaiser desired was "a spiritual Empire."

"The German people . . . have no thought of invading any country," Hitler stated at the opening of the Reichstage, on May 17, 1933. "Germany has only one desire," the Fuhrer continues, "to protect her independence and frontiers." (William Henry Beable, Celebrated and Historical Speeches, p. 274.)

Weren't Germany's reasons then for attacking the countries she did during this century merely a defensive action, a necessary move to acquire much--needed Lebensraum--living-space? "The development of Germany demands new conquests," we read in the Frankfurter General Anzeiger of June, 1913. So what we are expected to believe is that Germany, normally wanting peace, is forced into conquests for her survival's sake.

So we see that little has changed since the time the Romans first came into contact with the German tribes. The German philosophy of war two thousand years ago was

essentially no different from what it was during the first part of the 20th century.

"Germany understands no freedom without power, for real freedom is not thinkable except in a state the existence of which is founded on might!" stated the Deutsche Tageszeitung, June 1917; as quoted on page 29 of Lord Haldane's Conditions in Germany 1917.

And the Deutsche Wehr, organ of the German Army of World War I, echoes this philosophy by stating, "Every human and social activity is justified only if it helps to prepare for war."

To see how the German military of World War I believed in total war--that is, the complete annihilation of the enemy--notice the following quotation from the Deutsche Wehr:

A victor who allows the vanquished to rebuild their industry and continue to develop their economy has made his heavy sacrifices in vain and jeopardizes his own existence. The only prize of victory which justifies such a risk and compensates for such sacrifices is the complete liquidation of the vanquished as future rivals, as independent and significant economic powers. . . . He must therefore be crushed. . . . (Gerhart Eisler, The Lesson of Germany, p. 186.)

When Hitler appeared on the scene, he continued to carry this German philosophy of war. "War is the most natural, the most everyday matter," he stated. "War is eternal, war is universal. There is no beginning and there is no peace. War is life. Any struggle is war.

War is the origin of all things." (Hermann Rauschning, The Voice of Destruction, p. 699.)

Joseph Goebbels stated on September 4, 1938 in Berlin, "The methods by which a people forces its way upwards are of no consequence. What is important is the goal which is reached!" In other words, the end justifies the means.

But it is most important to realise how they-- (Germany's philosophers)-- "implanted deep in the German mind the idea of expansion by the sword, the right of the powerful to annex the weaker . . . and a disdain for other peoples." (Joseph McCabe, The Soul of Europe, p. 63.)

This philosophy was an integral part of the makeup of the early German tribes. It was kept alive during the Middle Ages; and that that philosophy was part of the Germans' makeup in the first part of the 20th century, none can deny. Nothing has changed during the last two thousand years.

War is the origin of all things." (Hermann Rauschning, The Voice of Destruction, p. 699.)

Joseph Goebbels stated on September 4, 1938 in Berlin, "The methods by which a people forces its way upwards are of no consequence. What is important is the goal which is reached!" In other words, the end justifies the means.

But it is most important to realise how they-- (Germany's philosophers)-- "implanted deep in the German mind the idea of expansion by the sword, the right of the powerful to annex the weaker . . . and a disdain for other peoples." (Joseph McCabe, The Soul of Europe, p. 63.)

This philosophy was an integral part of the makeup of the early German tribes. It was kept alive during the Middle Ages; and that that philosophy was part of the Germans' makeup in the first part of the 20th century, none can deny. Nothing has changed during the last two thousand years.

extent. Their customs, manners, religion bear this out.

This fact was observed two thousand years ago by Tacitus. States he:

Personally I associate myself with the opinion of those who hold that in the peoples of Germany there has been given the world a race untainted by intermarriage with other races, a peculiar people and pure, like no one but themselves. (Germania, p. 269, Loeb ed.)

In this same context, it is also of interest to note that not only Tacitus but others as well held this view of the Germans.

And Germans throughout history have not been lax in referring to Tacitus' description of their forefathers to prove that Germans even at that early stage were superior to the surrounding nations.

A few centuries later the Franks were still considered "the chosen people" according to G. Tellenbach, "Germanen und Reichsgedanke im Frühen Mittelalter," as quoted in Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte, Bruno Gebhardt, v. 1, p. 129.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation Germans were beginning to forget they were "superior." So Martin Luther had to remind them. "We were born to be masters. . . . It is time the glorious Teutonic people should cease to be the puppet of the Roman pontiff." (Bettensen, Documents of the Christian Church, p. 278.) Luther didn't have to explain how Germans were superior. All that was

necessary for him, was to remind them of something Germans were already aware of, at least to an extent.

Luther again at another occasion, "The Germans are the best nation in the world." (Ernest Hambloch, Germany Rampant, p. 63.) So if a man, regarded as chosen by God, preached this doctrine of superiority, one can see how easily Germans would accept such an idea.

German philosopher Fichte reassured his readers around 1810, "We Germans are the Chosen People. . . . We are simply the people. Beyond us are barbarians." (Ibid., p. 43.) "To have character and to be German is, no doubt, one and the same thing," Fichte boasted. (Jonas Lesser, Germany--The Symbol and The Deed, p. 177.)

To see just how seriously Germans were in classifying themselves as superior specimens, note what happened when a Frenchman challenged this "superiority" during the last century.

A. de Quatrefages, Professor of the Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, wrote a pamphlet entitled La Race Prussienne (1871), and concluded the Prussians were not Teutonic but descended from Finns, of barbarian Mongol origin. In order to refute this theory, the German government initiated a census of the hair, skin and eye colours of six million schoolchildren of the Reich. (Germany, History and Administration, Naval Intelligence Division, p. 2.)

Paul de Lagarde, professor of Oriental languages at the University of Göttingen during the time of Bismarck, spoke in his Deutsche Schriften of an "invisible force

which lives in everything that grows and thrives in Germany, bringing out in every single German that divine image which is in him from birth."

Another philosopher, Treitschke, taught in the late 19th century that the Germans stood on a higher level of the created world than other nations.

"If our Kaiser calls us," excitable Germans boasted in 1890, "We are willing to be led against our enemies. But we can ask for a price. . . . This price is: to become a master race." (Jonas Lesser, Germany--The Symbol and the Deed, p. 194.)

The idea of Germans excelling other races in intellect, ability, etc., was further stressed by the leader of the Pan-German Society, Thormann in 1895. Says he:

In a number of years the world will see the following: the German flag will wave over 86,000,000 Germans; and they will rule over a territory inhabited by 130,000,000 Europeans. Only the Germans in this region will possess political rights; only they will serve in the army and navy; only they will be able to occupy land. Then they will be the Master Race, as in the Middle Ages, and the peoples under their rule will do all inferior types of work. (Gerhart Eisler, The Lesson of Germany, p. 188.)

As we enter the 20th century this superior feeling reached a high pitch. "The German is physically and intellectually the highest form of the species homo sapiens," stated an anthropologist of Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany in the Politisch-Anthropologische Revue, Thuringia, 1902-22.

General Ludendorff, in the early part of this century, stated that Christianity is "alien to the German soul because it denies the difference between the races and nations by postulating that all men are equal before God." (Jonas Lesser, Germany--The Symbol and The Deed, p. 233.) What Ludendorff himself is postulating is that Germans are not equal to others but über alles.

"A new peace shall make Germany 'mistress of the globe,' a peace established by the victorious sword of the master race that takes over the world in the service of a higher civilization," states Propagandist Rosenberg during the Third Reich. (Hermann Rauschning, The Revolution of Destruction, p. 194.)

Theologian Karl Adam of Tübingen spoke with uplifted arms about Hitler. Says he:

Now he stands before us, he whom the voices of our poets and sages have summoned, the liberator of the German genius. He has removed the blindfolds from our eyes and, through all political, economical, social and confessional covers, has enabled us to see and love again the one essential thing: our unity of blood, our German self, the homo Germanus. (Guenter Lewy, The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany, p. 108.)

Is it any wonder then that the German masses have gullibly accepted this Deutschland Über Alles fallacy? With their religious and civil leaders, their philosophers, teachers and military men constantly inculcating such an idea into the minds of the masses, it is not difficult to

see why the average German feels superior to this very day.

In order to inculcate this doctrine into their minds, convincingly sounding arguments were found to "substantiate" such a belief. According to this doctrine, the Germans excel all other people in the major spheres of culture, be it in the field of music, literature, inventions, economics, industry or any other important aspect of civilization. In all these fields, they are über alles. However, since Germans on the whole are rational beings, the points of evidence in favor of their "superiority" must sound convincing before they will accept this teaching.

Now it is true that in many fields Germans are "superior" to others, if that word can be used. As a race they do excel in many fields, which will be related as we progress in this analysis.

Why Germans Feel Superior

That Germans as a whole are a capable people no one can deny. One needs only to superficially delve into the field of music to realise that in that sphere, one of several, they have contributed much. Musicians such as Bach, Beethoven, Schubert, Brahms, Mozart, Hayden, Mendelssohn, Straus, etc., have provided the world with a variety of musical entertainment. This is true also in

other fields.

But why do Germans feel they have to boast about their accomplishments?--to shout about their achievements? --to proclaim their capabilities to others?

Why do Germans feel compelled to write numerous books and exhaustive articles, desperately trying to convince others that they indeed are gifted, that they indeed are "superior"? And, most tragic of all, why must they--from time to time--even go to war to persuade disbelievers that Germans and anything that is German is über alles?

The reason is--and here is where the tragedy lies--that deep in their hearts they feel inferior; Germans suffer from an inferiority complex.

Without realizing this point, it is not possible to really understand the national character of these capable and gifted people.

That Germans as a whole are beset by an inferiority complex is borne out in many ways.

A feeling of insecurity is perhaps what contributes most to this negative sentiment. Finding herself in the heart of Europe, Germany felt encircled by hostile nations who were ever trying to keep her disunited and prevent her from becoming a big European power. Germans' mistrust of their neighbours has helped them in retaining this feeling

of insecurity. And this feeling has made it comparatively easy for them to follow strong leaders who promise deliverance from this insecure feeling.

Insecure in their vocation, unsure of themselves, unsteady in their character, Germans tend to go to extremes. And who can deny the fact of history that Germans have, all too often, gone from one extreme to another. Prussian Iron Chancellor Bismarck brings out this swaying from one extreme to the other. "It was constantly a mistake of the Germans, to obtain everything or nothing at all." (Bismarck, "Gesammelte Werke," IV, S. 49, as quoted by Gordon A. Graig in Deutsche Staatskunst von Bismarck bis Adenauer, p. 23.)

And so it has been in German history. On one side to go all out for something, to sacrifice their possessions, their souls, their very blood, to reach for the skies--to attain to the unattainable. The goal they set themselves must be attained, fulfilled, no matter by what means. If the goal is worthwhile--good for Germans and good for the whole world, then any means available will do, even if millions of lives are at stake.

On the other hand, total resignation, dejection, self-pity, as the next paragraph brings out.

This nation, driven, hunted, hopeless, obeying only impulses from without, continually shaken out of its composure, robbed of its self-reliance, in

constant anxiety, losing spirit, losing elasticity, but excited into hysterical outbreaks, has become a sick nation, mentally unbalanced and neurotic.

So was Germany described several decades ago by a German himself. (Hermann Rauschnig, Revolution of Destruction, p. 124.)

And to overcome their misgivings, their anxiety, their insecurity--to override their inferiority complex--they convinced themselves as better than others, as superior, as das Herrenvolk, the Master Race.

Feeling inferior, being unsure of himself, lacking in character steadiness, the German becomes unpredictable in his course of action.

"And once the people feel helpless to solve their own problems, anyone who comes along with a plausible panacea can pick up the reins with his left hand."
(Gudrun Tempel, Speaking Frankly About the Germans, p. 16.)

All I know is that I, a German, am literally afraid of the Germans, as I would of anyone who is unsure of himself and does not know where he is going nor what he will do when he gets to a crossroad. (Ibid. p. 46.)

Suffering from an inferiority complex, and yet making themselves believe in their superiority, they fall prey to dictatorial leaders promising them greatness, as Gudrun Tempel correctly analyses.

The Germans have so many faces, one today, another tomorrow. They identify themselves with whatever happens to come their way. Seldom do they relax into being simply themselves. (Ibid., p. 47.)

That Germans can be swayed easily by effective leaders was something Hitler himself realized. To deny the fact that Hitler understood what motivates the Germans is to deny the irrefutable evidence that millions upon millions of them followed, revered, worshipped their Führer. This man was an effective leader to the Germans, something he could not have been had he been ignorant of Germans' aspirations, hopes, frustrations and weaknesses.

States Hitler:

It has been my fate to be the servant of a people with so tragic a past, a people so unstable, so versatile as the German people, and a people who go, according to circumstances, from one extreme to the other. (Genoud, The Testimony of Adolf Hitler, pp. 94-95, as stated on February 25, 1945.)

"By and large the popular masses consist of . . . unstable human specimens, given to doubt and insecurity," Hitler adds. (Hannah Vogt, The Burden of Guilt, p. 112.)

Publicly this man lied to the German nation in saying that Germans are superior to others. Hitler realized their inferiority complex, the unsteadiness of their nature, and capitalized on these weaknesses by telling them of their importance, greatness and superiority. "I have not come into the world to make men better,

but to make use of their weaknesses." (Rauschning, Hitler Speaks, p. 274.)

Although Hitler made every German feel important and gave them an illusionary mission to fulfil, he himself knew it was all a big lie. Tell a lie big enough and long enough and people will believe it, he is reported to have said. Referring to the Master Race theory, he says, "If you wish the sympathy of the masses, you must tell' them the crudest and most stupid things." (Michael E. Mummanno, Ten Days to Die, p. 83.)

Tell them that their achievements exceed those of any other nation, and they will believe it. Convince them that they are a people of genius, unlike any other people, and they will cherish such an idea. Persuade them that they are the superior race, and they will swallow it.

Tell them, Hitler believed, "the crudest and most stupid thing"--and sound convincing about it--and the German people as a whole will believe it.

Now a person, or people who is sure of his position, of his abilities, of his station in life, need not prove his superiority to others. If Germans really believed that their accomplishments exceed those of any other race--if they were really, genuinely convinced--then there would be no necessity to feverishly convince others on this matter.

Only a people who are unsure of themselves, unsteady in character, suffering from a feeling of inferiority would want to broadcast their accomplishments and thus attempt to override this feeling, and so create a superficial belief in their own greatness.

But there is no difficulty when we see the real cause for Germans' "superiority" feeling. Johann Gottlieb Fichte, German philosopher born in 1762, was beset by this typical German "inferiority complex, which dominated his early political thought." (William M. McGovern, From Luther to Hitler, p. 212.)

This negative characteristic of his is borne out in his philosophy, as Professor McGovern brings out.

In 1807 the French army occupied Berlin and took over control of the local administration. Fichte's blood rose to the boiling point and he chose this occasion to deliver the most impassioned appeals to German nationalism. In his "Address to the German Nation" delivered at this time, Fichte set out to show how far superior the Germans were to all other peoples, and how the future of the world lay with them . . . Germans must show the world that they were just as good if not a little better than the cocky French. (Ibid.)

Another characteristic pointing in this direction is their inclination to self-pity. Now a person believing in his own merits, his own superiority, has no room for self-pity or feeling sorry for himself. Why should he? After all, isn't he "superior"?

Yet their history has shown that the German finds

a painful happiness in feeling the whole world is against him and misunderstands him. With his distrustful nature towards others, he feels that their actions are directed against him to his hurt. He suspects the worse in others' motives, be they Germans or foreigners. He believes that other people look down upon him and hold him in little esteem.

Yet nothing could be further from the truth. In my experience of dealing with English, French, American, Jewish and other people, I find them having a high regard for Germans. They find admirable traits and speak highly of their talents and accomplishments.

Despite this, Germans tragically find comfort in and commiserate with the darker elements of nature and death. But so it has always been, as is brought out by a German himself. "The utter contempt of death which amazed the people of antiquity so much in the Teutons resembled an intoxication such as only wild and pugnacious men develop." (Emil Ludwig, The Germans, p. 17.)

History shows us that whenever Germans fail to fulfil their lofty and often illusionary goals they sink into utter oblivion, as Bismarck and Hitler have attested to, as already quoted in this chapter.

Note the words of a German military man on the eve of his country's imminent defeat in 1917, as he appeals to

the sense of self-pity in the Germans.

We should not nurture ourselves on illusions. We shall have to bear even more terrific attacks than heretofore on the Western front. Our nerves will be tried in a way such as no nation on earth has ever experienced. If they collapse under that fearful trial, we may bid a long farewell to German might and the benign influence of German Kultur. (Colonel Cadke in "Schwäbische Tagwacht," April 1917, as quoted in Lord Haldane's Conditions in Germany, 1917, p. 24.)

"This German inclination of self-pity is connected with their great touchiness," stated German Professor Wilhelm Roepke in "Die Freiheit," Mainz, March 19, 1956.

"They are very little gifted with the precious gifts of self-irony and self criticism," he continued. (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and the Deed, p. 310.)

Back in 1945, the bishop of Osnabrück stated to British General Sedwick, "You Englishmen can do what we never have learnt to do, laugh at ourselves." (Ibid., pp. 310-311.) "Seldom do they relax into being simply themselves," states Gudrun Tempel in Speaking Frankly About The Germans, p. 47.

This refusal to take things with a grain of salt, to self-analyse and realise one's weakness and points of strength, has never been a German trademark. "Professor Alois Melichar . . . as conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, speaks of 'the well-known habit of the Germans uncritically to accept every ideology from

Frederick II to Adolf II." (Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 312.)

Gudrun Tempel elaborates on this point by stating, "The Germans have so many faces, one today, another tomorrow. They identify themselves with whatever happens to come their way." (Speaking Frankly About the Germans, p. 47.)

This refusal of self-analysis has brought untold suffering to the German nation, not to mention other peoples. The lack of this trait has allowed vicious men to take the helm of these often gifted people, leading them into paths of adventurous destruction.

It is usually a people who feel insecure in their environment, unsure of their accomplishments, and inferior in their persons who refuse evaluation by themselves or by others. To permit self-criticism of their lives and actions would adversely disturb their inferior feeling. So it is suppressed instead.

This fact was very evident in World War II, as Hermann Rauschning brings out. "Today in Germany any criticism, even from the noblest and most genuine of patriots, is accounted one of the worst crimes, and placed in the same category as high treason." (Revolution of Destruction, p. xiii.)

The German people on the whole portray many

symptoms of someone being unsure of himself, lacking steadiness and moderation--someone who feels inferior yet wants to override this feeling by pretending to be superior.

Speaking of this lack of steadiness, Martin Luther stated in the 16th century, "A German will get along very nicely with those who do not provoke him, but let someone proffer only the slightest irritation and he will flare up in anger." (Bainton, Here I Stand, p. 34.)

Belief in Illusionary Grandeur

Their belief in unrealistic grandeur approaching illusion is another symptom of a person beset by an inferiority complex. Hermann Rauschnig, who had private talks with Hitler and understood his own people well, says that they reveal "this weakness of excessive capacity for illusion." (Ibid.) On page 124 of his book he shows that they are often "excited into hysterical outbreaks" to the extent of becoming "mentally unbalanced and neurotic."

Seeking illusionary glories in inaccessible pastures, the German nation has been disappointed all too often. And once their frustrations don't find outlets, once their ambitions aren't realized, then a sense of self-pity and fatalistic spirit overwhelms them. Unsatisfied with a moderate course, they succumb to the temptation of reaching for the sky, or else seek solace in

self-pity and often death. It's not a question of a moderate course; rather two extremes.

"Fatalism has always been a marked trait of German thought," states Ernest Hambloch in Germany Rampant, p. 7. This is further illustrated by Hans Kohn when he states that, "Germans easily succumb to the strange fascination which words such as fate or doom exercise upon them." (The Mind of Germany, p. 6.)

Carl J. Burckhardt, Swiss historian, referring to this frame of mind, says, "Myths are always intoxicating for the Germans. Far from being harmless allegories, they are dooms-laden invitations to danger." (Ibid., p. 14.)

If Germans were to take a good, thorough look at a point in question, or political issue, or anything else worthwhile--if they were to closely scrutinize and fully analyse any issue and then really think about the consequences of their actions--then the history of Germany would have been a brighter and more beneficial one. Unfortunately--and this cannot be denied but by the most biased and prejudicial minds--they have failed or refused to always think as rational beings; instead, they have embraced in part myths, all too often receiving more inspiration from legends than from realistic analysis.

Not always--yet all too often. "More than any other European, the German has seemed capable of switching

from romanticism to materialism--and back again--at different periods of history." (Germany, The Sunday Times World Library, p. 142.)

This facet of their national character is important to bear in mind so as not to conclude that Germany will never in the future rise again to illusionary heights of grandeur. But more of that later.

We have seen in history that Germany, feeling unsure of herself, developed a superficial superiority belief. Obviously other nations would not accept this doctrine, so Germany felt compelled--and no other nation has ever done this--to convince them by writing myriads of books enumerating her achievements. And from time to time--because others wouldn't believe her--Germany even went to war as convincing evidence that she was not only as good but even superior to others.

Yet all these tragic, bloodstained chapters of Germany's history could have been avoided if they had learned to analyse themselves and subsequently work on their weaknesses.

There is no reason why Germans should be ashamed of their accomplishments as they benefited mankind. They have given the world a good portion of inventions, scientific know-how and cultural entertainment, especially in the field of music.

Wherever Germans have gone, upon leaving their homeland, they have never been a "drag" on society. They never had to be supported by others. Instead they set the right example by being industrious, law-abiding and orderly.

A proper example is what happened when in the 18th century, Hungarian leaders requested Germans to colonize part of Hungary.

The German settlers . . . within a century of their arrival, made up the most prosperous and best established agricultural communities in their environment; a fact that speaks for their ability, industry and devotion to duty. Truly, it was the "German economic miracle" of the day. (G.C. Paikert, The Danube Swabians, p. 26.)

The same author continues,

A truly massive part of the literary, artistic and scientific achievements of Hungary has been accomplished since the middle of the last century, by persons of German stock. (Ibid., p. 60.)

Do Germans Still Feel Superior?

As was shown, history is not replete with records attesting to the fact that Germans have felt "superior." But is that all past? Is that feeling gone? Have they finally--after 2000 years--changed in this regard? Or do Germans still possess the same trait they have always possessed. Do they still pretend to be better than anyone else? Do they feel they are still the Master Race? The next few paragraphs will answer that question!

Take language for example. Germans in the past have always felt that their language excels all others. J.G. Fichte, whom we have already mentioned as writing in the early part of the 19th century, was the one who stressed the purity, the uniqueness of the German tongue. To him, German was the least corrupted language extant. It was pure, and ought to stay that way, Fichte taught.

Fichte's concept of nation in his speeches to, the German nation after the Jena catastrophe contains heterogeneous elements, rationalism and romanticism. Romantic is the idea of the uniqueness of the German nation as the sole creative nation in Europe because of having retained its original language, while other nations have taken over Latin, and thus borrowed an alien personality and alien modes of thought. (J.L. Talmon, Political Messianism, p. 201.)

But not only in the past have Germans revered their language as the most pure of all; even now, Germans somehow feel that their medium of expression surpasses other tongues. This is so despite the fact most Germans have no speaking knowledge of a second language, with which to compare. I know Germans personally who believe in this fallacy.

It is true that English, unlike German (if you omit a few exceptions), is a conglomeration of various languages, primarily Latin, Greek, Old German, and to a lesser extent a vast number of other tongues. This is also true of other languages. Yet what difference does it

make? After all, is not the purpose of a language to communicate ideas; to get a message across?

And the idea that German exceeds English or French or other major languages in effectively communicating ideas is just not so. Germans believing this are wishful thinkers and not realistic.

In discussing language, it is also of interest that a particular vocabulary has been insidiously incorporated into the German tongue which is very suggestive of Germans' "superiority." The word Ober, meaning above, crops up often in such words as Oberburgermeister, Oberleutnant, Oberkellner, Herr Oberst, etc. (Chief burgomaster, first lieutenant, head waiter, uppermost waiter).

Also of importance is the word Führer, leader, which is attached to a number of key German words. Below is a list of the military rank of the S.S. Notice how often the word Ober crops up, and the word führer is associated with each rank but one.

Private	-	Schütze
Lance-Corporal	-	Rotten <u>führer</u>
Corporal	-	Unterschar <u>führer</u>
Sergeant	-	<u>Oberschar</u> <u>führer</u>
Sergeant-Major	-	Hauptschar <u>führer</u>
Second Lieutenant	-	Untersturmführer
Lieutenant	-	<u>Obersturmführer</u>
Captain	-	Hauptsturmführer
Major	-	Sturmbann <u>führer</u>

Lieutenant-Colonel	-	<u>Obersturmbannführer</u>
Colonel	-	<u>Strandartenführer</u>
Brigadier	-	<u>Oberführer</u>
Major-General	-	<u>Brigadeführer</u>
Lieutenant-General	-	<u>Gruppenführer</u>
General	-	<u>Obergruppenführer</u>

That Germans love titles is no secret. Regarding their individual achievements and being satisfied with what they are is not enough. Their inferiority feeling compels them to override this negative trait by showing --outwardly--that they are superior, that they are each a Führer.

Now this craving for titles is not limited to the military. It's carried over in civilian life. Now all people love big titles, but with Germans it seems an obsession. Having discussed this with other Germans bears this out. If you are introduced or merely write or converse with a director of a company, you must address him as Herr Direktor. Failure to do this means offense, gross offense.

This is also true in schools. I remember, in attending school in Westphalia, addressing the teacher as Herr Lehrer (teacher). It was not Herr Schulz or Herr Schmidt, but always that which advertised what Herr Schulz or Herr Schmidt was--a teacher.

Although it is not generally done today, but not so long ago a child addressed his parents as Herr Vater and

Frau Mutter.

In German life, the title of "Dr" is acclaimed not only in the academic or scientific fields, but also by business executives and other people of high station. To be addressed as "Dr" carries a tremendous amount of prestige and is something feverishly coveted.

Titles in Germany are regarded as a sign of superiority. Qualifications alone are not enough, you must carry a badge. This fact was vividly brought to my mind several years ago when accompanying two business executives. The German person we were dealing with could not understand why we did not carry small cards which identified us with a certain corporation. He was almost ready to cancel the tentative agreement when he was informed that in America businessmen don't bother carrying identity badges.

It is but natural for a people to acquire a sort of superior feeling if an important part of the vocabulary contains suggestions to this effect. In language, in education, in other important aspects of society, "this view of the Germans constituting a peculiar race, distinct and separate from all the other races in Europe . . . is one which has been sedulously cultivated." (J.S. Davies, From Charlemagne to Hitler, p. 12.)

"It is difficult to dispute the suspicions," states

Ralf Dahrendorf, Professor of Sociology at the University of Koblenz, "that the ability to distinguish not only between men of different classes but also between men and 'submen' is still slumbering in many Germans." (Society and Democracy in Germany, p. 82.)

The word "slumbering" is the right choice. As is true with other aspects of their character, it might not always show itself outwardly; it lies dormant--but it is still there, merely needing rekindling. "We cannot deny the fact that the mentality of the Germans of today shows many astonishing points of similarity with those characteristics that impressed the Roman authors." (Verrina, The German Mentality, p. 7.)

One final aspect not to overlook is German driving. Recently a case came to my attention where the following happened. A chauffeur-driven Mercedes was overtaken by an "inferior" car. The owner ordered the chauffeur to overtake the other car, fuming, "We are not going to stand for that!" During the next few minutes, each overtook the other several times until the Mercedes owner forced the other man off the road and they then engaged in a free-for-all till the police broke it up. The chauffeur-driven man, after all, had to exhibit his "superiority."

This is of course no isolated case. It happens often. Not long ago, Dr. Ernst von Xylander spoke of the

German driver as neurotic, insecure, aggressive and vengeful. He continues:

The background to this terrorism on German roads and autobahns is the general feeling of insecurity caused by defeat (of the wars). There is a wide-spread lack of self-confidence. People have the feeling that they are not allowed to live as they wish to live. Out of this dissatisfaction grows violence. Cars are seen as weapons, and with a few horse-power at their command, drivers see themselves as heroes.

Dr. Xylander continues:

He blocks the overtaking lane of the autobahn for miles, deliberately stopping faster cars from overtaking, and ignoring flashing lights and horn-blowing from those behind. With delight--when he passes a speedlimit sign--he drives along the outside lane at exactly that speed--no faster and no slower--watching his rearview mirror with delight to see the column of traffic piling up behind him. (Bild-Zeitung, October 24, 1966.)

In driving, the Germans' sense of inferiority, of insecurity, is brought to the surface. States Brian Connell,

Drivers of fast and expensive cars are not the most desirable citizens the world over, but only in Germany will you see them deliberately seeking to humiliate and harry those with cheaper and older vehicles. (Watcher on the Rhine, p. 290)

There are many other indications which would further show this shallow, superficial "superiority" Germans have. But let's go on to another chapter showing that the German character has not changed.

CHAPTER VI

GERMANS AND NATURE

Germans are nature lovers. There is no other nation on earth that praises and admires nature as much as they do. This admiration has become part of their way of life; it is to be found in their laws, customs, music, homes, etc.

Unlike any other race, Germans find much of their inspiration in nature; and it is also nature which often guides them in their social behaviour and moral concepts. But more of that later.

Notice now a few examples showing the Germans' almost fanatical love of nature. The most obvious to many is perhaps their natural health cures. It's an obsession with them. This becomes very obvious when opening a daily newspaper to the travel section. According to these ads, this natural healing can best be accomplished by Heilbäder (healing baths) at special Kurorte (health resorts).

Lying before me is such an advertisement in a top German newspaper, WELT AM SONNTAG, carrying the caption, "Europe-Renowned Healing Baths." Under one health resort on the Mosel River is categorized all the main illnesses that their particular healing baths are good for. Listed

are stomach disorders, intestine and bowel difficulties, liver ailments, gall and metabolism complaints. The several other resorts reveal how other common ailments are healed naturally by coming to their specific health resorts.

Germans' obsession with nature as cure-all is further exemplified in Das Grosse Buch des Wissens, a lexicon. Under the caption "A Choice of German Bathing Resorts and Healing Springs," are listed about fifty main cities where the following ailments are treated and corrected: arteriosclerosis, asthma, intestinal ailments, obesity, women's ailments, gall difficulties, gout, skin diseases, catarrh, liver complaints, stomach disorders, rickets, rheumatism, sugar diseases and several others.

Here are some of the more common cures:

- 1) Kneipp-Kur. This cure is named after the inventor, Kneipp. It is supposed to be good for people suffering from faulty blood circulation. The remedy in short is to walk in ankle-deep cold water.
- 2) Drinking Cures. At places where mineral-rich water belches out of the earth, little villages and towns make their fortune by establishing themselves as Spas or Baths, where people with numerous ailments come and drink only mineral water.
- 3) Beauty Cures. This is the latest thing. "Beauty Farms" have been founded, where a person is given a special diet, exercise and massage. While this beauty cure is very expensive, all other cures are very often financed partly if not wholly by the various health services.

In this same connection it is interesting to note that many cities and towns in Germany carry the appellation Heil-, healing. Jacob Grimm, in his Teutonic Mythology, bears this out when stating, "Many places in Germany are called Heilbrunn, Heilborn, Heiligenbrunn, from the renewing effect of their springs, or the wonderful cures that have taken place at them." (v. 2, p. 587.)

Looking upon nature as the cure for their ailments is but one of many indications that Germans admire nature more than others do.

Grimm, in his Teutonic Mythology, speaks of "a worship of nature of our ancestors." Yet this admiration and worship of nature the ancient Germans engaged in is still, to a very great extent at least, with them today. Notice how Grimm himself felt about nature when he wrote in the latter part of the 19th century,

Even today the majesty and might of these eldest born of things awakes our admiration; how could antiquity have forborne its astonishment and adoration? Such a worsnip is simpler, freer and more dignified than a senseless crouching before pictures and idols. All the elements are cleaning, healing, atoning. . . . (Ibid.)

The ancient Germans literally worshipped nature. They looked upon it as the life-giver, the provider; and it is from nature that they derived their morality. Recent German writers have taken pride in the fact that their forefathers did not worship lifeless images but

rather adored the mighty forces of nature.

"The Alamanns and Franks worshipped rivers and fountains!" Grimm states. (Ibid., p. 583.) The ancient Germans used to "pray on the river's bank, and at the fountain's brink they lighted candles and laid down sacrificial gifts." Lighting candles, usually at night, would "excite a religious awe." (Ibid., p. 584.) Among the Semnones, early German tribe, forests "were regarded as peculiarly sacred, and were dreaded." (P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, The Religion of the Teutons, p. 359.)

It was the belief of these ancients that the gods, and goddesses abode in rivers, wells and springs. The Franks, when crossing a river, offered sacrifice to it. The Goths buried their king Alaric in the bed of a river. There were of course all kinds of superstitions associated with wells running dry, rivers overflowing their banks, etc.--all these omens precipitating something foreboding. The elements in nature were regarded as beings that move and live. The tempest of the storm depicted a divine being wrathful.

Of course, this crude form of nature-worship is no longer obvious in German social life. Today it is no longer an outright worship of the elements of nature that occupies them; instead it is an inner yearning and love for things in nature that occupies them.

Often remnants of former nature worship are displayed in various parts of Germany throughout the year. Fire is one such element which the ancient Germans worshipped and which is still associated with festive occasions today. At Easter time, for instance, fires are set alight in numerous geographic areas, particularly in northern parts. It's usually done on the eve before Easter, when the towns or village people gather wood and place it around a large tree which is then set alight. The participants encircle the fire and watch this conflagration, little realizing that in past times humans were sacrificed in these surroundings. These fires, set ablaze at night, and in many localities, provide a truly spectacular sight.

Of this event Grimm states:

At all the cities, towns and villages of a country, towards evening on the first (or third) day of Easter, there is lighted every year on mountain and hill a great fire of straw, turf, and wood, amidst a course and jubilation, not only of the young, but of many grown-up people. . . . Men and maids, and all who come, dance . . . hats are waved, handkerchiefs thrown into the fire. The mountains all around are lighted up, and it is an elevating spectacle, scarcely paralleled by anything else, to survey the country for many miles round from one of the higher points, and in every direction at once to see a vast number of these bonfires, brighter or fainter, blazing up to heaven. (Ibid., p. 615.)

It is also of interest to note that the very name Easter is a corruption of the name of the German Spring goddess of fertility, Ostara. Human sacrifices were

Craig White

associated with her worship. With this festival, searching for eggs is still to this very day an enjoyable and much indulged pastime of Germans each Springtime. Easter eggs are of course coloured so that the colours painted on the eggs usually portray the brilliant rays of the sun and other elements of nature.

It is also of interest that the Christmas tree was introduced into the Western world by a German. Dr. Martin Luther was responsible for giving us this component of nature. It is recorded that back in 1546 Luther, while promenading in the countryside one evening, noticed on a snow-white landscape the beauty of the sparkling stars in the heavens. It was Christmas time. Observing a fir tree, he thought to copy the beauty of the heavens by decorating it with brilliant and shiny utensils and candles suggestive of the manifold variations of colours found in nature. Centuries later, during the American Revolution, a German tribe of Hessians introduced the Christmas tree into America. In England, the fir tree was not used at Christmas time until Prince Albert brought this custom back with him from Germany in 1840.

These things show that Germans are, to quote a German, "on good terms with nature." (Ralf Dahrendorf, Society and Democracy in Germany, p. 148.)

What is also noticeable in travelling through Ger-

many today is the floral decorations they go in for. Germans like flowers--Germany has more flower-shops than any other country. Flowers are not a luxury, therefore not expensive. They have good taste in making even the most ordinary bouquet--something which is admired by many foreign visitors. The shop-attendant doesn't look down on you if you buy only one magnificent rose or a few tulips; you will get the same friendly service and quick attention as if you had bought several dozen flowers.

Visitors find Germany a beautiful country, with quaint villages and attractive parks and gardens. Many a house is decorated with flowers hanging down in window boxes. Their houses are neat, everything seems well organised. Even in offices and official buildings they take great care of and pride in their green plants.

Of interest is also the German photographic industry. You would of course expect a people who greatly admire nature to fully develop this industry in order to retain the beautiful scenes in nature through snapshots.

Another facet showing their longing and love for things in nature is in the field of music. In past times, musicians very often would get their inspiration from nature by meditating and thinking about the scenic beauty around them. Pastoral symphonies are but one example of this. So it seems more than mere coincidence that many

of the famous old masters in music were racial Germans; it is logical that a people with a propensity to adore things in nature would be inspired by the same to express themselves in music.

Much of German music falls into two categories. It seems when they, in song, express their feeling towards human beings, it is usually of a sad nature. Now all nations have their romantic love songs or folklore, with a smattering of sadness. But none excel Germans in expressing tragic and sad emotions in this way about each other? In dealing with human beings, their expressions hardly reflect happiness. Their love songs are full of sadness, mistrust, resentment--tending not to believe in true love nor in faithfully trusting their partner.

The second and equally important category of German music is their expressions of joy in nature. Whereas with human beings, music is used to exhibit sadness, with nature it's the exact opposite--happiness and joy.

Germans love to sing about every facet of NATURE. Their feelings and emotions are all contained in their music, which is an excellent means of expression--be it opera or simply folk songs. With gaiety they sing about trees and birds, streams and valleys, flowers and mountains. They have their wanderlieder (wandering songs) and their "Heimat" songs, about their homeland. Their

songs about nature are happy ones--full of life and exaltation. And what German has not been on at least one hike during his life, where he can really see and be part of nature? Throughout Germany one finds many hiking clubs, where members hike for a week or more from one area to the next.

Richard Wagner is a fitting example of one musician who expressed his feelings for nature through his music. In the "Flying Dutchman" his music depicts a raging sea, where one can literally imagine the wind blowing in the sails. Wagner sought a national revival of the German spirit by exalting and personifying the mighty and devastating forces in nature, thus stirring the German masses to be like the elements of nature--forceful, violent, exciting, impressive.

Throughout the centuries Germans have focused a great deal of attention upon nature that it has, perhaps, subconsciously, dictated a great deal of their attitude towards law and morality. It is interesting in this context that much of the positive characteristics Germans exhibit is also found in nature. Here are a few.

Germans are organized, disciplined, law-abiding, obedient. In nature one finds also a great deal of organization, discipline and an automatic respect for and obedience to law. If nature were not based on organiza-

tion, discipline and law, and if there were no instinctive obedience to this established system of law, it would ill function.

Germans are industrious, thorough, efficient. And these propensities are also found in nature.

Germans admire beautiful gardens, exotic parks and magnificent woods. Their pride in the Black Forest, the Lüneburger Heath, the individual city parks is unsurpassed. And their songs about the rose, the heath and the forests seem innumerable.

Germans love adventure, excitement; they are bold and heroic, and throb with activity. Nature likewise is filled with excitement, adventure; it also pulsates with activity.

Germans are neat, clean, orderly. In nature, the only time we don't find these "qualities" is when man pollutes it.

All these traits are commendable and greatly appreciated by travellers visiting that country so richly embellished with the beauty of nature. In asking a visitor what he or she admires so much about those people will mostly bring out the characteristics mentioned above; characteristics found in nature.

But nature can also be forceful, violent, cruel, merciless. And this trait is, tragically, often part of

the German makeup. Germans are by nature, forceful, and often violent. Further, only those who shut their eyes to the evidence of history will deny that this often gifted race has not reverted many times to cruelty. And with this cruelty is associated a lack of mercy towards others.

There is one characteristic that Germans have not copied from nature; because it is not found there--human warmth, an attitude of benevolence, a spirit of goodwill toward others. Though this might sound harsh, history bears out this tragedy. Human dignity and love towards one another--although a problem with the entire human race--has always been a particular and noticeable lack with these people who excel so very greatly in so many fields.

This trait nature could not supply them with; this trait they greatly lack.

Although nature is very clean, organized, law-abiding, beautiful and impressive, it lacks one thing: human warmth and benevolence.

In looking upon nature one sees the strongest, the most forceful, the most aggressive and often the most cruel win. And in this struggle for the survival of the fittest, there is little room for sentiment.

One main and tragically negative character trait identified with the German people throughout history is

that of cruelty to other human beings.

Several years ago, Helmut Hammerschmidt, speaking over Radio Bavaria, stated:

We all know this, of course: the Germans are more efficient than the French, more civilised than the Russians and the nations of the East, bolder than the Swiss, the Dutch, the Danes and all the other small nations. We are harder than the rest; the only thing we are not is more humane. But this does not matter, we leave humanitarian sentimentality to the others. (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 178.)

Describing the general affinity the German populace show toward Nazis, Gudrun Temple, a German herself, states, "For a German to feel anti-Nazi on purely humanitarian grounds is impossible; the idea that one might feel sorry he finds fantastic." (Speaking Frankly About the Germans, p. 163.) Further showing that Germans in general lack human warmth she continues, "No one in Germany today wants to sympathize with anything. The Germans . . . turn their backs on everything that seeks their sympathy" (Ibid., p. 82).

But so it has always been.

We cannot deny the fact that the mentality of the Germans of today shows many astonishing points of similarity with those characteristics that impressed the Roman authors. . . . We see how their primitive touchiness is still accompanied by a total lack of understanding of the feeling of others and by a stubborn unwillingness to listen to their arguments. . . . (Ibid., p. 7.)

Let's briefly trace the history of German cruelty and aggressiveness during the last 2000 years. If we

start with the Cimbri and Teutons as they invaded Northern Italy in 113 B.C., we note that they categorically slaughtered all prisoners.

About the German tribes at the time of Christ, Kurt F. Reinhardt says,

They were children of nature, and there was something childlike in the mixture of violence and sentimentality, of harshness and tenderness that characterizes their lives. Their lust of adventure and love of warfare made them frequently oblivious of human considerations and inhibitions. They tortured criminals, occasionally killed their prisoners of war, and broke solemnly sworn treaties without scruples. (Germany: 2000 Years, p. 10.)

"The ancient Germans," states Wolfgang Manzel, "who only respected the rights of those with whom they were in immediate alliance . . . habitually treated every stranger, nay, even their own countrymen and nearest neighbours, as enemies, and made it their chief occupation to attack and oppress each other." (The History of Germany, p. 146.)

Of noteworthy interest in this context is what transpired in the Second World War. Many were the cases of children betraying their parents to the secret police. Yet this should not be surprising if one understands how Germans watch each other like hawks to see whether they keep in line with rules and regulations. If not, the police are informed. It has been said that the individual German--because of a lack of human warmth and a benevolent

attitude toward his fellow man--was the best and most reliable Gestapo agent during the Third Reich. It was comparatively easy for the police to control the average German; after all, he was closely watched and suspiciously scrutinized by his neighbour. One wrong step and the Gestapo was at his door. For the time being, the Gestapo are nonexistent. But this trait of German watching German, to his hurt, is still there.

I remember one person telling me that she had to be careful not to do any work, such as ironing, inside her own home on a Sunday; otherwise her neighbour would report her to the police and she would have to pay a fine by working on a day not permissible to do work on.

Another example illustrating the German's mistrust of his neighbour occurred a few years ago. A woman went to borrow some sugar from her neighbour friend. Upon entering her home, she noticed that the woman's daughter and her fiance were residing in the same house. Wrongly suspecting something immoral was going on, she immediately informed the police. After investigating, the police were satisfied that nothing immoral took place. But this was not sufficient evidence for the woman. She took the case to the court, where she lost the case.

Her purpose was to tear down and destroy her neighbour. She set out to go all the way, even though it

proved an embarrassment to her, to say the least.

Not long ago, while in Berlin, my wife and I stayed in a Pension-Hotel in the city. When I signed in the owner asked me where I stayed last night. Upon informing her I stayed next door in another Pension, she immediately asked, "Didn't you like it there?" I knew why she asked. Her neighbour, although they were on "friendly" terms, was her enemy. Had I said I didn't like it there, she would have had ammunition for character assassination.

In Berlin recently, an old and slow man was observed walking against the red traffic light. A policeman standing nearby hadn't noticed this infringement of traffic regulation. But several German bystanders did see it and immediately shouted to the policeman to deal with the offender.

There are many more examples of this sort; examples which would fill pages. But let's look at another aspect of this lack of wishing others well, this lack of the humane in the Germans as a whole. It is the lack they have for the dignity of each other's persons; the holding of each other in contempt.

Anyone who drives automobiles will sooner or later get into some difficulties with the traffic police. It may merely be a misunderstanding of the country's particular codes or a matter of stretching the law somewhat

to the motorist's favour. A few personal experiences should illustrate this.

Having stopped suddenly to allow a pedestrian to cross, I found my car on a pedestrian crossing. It was of course my mistake. Yet the policeman who noticed my mistake came charging at me, literally shouting, "What do you think you are doing?" Looking at my Bonn licence plates, he continued shouting contemptuously, "Is this the way they drive in Bonn?" Upon mentioning that I was not a Bonn resident, he snorted at me, "How did you ever get a licence?" The man in uniform had nothing but contempt for me.

On another occasion a Post Office official, upon showing him the broken contents of a box the post office had failed to deliver to me intact, retorted contemptuously when I enquired who will pay for the damage done to the contents. "That doesn't concern me!" Examples like these are not isolated cases, but typical of a people who lack human warmth and dignity. It is typical of a people who are aggressive and often cruel.

This characteristic the ancient German tribes had. When we come to the Middle Ages, nothing had changed, as we shall see now. Froissart, chronicler of the 14th century, says of Germans, "They have no pity if they have the upper hand, and they are hard and cruel with their

prisoners." (Robert Vansittart, Black Record, p. 22.)

Although we will come to modern times shortly, it will be of interest that many German POW's of the British and Americans were delightfully surprised how humanely they were treated in POW camps. They expected to be treated about the same way they would automatically treat their prisoners. One senses a totally different mentality in this regard.

Fredrich Hölderlin, German poet born in Württemberg in 1770 states in his Hyperion,

It is a harsh thing to say, and yet I say it, because it is true: I know of no people more torn apart than the Germans. You will see craftsmen, but no human beings; philosophers, but no human beings; priests, but no human beings; masters and servants, young people and settled folk, but no human beings. Is it not like a battlefield where hands and arms and broken limbs lie scattered, while the spilled lifeblood drains into the sand? (Gudrun Tempel, Speaking Frankly About the Germans, p. 75.)

It becomes clear that the lack of human warmth the German character displayed in such a gruesome manner in World War II was not unique to that particular period. It is something that has permeated German society from its very beginning. "The Germany of Hitler was a logical development of Germany's past as a whole. The Germany of Hitler's day was true to her past." (Ernest Hambloch, Germany Rampant, pp. 8-9.)

German philosophers are not guiltless in perpet-

uating the idea that the forceful, the violent, and if necessary the cruel elements are means to be employed if it results in Germany's welfare. States Kant: "No aim is absurd, much less wrong, if there are means of obtaining it!" (Ibid., p. 32.) In other words, the end justifies the means.

For in world history success utters the decisive word. Even those formerly incapable of being taught this, will now realize that success in war is not an accident, but rather the outcome of eternal law, in which God's rule reveals itself. (Otto von Gierke, The German Folk Spirit in the War.)

And how does God's will reveal itself? Many people believe that the Divine will is written within the pages of the Bible. Yet German philosophers have categorically rejected that Source outright as revealing God's will. They regarded it a Jewish book. Evidently they could never forgive God for using the Jews and Israelites as His people instead of the Germans. Hence they rejected that Book, convincing themselves that the Bible is not of Divine origin.

Not wanting to have anything to do with the Source that revealed the Divine will, they went to another source which they thought revealed God's will: Nature.

After all, they reasoned, did not God create nature? Is not God's character revealed in nature? There you find organization, law, beauty, majesty, cleanliness, etc. And, most important of all, there is little room for

benevolence, love, humane sentiments in nature. Instead, one found a constant struggle for survival, where the strongest, the most fierce and often the most cruel win.

Even a cursory reading of the Bible will show that the Author indeed did create nature and what is in it, establishing certain laws governing the behaviour of the animal kingdom. But to man He gave certain laws--humane and positive laws--by which he was to live. Unfortunately, man rejected these laws--if not entirely then in part. Anyone with an open mind, upon reading the contents of both the Old and New Testaments, must surely come to the obvious conclusion that the Author is portrayed as a loving, humane and beneficent Being who wishes mankind to abide by His ten spiritual laws.

It will also be obvious to anyone paging through that Source that the ancient people of Israel were chosen as the perpetrators and carriers of that Divine Law which would, if obeyed, bring mankind lasting joy and success. Although they themselves were not always faithful to their calling, nevertheless the Jews have always been staunch defenders of the Law--the Torah.

Having come into contact with that Law during the course of the centuries has made the Jewish people the most humane, liberal and humanitarian minded people in the world.

And this was something that German philosophers, historians and others detested. German philosopher E.M. Arndt spoke in 1848 of the "poisonous Jewish humanism which has always been an abomination to me . . ." (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 175).

Of course, anti-Semitism is a problem wherever one finds Jews. But no nation has ever gone as far as the German people in systematically annihilating millions of Jews.

But the figure of the Jew as a creature devoid of human rights, as no longer human, is a German invention. And it is this notion that provides a motive and a horrible excuse for those many thousands of Germans who directly or indirectly took part in the great mass murder after 1940. (Rudolf Dahrendorf, Society and Democracy in Germany, p. 80.)

For instance:

Gottlieb August Schüller said in 1880 that the Germans treated the Jews "in a most characterless, most ignoble and most unworthy manner" and "ill-used the poor Jews for centuries by stupid arrogance, never-heard-of contempt, bitter mockery, the greatest possible cruelty, and cold hatred." (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 91.)

It was the humane element in the Jew that offended the German philosophers and historians. So it was that in 1921 the Pan-German Otto Bonhard published his book, From the Ghetto to Power, where "he quoted his anti-Semitic forerunners, Luther, Dühring, Lagarde, Wagner, Stöcker, and Treitschke, who had always spoken of 'the alien drop'

which has found its way 'into our blood' and must be secreted again if it is not to poison us . . ." (Ibid., p. 92).

And that "alien drop" is the humanitarian element that does, from time to time, creep into the German soul. And unless the German populace is warned of such an "alien" part of culture, they would soon become more humane. So they were warned, "Away with all half-hearted measures, away with our fear of unavoidable cruelty!" Bonhard continues.

Adolf Bartels wrote in his Our Right to Anti-semitism, "Cast off those who stultify our nation, and get out of the way those who disgrace our culture!" (Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 92.)

And that culture, in the main, was based on the lessons nature taught; and that meant to be hard instead of humane.

In order to establish this culture, Germans "must trample down many on their way. World-history moves on a higher level than where morality resides," states Hegel. (Ibid., p. 179.) Democracy with its humane type rule was, according to Wagner, "something un-German." (Ibid., p. 108.)

Someone who looked upon the Germans with more objectivity was philosopher Leopold Ziegler. According to

him "the Germans were a nation of seekers and wanderers, something unfinished, raw, half grown among so many finished, disciplined, grown-up peoples. . . . We have always remained half-finished barbarians!" (ibid., p. 114.)

Goethe, Germany's Shakespeare, was one of a very few Germans who detested the lack of humane elements in the average German. Says he, "The German's nation is ruled by a spirit of sensuous exultation which is alien to me." (Goethe's Gespräche ohen die Gespräche mit Eckermann, abridged ed., Leipzig, p. 655.)

Towards the end of the last century Nietzsche wrote a book which he entitled The Antichrist, calling Christianity "the one immoral blemish of mankind." (Thomas Mann, Neue Studien, p. 118.) Nietzsche hated the humanitarian and democratic type of society established in Britain and the United States among other countries. He held any laws originating from a Divine Being in utter contempt. This philosopher wanted no one to dictate to him how to live.

Nietzsche, Hegel, Kant and other German philosophers showed their hatred and contempt for the moral or humane aspect of Christianity. They did not mind a "Luther" brand of Christianity, where a person can be justified in his deeds by merely believing in the

goodness of what he is doing. States Hermann Hesse, himself a Lutheran in 1948, "The minimizing of 'good deeds,' the idea of salvation by faith (Luther's fide sola), was already with Luther a terrible and even impudent foolhardiness which helped unspeakable bad things into being." (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 115.)

Luther is of course a personage respected by almost all Germans. Yet this reformer could not with justice be described as humanitarian in his outlook. According to him, it need not matter how wicked a person is, as long as he believes in Christ. There was never a question in Luther's teachings that a Christian had to obey the Founder of Christianity and show the same love and human warmth He showed. "As many as believe in Christ, be they as numerous and wicked as may be, will be neither responsible for their works or condemned on account of them," Luther stated. (Alzog, Universal History, p. 199.)

"No man has ever been so representative of the German spirit, and no man has had such a deep and lasting effect on German history," A.J.P. Taylor says of Luther. He continues:

Germany is the Germany of Luther to this day. He was a man of great intellectual and supreme literary ability, with a readiness to maintain his convictions to the death. But he turned with repugnance from all the values of western civilization. . . . He hated art, culture, intellect, and sought an escape into an imagined Germany of the past, romantic, irrational, non-European. In Luther was implicit the emotionalism

of the Romantic movement, the German nationalist sense of being different, above all the elevation of feeling over thinking, which is characteristic of modern Germany. (The Course of German History, p. 8.)

Luther also had little love for Jews, as the Austrian historian Friedrich Heer shows,

Succumbing to the old hatred of the mob and whipping it up even more violently, he told them to burn the synagogues and murder the Jews. In 1534, he composed a detailed program for the liquidation of the Jews. (Jonas Lesser, Germany: The Symbol and The Deed, p. 106.)

So we see that the reason why the Jews have been despised and hated lay in the fact that they were carriers of Divine Law in the form of the Ten (humane) Commandments. This is also the reason Hitler hated the Jews, which we will deal with shortly. "Hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity," stated Sigmund Freud in Moses and Monotheism (Sidney Greenberg, A Modern Treasury of Jewish Thoughts, p. 361.) And any Biblical scholar must know that the New Testament is nothing but an augmentation of the Old Testament. Both teach a strict but benign observance of law.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, anti-Semite of the last century, gave his reason for hating the Jews. "The Jew came into our gay world and spoiled everything with his ominous concept of sin, with his Law and his Cross." (as quoted by Will Herberg, Judaism and Modern Man; Ibid., p. 369.)

Note the real reason for the hatred of Jews.

It is of Christ that the anti-Semites are afraid. . . . Therefore they make their assault on those who are responsible for the birth and spread of Christianity. They spit on the Jews as Christ-killers because they long to spit on them as Christ-givers. (Maurice Samuels, Ibid.)

That Christ was a humane person, with an unselfish concern for others no one can deny. Yet what many don't realize is that those humane doctrines He taught were based on the keeping of Divine Law.

But the German philosophers rejected such a Divine demand; and they didn't wish to be reminded of it. So, they tried to get rid of the carriers of this demand, and almost succeeded.

We must now come to Hitler. He in particular showed his contempt for Jews. And, as we shall see now, the reason for his hatred of these people lay in the fact that they were responsible, according to him, for establishing and teaching Divine Law.

Hermann Rauschning knew the Führer personally in his earlier life. He had many talks with him and records for us the mind and temperament of this man. About anti-Semitism Rauschning says,

No believing Christian and no humane-minded person can be an anti-semite. . . . Rosenberg and Ludendorff [German propagandists during the Third Reich] are right, if in nothing else, in their claim that the New Testament is inseparably connected with the Old, and we Christians with our Jewish heritage. (Revolution of Destruction, p. 99.)

"Historically speaking," stated Hitler, "the Christian religion is nothing but a Jewish sect. It has always been and it will remain just that, as long as it exists. (The Ten Commandments, ed. by Hermann Rauschning, p. ix.)

Hitler vehemently wanted to rid the world of the humane aspect of both Judaism and Christianity. Hitler:

After the destruction of Judaism, the extinction of Christian slave morals must follow logically. I shall know the moment when to confront, for the sake of the German people and the world, their Asiatic slave morals with our picture of the free man, the godlike man. (Ibid.)

The "Asiatic slave morals" he refers to are the Ten Commandments. Do away with them and you have the free man; a man without scruples and sentiment, a man of nature.

The "godlike" man according to him is one who totally copies and imitates nature. "Struggle is the father of all things. Moral excellence derives from the race!" Hitler said. It's a matter of the physical and not the mental or spiritual that counts. This is the lesson of nature. (Hannah Vogt, The Burden of Guilt, p. 110.)

Said he,

Whether the German people retained its Jewish faith in Christ, with His soft morality of pity, or whether it believed strongly and heroically in god in nature, god in the nation, god in destiny, god in the blood was a question which would decide its very destiny. (Ibid., p. 168.)

Despising all morality based on the Ten Commandments Hitler gave the Germans this advice: "We must free ourselves of all sentimentality and become hard. . . . What impresses is cruelty and brute force. . . . Nature is cruel; therefore we may be cruel too. (Ibid., pp. 146-147.)

The very fact that this man could even approach the German populace with the doctrine justifying cruelty and not be the laughing stock of the nation--that alone suggests that the people he led were not in total disagreement with what he taught.

About education he said,

My pedagogy is hard. The weak must be chiseled away. In my "order castles" young people will grow up who will frighten the world. I want a violent, arrogant, unafraid, cruel youth, who must be able to suffer pain. Nothing weak or tender must be left in them. Their eyes must bespeak once again the free, magnificent beast of prey. (Ibid., p. 163.)

By so doing he would, and these are his own words, "erase a thousand years of human domestication"--based on the principles of Christianity. (Ibid.) To this man whom millions of Germans adored and were willing to die for, the human conscience was a Jewish invention.

We are fighting against the most ancient curse that humanity has brought upon itself. (Hitler said.) We are fighting against the perversion of our soundest instincts. . . . It's got to get out of our blood, that curse from Mount Sinai. That poison with which both Jews and Christians have spoiled and soiled the free, wonderful instincts of man. . . .

This is what we are fighting against . . . the great law of divine nature. Against the so-called Ten Commandments, against them we are fighting. (The Ten Commandments, ed. by Rauschnig, pp. ix, x.)

And this man millions of Germans adored far beyond the normal respect due to a national leader. To this their Führer they gave their hearts, their souls, their everything.

One must not forget that Hitler came close in succeeding in enforcing this sort of doctrine on the German people and the rest of the world. If Hitler had been an Englishman, or an American, or a Frenchman--how far would he have gotten with those particular people? It sounds ludicrous to even bring up the point. Only a people who by nature are forceful and possess streaks of cruelty would have allowed a man like Hitler to say what he said.

Hermann Rauschnig mentions in this connection one of the main reasons for the German hatred towards Britain during the Third Reich.

The German dislike of England is derived directly from the ideas of anti-semitism. The Englishman in his Puritanism, saturated with the spirit of the Old Testament, has become the chief representative of the capitalism which, in the eyes of National Socialists, is the principal Jewish achievement; thus the British Empire is a Jewish empire, an empire in which the typically Jewish way of thinking, guidance by economic considerations, the spirit of profit-making, dominates. (The Revolution of Destruction, p. 205.)

Rauschnig continues to show the German thinking.

The English through their Puritans have become the nation that appropriated the promise to Israel,

and they are Judaized through and through. England is to blame for the dominance of the Jewish spirit in Europe. England has made this identification of economic success with the blessing of God, the ethical framework of her public morality and civic virtues. England is Judah. . . . (Ibid.)

"The German nation is simply out to discover at last its own style of living, a style of living that is fundamentally distinguished from what is called British liberalism . . ." (German propagandist Rosenberg in his Gestaltung der Idee, Hermann Rauschnig, The 'Revolution of Destruction, p. 51.)

In looking into history objectively one can come to only one conclusion that explains the dislike, contempt and hatred Germans as a whole have had for Western civilization as exemplified in American, British, French and Scandinavian society: Judaic and Christian elements permeate it.

The total impact of Hebrew literature on Western civilization is impossible to calculate. There hardly exists a writer in the English language . . . whose work has not been affected by the images, phraseology and verbal rhythms of the Old Testament. (Gerrit P. Judd, A History of Civilization, p. 31.)

Whereas Western nations like the United States, Britain, Scandinavia and others have accepted some of the more humane aspects of Christianity, the Germans as a whole have lagged behind. Through their philosophers, historians, teachers and military men they have been responsible for teaching their people the value of looking to

nature for guidance, where there is no room for sentiment, benevolence, goodwill and human warmth.

It is true all nations fall short when it comes to showing genuine love and concern for the welfare of others. But at least there has been an important degree of the humane and benevolent teachings of Christianity in countries like Britain, the U.S.A. etc. All the foreign aid distributed to other nations (although not always the wisest policy), all the missionaries sent out during the course of the last two centuries, the lack of offensive military exploits to the detriment of others, etc.--all this shows that these societies have been, because of the permeation of Christian morality, more humane than is the case with Germany.

The German people, with philosophers, teachers, historians, reformers etc. inculcating into their minds the need to reject the more humane and benevolent aspect of society--to reject the morality which Judaism and Christianity teach--and to look instead to nature as their guide, has had a devastating and tragic effect on the German character. It has given them an excuse for being aggressive, yes even cruel.

There is no need to go into all the horrible things that happened during the Third Reich to show how the German nation has lapsed into barbarism and exhibited the

cruel traits of nature. No writer could portray the abysmal depths of human degradation reached by a people so very greatly gifted in so many fields. What happened there is now past.

But can it happen again? The next, and final chapter will give the answer.

CHAPTER VII

GERMANS AND THEIR "DIVINE MISSION"

The question: Can what transpired in the Third Reich again become reality in the future? can best be answered by a particular belief Germans possess. It is that they are the chosen vessels to carry out a Divine Mission, to establish Kultur, German Culture in the entire world. This belief, although hazy in many people's minds, does still have its attraction.

This doctrine was particularly prevalent during the time of Charlemagne. This German Frankish king was actually looked upon as a Divine King. The Catholic missionary Augustine "inspired him with the idea of theocracy and of his mission to act as God's representative and as a priest-king on the model of the Old Testament." (Frederick Hertz, The Development of the German Public Mind, p. 38).

And the conversion policy of Charlemagne when he forced the Saxons to accept Christianity carried with it little humane elements. Instead, the Saxons had a choice, to either accept this new religion or be put to the sword. And with this sort of cruel, hard policy one can well imagine the amount of bloodshed that was spilled by this "Divine King."

This belief in being God's instruments led Otto I almost 200 years later to Christianize the whole east of Europe. And by what method? Christ's humane method of love as exemplified in the New Testament? Or was it based on hatred, cruelty and if need be, killing? About this campaign, Frederick Hertz states, "The Saxon warriors were used to treating the heathen Slaves in a very ruthless way. In their ideology, heathens were hardly human and had no rights." (Ibid., p. 62.)

Two centuries later again, we have recorded for us in the Great North German law book (Speculum Saxonicum, cir. A.D. 1240), "The Empire is held from God alone . . . Emperor and Pope are supreme each in what has been entrusted to him: the Pope in what concerns the soul; the emperor in all that belongs to the body and the knight-hood." (James Bryce, The Holy Roman Empire, p. 107.)

At this same time, the German Eike in his Saxon Mirror, stated that "God has successfully created four empires, and the present one is the continuation of the old Roman Empire. Caesar had conquered Germany and the [German] Franks had then inherited the Empire from the Romans." (Frederick Hertz, The Development of the German Public Mind, p. 138.)

It is interesting to note in this context that the Roman Empire and later the empire of the Franks, etc. was based on the governing principles of might, coercion,

violence, and if need be, cruelty. Evidently the God who supposedly inspired such a mission possessed characteristics of the same nature. This is important to realize. When German philosophers, teachers and historians speak of "God's will" or "Divine Mission" they mean to portray a Being who is, like nature, efficient, organized, forceful, yet hard, cruel, merciless.

Representing God's instruments to carry German Kultur to the rest of the world was also prevalent during the Habsburg reigns over the last few centuries up to World War I.

In an important sense, the Habsburg system was more rational than anything seen in Europe before or since. In the eyes of its rulers, it was a supra-national organization, ordained by God, and ruled over by God's nominee. (A.J.P. Tylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, p. 4.)

Dr. Martin Luther enlightens us further on this aspect. "The prince holds the sword, therefore he is of God; and it is the first duty of the ordinary man to bow to God and the prince." (Ernest Hambloch, Germany Rampant, p. 32.)

"The Diocese paper of Freiburg [1940] hailed the great successes of the courageous German soldiers as proof that God guided history." (Günter Lewy, The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany, p. 228.) That the strongest win over the weaker elements in nature no one doubts. Likewise, Germans felt that the law of nature should also

guide the human relationship. The idea that God sides with the stronger forces is further illustrated by the next quotation.

Bishop Kaller of Ermland, in a pastoral letter [1941], stated: "With admiration we look upon our army, which in courageous fighting under extraordinary leadership has achieved and continues to achieve unparalleled success. We thank God for his support. Especially as Christians, we are determined to rally all our strength so that the final victory will be secured for our fatherland. Especially as Christians, we are determined to rally all our strength so that the final victory will be secured for our fatherland, especially as believing Christians, inspired by God's love, we faithfully stand behind our Führer who with firm hands guides the fortunes of our people." (Ibid., p. 230.)

That is not much different from the philosophy of Bismarck: Might makes right! States Prussia's Iron Chancellor: "I am God's soldier, and where He sends me, there I must go, and I believe he is sending me, to carve my life to his needs" (Brief an seine Braut und Gattin," as quoted from Gordan A. Craig, Deutsche Staatskunst von Bismarck bis Andenauer, p. 269).

The words, Divine Mission, have always had such an awe-inspiring effect on the German people. Even Hitler, obviously not sincere, felt compelled to tell his followers, "And so I believe today that my conduct is in accordance with the will of defending the handiwork of the Lord." (Mein Kampf, chapter 2, p. 66, Murphy translation)

In the annals of German history the doctrine that

das deutsche Volk has been chosen by God to establish a superior Kultur in all the world, has been taught, practiced and believed often. Such a belief in her destiny led Germany to great heights of illusionary glories.

The world was to be renewed, healed, and strengthened by the example and through the organizational efforts of the German people. . . . Every thinker and author of note, and many who were not, flooded the home front with evidence of the decadence of the Western world and its civilizations, the evil of its ideology and its institutions. In contradiction, the unique qualities of the German being and the glories of its form of state and of its culture were endlessly celebrated. (Kurt P. Tauber, Beyond Eagle and Swastika, v. I, p. 11.)

"A new peace shall make Germany 'mistress of the globe,' a peace . . . established by the victorious sword of a master race that takes over the world in the service of a higher civilization,"--German propagandist Rosenberg during the Third Reich. (Herman Rauschnig, Revolution of Destruction, p. 194.)

Words like these have always been appealing to Germans. As a people they have not always looked upon political issues or doctrines realistically.

To Germans, nothing is easier than the creation of a national legend, and nothing is more fraught with dangerous fallacies, but a fine sense of balance in the French, and an acute sense of humour in the English have saved both from being slaves of their own foibles. They have thus been able to keep their national legends where they belong: in the realm of dreams. But the Germans . . . have turned their dreams into nightmares and their delightful fairy tales into sinister incantations. (Ernst Hambloch, Germany Rampant, p. 15.)

Very often it has been what the German feels to be true, not what he has analysed as being truth that guides his actions.

This Divine Mission, the carriers of which the Germans believed themselves to be, must be carried out ruthlessly, mercilessly; there is no room for sentiment, love. It is based entirely on power, as the lessons of nature teach.

Even today there is still an important longing for these past glories. This yearning for the romanticised past is exemplified by the following quote.

The memory of Barbarossa's power fascinated the Germans for many centuries after he died leading a crusade in the Near East. A legend originally involving his grandson Frederick II was soon transferred to Barbarossa: it portrayed him asleep deep down inside a mountain. But even asleep the hidden emperor remained the guardian of his nation's destiny. If Germany were ever in need of a saviour he would then rise and lead Germany from defeat and despair to the glory of a new golden age. . . . Deep down in their hearts the Germans felt that their true ruler, Germany's heimliche Kaiser, was ever ready to come to her rescue. Under the spell of such legends Germans were sometimes in danger of losing sight of political realities and of abandoning themselves to wishful dreams. (Hans Kohn, The Mind of Germany p. 34.)

There is something deep in the German soul that believes God is on Germany's side. After all, only they have been given the Divine commission to convert the world to the true culture--deutsche Kultur. This aspect is brought out by Melita Maschmann, a former youth leader

of girl scouts in Germany during the Third Reich.

The question of whether God might possibly be on the side of those who were opposed to National Socialism did not occur to me once. . . . We were so filled with the joy of being allowed to contribute our efforts and so proud of the responsibility which we were allowed to bear . . . that the idea that God could perhaps be against us would have seemed absurd. (Account Rendered, A Dossier on my Former Self, p. 50.)

The author continues to add:

The notion that our so-called "lebensraum" could be secured at the expense of the neighbouring nations caused me no moral discomfort. . . . A group which believes itself to be called and chosen to lead, as we did, has no inhibitions when it comes to taking territory from "inferior elements." (Ibid., p. 70.)

So even during Hitler's dark days, millions of Germans believed him to be a godsend--a leader chosen by God to bring Germany out of chaos and into a bright and glorious future. One German woman is reported to have said of Hitler, "Isn't it good that God has sent us another saviour just like Christ."

Obviously, Germans have little need of a saviour if all goes well economically, socially and politically. But the acid test is yet future. Since the end of the war, Germans have gone through no particular crisis, have not been suffering economically and certainly have not yet experienced political or social chaos. Time will of course give us the sure answer.

For Germans merely to believe in a vague Divine

Mission is not sufficient. Their efforts, sacrifices, forcefulness, organization, etc. must be harvested in the right channel. They need to be taught how such a Divine Mission can be accomplished. There is only one way, to submit to the State. This the German philosophers have also inculcated into the mind of the average German. It wasn't very difficult. After all, if God is to use the German people as His instruments to carry out His mission then it seems logical that He would use the State for such purpose. Now in order for a state to be powerful enough, all the energies and talents of a people must belong to the State. Not only is the emperor or leader God-ordained, but also the State. So anyone not going along with the policies of the State was going against the will of God, these philosophers fervently taught and their listeners and readers readily believed.

This doctrine that the State incorporates and embodies all the attributes of and the entire will of God has not been omitted on the Curriculum of German education. States Ernst Hambloch, "It has been instilled into them for generations that submission to the Powers that Be is the highest duty of the individual." (Germany Rampant, p. 58.)

The State, in other words, is the keeper of the people's conscience. This means of necessity that the

people take no direct part--as is the case in democracy--in governing. It's left entirely to the State.

Even though Germany is presently based on a democratic government, it is wrong to look upon it as a real democracy. The average German takes little interest in such form of governing. Of course he does vote at specified times; this because he is told to do so. However, his heart is not really in it. What Germany has today is more of a bureaucratic democracy. And of course, as long as the average German finds sufficient food on the table, has a reasonably secure job, is able to save some money for his annual vacation; as long as things are going well, he is in no hurry to throw off this form of democracy.

But comes a time of crisis--and in German history there have been many--will democracy withstand the acid test? Will the people who have embraced what many German observers call the American import again reject it and embrace something more familiar, more exciting, more corresponding to their character--a new strong man, a powerful Führer? Time of course will tell!

The philosopher who more than anyone else stressed the importance of the State as the guardian of the people's conscience was Hegel. According to him, "The state says: I do not care what you think, but you must

obey." (Ralf Dahrendorf, Society and Democracy in Germany, p. 202.) Further, "The state has rights against the individual; its members have obligations, among them that of obeying without protest." (Ibid.)

"Obeying without protest!" That would be fine if it were an ideal and just State. But with human government, that is hardly likely. And with German leaders and dictators, it has often been tragic.

But perhaps we should leave the past behind us and concentrate on the future. Perhaps there is now--since the end of the Second World War, a genuine change in the mentality of the average German towards obedience and submission to the State, their belief in a "Divine Mission," and their lack of interest in democracy. Let us see whether they have lost their aggressive inclination. Let us see, in short, whether their character has really changed since 1945.

We have read the contemporary evidence from history which showed us that at least up to 1945 the German character had not changed essentially. But what about post World War II? Perhaps it has changed since that time?

If it has, good and well. If not, we must remember that characteristics are an infallible guide to future actions. In other words, if their character has seen no essential change, then the dark chapters in German history

yes, even the darkest chapter in all of history--the Third Reich--will be repeated again, sooner or later.

Karl Jaspers, Germany's foremost philosopher, brings out in his book, The Question of German Guilt, that the Germans haven't really changed since the end of World War II.

Of course they haven't.

Germans still believe in authoritarianism-- government from the top down rather than government by the people. According to a recent poll (Divo-Poll as quoted in Der Spiegel series on "Nationalism in Germany," No. 21, 1967) fifty-four per cent of those asked preferred to have a strong man at the helm of government. Of those asked, forty-four per cent were also for more "discipline and order" in today's youth.

About another trait Germans have always exhibited Der Spiegel states, "Unquestionable obedience and heroism on the battlefield is admired more than a believing Christian admires the martyrs of his church." (No. 19, 1967, p. 106.)

There is certainly nothing wrong with these character traits. The tragic thing is that all too often strong leaders exploit these positive points to their own selfish benefits.

The good traits Germans have had in the past are

still with them: loyalty towards their leaders, employers; respect for law-enforcing agencies; obedience to law itself; ability for organisation; capacity for industry; hospitality, orderliness, etc.

No one will claim that Germans have lost these positive traits.

And the negative ones? Has there been a marked change in their tolerance towards the lives, beliefs and attitudes of others? Are they still forceful and aggressive? Do they still exhibit a spirit of pride, a feeling of superiority? Do they no longer lack human warmth and a desire to see others prosper?

Has nationalism been crushed out of millions of Germans once and for all? Kurt P. Tauber, in his two volume work, Beyond Eagle and Swastika, sums up by stating, "We have traced the political failure of the extreme Right as an independent, organized contributor to political decision-making in postwar Germany, but we have also recorded the vitality and spread of nationalist thought, ideals, and ideology. We have analysed the myriad difficulties and disappointments of postwar nationalism, but we strongly doubt that we have written its epitaph." (v. 1, p. 986.)

If we answer the above questions in the affirmative, we must also show evidence for reaching such a

conclusion. My constant travels to Germany and my personal association with these people have revealed little if any evidence that Germans have really changed, even though a temporary facade hides some of the evidence.

Will Germans again rise to illusionary heights of grandeur? Not as long as one thing is lacking: a strong, authoritarian leader. Once he appears, the characteristics Germans have always possessed will again be obvious to all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balfour, Michael. The Kaiser and His Times. London: The Cresset Press, 1964.
- Beable, William Henry. Celebrated and Historical Speeches, article "Germany's Aim." London: Heath Cranton Limited, 1933.
- Dettensen. Documents of the Christian Church. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Bryce, James. The Holy Roman Empire. London: MacMillan, 1910.
- Caesar, Julius. The Conquest of Gaul. Penguin Edition, 1967.
- Connell, Brian. Watcher on the Rhine. New York: William Morrow, 1957.
- Craig, Gordon A. Deutsche Staatskunst von Bismarck bis Adenauer. Duesseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1961.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. Society and Democracy in Germany. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, c. 1967.
- Davies, J.S. From Charlemagne to Hitler. London: Cassell, 1948.
- Eisler, Gerhart. The Lesson of Germany. New York: Albert Norden and Albert Schreiner, International, c. 1945.
- Gebhardt, Bruno. Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte. Vol. I. Stuttgart: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1954.
- Genoud. The Testimony of Adolf Hitler. Translated from the German by R.H. Stevens. London: Cassell, 1961.
- Gerard, James W. Face to Face with Kaiserism. London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1918.

- Goerlitz, Walter. History of the German General Staff.
New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1961.
- Gould-Baring, Sabine. The Story of the Nations, Germany.
5th edition, circa 1886. London: T. Fisher Unwin,
1893.
- Greenberg, Sidney. A Modern Treasury of Jewish Thoughts.
London, New York: Thomas Yoseloff Ltd., 1964.
- Grimm, Jacob. Teutonic Mythology. 4th edition with notes
and appendix by James S. Stalybrass. New York:
Dover, 1966.
- Haldane, Lord. Conditions in Germany. London: British
Museum, 1917.
- Hambloch, Ernest. Germany Rampant, A Study in Economic
Militarism. London: Duckworth, 1939.
- Hass M. Die politischen Testamente der Hohenzollern.
London i. 56. Leipzig: 1919.
- Hertz, Frederick. The Development of the German Mind.
London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1957.
- Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf. Murphy Translation. London:
1939.
- Igra, Samuel. German's National Vile. London Quality
Press, 1945.
- Judd, Gerrit P. A History of Civilization. London:
MacMillan, c. 1966.
- Kohn, Hans. The Mind of Germany. Revised edition, 1962.
London: MacMillan, c. 1960.
- Lesser, Jonas. Germany--The Symbol and The Deed. London:
Thomas Yoseloff, c. 1965.
- Lewy, Guenter. The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany.
Weidenfeld and Nicolson, c. 1964.
- Ludwig, Emil. The Germans. London: Hamish Hamilton,
1942.

- Mallet, M. Northern Antiquities. London: H. G. Bohn, 1847.
- Maschmann, Melita. Account Rendered: A Dossier on my Former Self. Translated by Geoffrey Strachan. London: Abelard-Schuman, c. 1964.
- Mattingly, H. Tacitus on Britain and Germany. Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press) Ltd., 1948. (Penguin Edition 1967.)
- Mayer, Milton. They Thought They Were Free. The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- McGovern, William. From Luther to Hitler. The History of Fascist-Nazi Philosophy. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., (no date).
- Menzel, Wolfgang. The History of Germany. 4th German edition, translated by Mrs. George Horrocks. London: Bohn, 1852.
- Musmano, Michael E. Ten Days to Die. London: P. Davies, 1951.
- Naval Intelligence Division. Germany History and Administration, 1944.
- Ozanam, A.P. Les Germains avant le Christianisme. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1894.
- Paikert, G.C. The Danube Swabians. "German Populations in Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia and Hitler's impact on their Patterns." The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.
- Peertner, Rudolf. Das Roemerreich der Deutschen. Daesseldorf, Wien: Leon Verlag, 1967.
- Rauschnig, Hermann, The Ten Commandments. Written by various authors but prefaced by Rauschnig. London: 1945.
- _____. The Revolution of Destruction. London: William Heinemann, 1938.
- _____. Hitler Speaks. London: Thornton Butterworth, 1939.

- Reinhardt, Kurt F. Germany: 2000 Years. Revised edition. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1965.
- Ridpath, John. With The World's People. Vol. 6. London Jonathan Cape, 1930.
- Rosinsky, Herbert. The German Army. London: Hogarth Press, 1939.
- Saussaye, P.D. Chantepie de la. The Religion of the Teutons. London: Ginn, 1902.
- Strauss, Franz-Josef. Herausforderung und Antwort. Stuttgart-Degerloch: Seewald Verlag, 1968.
- Tacitus. Germania. Loeb ed. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Talmon, J.I. Political Messianism. London: Sacker and Warburg, 1960.
- Tauber, Kurt P. Beyond Eagle and Swastika. Vol. 1. Middleton, Conn. U.S.A: Wesleyan University Press, 1967.
- Taylor, A.J.P. The Habsburg Monarchy. Hammondsworth, Penguin, c. 1948.
- _____. The Course of German History. London: Methuen Ltd., 1966.
- _____. Bismark, the Man and the Statesman. London: The New English Library, 1965.
- Tempel, Gudrun. Speaking Frankly About the Germans. (Parts originally translated by Sophie Wilkins.) London: Secker and Warburg, c. 1963.
- Vansittart, Robert. Black Record. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1941.
- Verrina. The German Mentality. London: Allen and Unwin, c. 1946.
- Vogt, Hannah. The Burden of Guilt. (Translated by Herbert Strauss) London: Oxford University Press.

von Bernhardt, General Friedrich. Germany and the Next War. 9th edition. London: 1914.

von Treitschke, Heinrich. German History in the Nineteenth Century. English translation. New York: 1915-19.

Wedgwood C.V. The Thirty Years War. London: Jonathan Cape, 1966.

Williams. The Historian's History of the World. Vol. 6, Henry Smath edition. London: The Times, 1908.

Craig White