

## EIR Reviews

# New book shows parallels between Greens and Nazis

by Mark Burdman

---

### **Ecology in the 20th Century/A History**

by Anna Bramwell

Yale University Press, New Haven and London,  
1989 292 pages (with index), paperbound, \$16.95.

---

As an antidote to the usual flow of Establishment media portrayals of “ecologists” and “greens” as the saints of our New Age, Anna Bramwell’s *Ecology in the 20th Century* is necessary reading. It is extremely rare these days to read a book that makes, and documents, assertions like: “Indeed, neo-Nazi movements in general seem to be inspired by a strong ecological input,” or “Ecologists believe in the essential harmony of nature. But it is a harmony to which man may have to be sacrificed.”

Bramwell takes up the thesis that the Nazis were the first “radical environmentalists in charge of a state.” She notes that there was “top-level Nazi support for ecological ideas—especially if one incorporates the attitude of Hitler and Himmler on vegetarianism and animal rights. . . . Nazi Germany was the first country in Europe to form nature reserves. . . . On Himmler’s insistence, anti-vivisection laws were passed. SS training included a respect for animal life of near Buddhist proportions.”

She states: “A discussion of the element of green and ecological ideas in Nazism is bound to have an explosive effect. There are also possible political consequences for Germany. The Green Party in today’s Germany is popular

among many disaffected intellectuals, because it appears to be pure and untainted by the past. . . . So a link between today’s fashionable green ideas and the Nazis can meet with displeasure or even vituperation.”

Hence, Bramwell has reached many of the same conclusions as Lyndon and Helga LaRouche and collaborators about the coherence between “Green” and Nazi ideas, albeit she comes from a different philosophical approach. What that philosophy is, is not entirely clear, a problem that sometimes makes the book less readable than it should be. Nevertheless, she has done her homework. A former junior research fellow at Trinity College, Oxford, Bramwell was previously the author of a 1985 work entitled, *Blood and Soil. R. Walther Darre and Hitler’s “Green Party”*. Darre was the Nazi minister of agriculture, and is a key protagonist in her story.

### **Bio-genetics and the British pagan movements**

Bramwell’s discussion of the conceptual roots of “ecologism” in the “bio-genetic” theories of Ernst Haeckel is one very interesting segment. Haeckel was one of the most influential proponents of the idea that man is explainable, and changeable (or controllable) through application of certain supposedly eternal biological and natural principles.

For Haeckel, it was no problem to go from this overall world concept, to support for eugenics and the like. A recurring leitmotif in Bramwell’s accounts of various “ecological” thinkers of the past century, is their support for ideas like eugenics and euthanasia.

Haeckel was involved in the Theosophy movement and

was an early seminal influence over Rudolf Steiner, founder and guru of the Anthroposophical movement. Especially when his philosophy is intermeshed with a pagan belief in Nordic myths or a certain kind of mystical "Germanic-Teutonic" ideology, matters can become very dangerous.

She writes, of Haeckel: "Later in life, he attacked Christianity for putting man above animals and nature. [She quotes him] 'It has contributed not only to an extremely injurious isolation from our glorious mother nature, but also to a regrettable contempt of all other organisms'. . . . The extraordinary influence of Haeckel and his successors can be attributed, in part, to the quasi-religious appeal, the incipient pantheism of his picture. But there is a deeper appeal; the return to a god-impregnated nature, which had been banished from the North by Christianity."

### The national Bolsheviks

Which is not to say that certain traditions in Christianity itself are not part of the problem. Bramwell has some interesting leads here, too. For example, she cites a 1978 book by Armin Mohler, the Swiss philosopher of the so-called Conservative Revolution, and an apologist for various strands of "national Bolshevik" thought in this century. In this book, Bramwell points out, Mohler stresses the particularly Protestant character of the area where ecological beliefs are found, namely "the triangle between San Francisco, Zurich, and Stockholm."

She writes at a later point: "So the lesson of the Third Reich in peasant-oriented land reform is an important one, and, given the link between a 'Germanic' ideology, the Protestant transcendentalism of northern Europe and her children overseas, and the current popularity of ecological ideas, one that should be considered."

### Pagan 'nordicism'

The impact of such a complex of ideas on Great Britain, usually expressed in various forms of pagan "nordicism," provides material for some of the most interesting passages in the book, with a cast of characters and institutions ranging from D. H. Lawrence to the lesser known "Kibbo Kift Kin," Dartington Hall, the novelist Henry Williamson, the Soil Association, Lord Lyvington (later the Earl of Portsmouth), Montague Fordham, John Hargrave, Patrick Geddes, and others. Rather than recapitulate this here, the best advice is for the reader himself or herself to go through this material about some of the more peculiar features of British political and economic life in the interwar years. There are many lessons to be drawn for today: it is certainly eerie to reflect on a contemporary speech by Prince Charles advocating "organic farming," after one has been exposed to the curious blend of Anthroposophists, supporters of Oswald Mosley and other brands of fascism, nordicist pagans, theosophical Mother Earth worshippers, Fabians, crypto-communists, and others described by Bramwell!

In this reviewer's view, one area she has underestimated, is the weight of *the Russian* occult, mystical, and blood-and-soil outlook in shaping the "ecological" worldview in recent years, although she does briefly draw attention to the importance of "ecology" in the ideology of the *Pamyat* movement. (In this respect, her book is weak in comparison to James Webb's *The Occult Establishment*, published some years back, which discusses the Russo-slavic input into contemporary irrationalism and mysticism in detail. Webb's book, by the way, is a good companion-piece to read, with Bramwell's, as it touches upon some of the same terrain, although from a different standpoint.)

### The Pol Pot analogy

Overall, however, Bramwell has a sharp eye. She draws the connection between ecological policies, and the results as seen in Pol Pot's Cambodia: "The Pol Pot analogy comes to mind from the current fashion for ecology among revolutionaries; e.g., the comment by a 'Senior Officer' in the National Resistance Army of Uganda: 'I have killed many men. What I want now is a degree in ecological and conservation studies.'"

Or, as another case: "The feminist witches of PAN (Pagans Against Nukes) worshiped at the same pagan stones as the pagans of the Third Reich. . . . Green culture today ranges from CND to the European Nouvelle Droite. It incorporates the new pagans, such as the nomadic bands of witches, who visit Stonehenge for the solstice and follow the astral plane across Britain's sacred land, the matriarchal witches who worship at exactly the same standing stone in Germany as did the pagan Nazis, although rejecting the patriarchy of the Nazis."

Various of these themes should, in and of themselves, be the subjects of book-length studies, especially at a time when our bookstores, newspapers, and electronic media are supersaturated with the "ecological" insanity. Truly, one could say that too many forests have been torn down to supply the paper for "green" books.

Bramwell's last words could be a good point of departure for some rigorous researchers who abhor the blackmail of the ecological movement today. After she has criticized some of the key ideas of today's ecological movement in the concluding chapter, she writes:

"What after all today's ecological movement is advocating is a return to primitivism. . . . Consciously or not, this is a death-wish. We are not talking here about eschewing food additives and coloring matter, whole food in a whole land, as were the earlier ecologists, but something different—and deathly. For today's ecologists, their hope of regeneration presupposes a return to primitivism, and thus, whether they wish to enunciate it or not, concomitant anarchy, the burning before the replanting, the cutting down of the dead tree. The father of the movement is an utter rejection of all that is, and for at least three millennia all that was."