

Schmidt sets German reunification course

In an interview, Jan. 15, with the West German weekly, Der Spiegel, West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt gave a spirited defense of the nuclear fast breeder reactor as a new energy source, and sketched a program for the reunification of Germany in the context of an overall Atlantic-to-Urals development policy.

In the following excerpts from the 10-page interview, the Chancellor's contempt for the antinuclear and pro-terrorist Der Spiegel is quite evident. Never before has Chancellor Schmidt felt it necessary to warn a publication that they had better print all his "bitter answers" to their questions.

Spiegel: There is a difference as to whether it was an empire that the Germans looked for that collapsed or whether it was this Germany which did not yet exist even during Goethe's time.

Schmidt: What was said about the collapse is correct, but not because people were unable to conceive of a unified empire during Goethe's time. For how many wars did Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa lead against each other during the period of this Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, and on what different sides did the German kingdoms, Grand Duchies and so forth participate? Germans conducted war against Germans endlessly, for hundreds of years. And this is not only not the case between the DDR and the Federal Republic, but there also has never existed such a danger in these 30 years that such would occur.

Spiegel: Then, 30 years of the Federal Republic, 30 years of the DDR, only a footnote in history?

Schmidt: That is a journalistic formula that I will not make my own. **The partition is in no way a marginal phenomenon.**

Spiegel: But something that a person who thinks in terms of historical greatness does not need to take too seriously?

Schmidt: It is something that must be taken seriously but by no means must be considered as lasting forever. Hindsight into history should do nothing less than open insight into the fact that present relations between both German partial states are not so bad as former relations among German partial states, even though at that time they formally belonged to one single empire.

Spiegel: You want to say: not tragic and not irreversible?

Schmidt: No: already very tragic, but not final in my eyes. . . .

Spiegel: What does the picture of the entrepreneur of the future look like to you? Is there still the daring entrepreneur like in the 50s and 60s who is prepared to bear any risk that the market economy actually allots?

Schmidt: I think that in our industries, as well as in our banks and insurance companies and actually in almost the entire German economy, with exceptions that prove the rule, we have —

considering this through world-wide comparison — first-class management. Certainly not worse than the Americans or the Japanese.

But the question about the entrepreneur also means something else. What we relatively seldom meet with in Germany are the types who would fit into the motto of "Go west, young man," the new frontier types, people who have something new in their heads, who summon together their entire strength, who possibly even risk their own existence, in order to bring about something new. What has stepped in the background is the dynamic entrepreneur.

We had a whole string of outspoken pioneer types in Germany after the war. Many of them remained unsuccessful or finally had to put up with a failure, for example Schlieker and Borgward. But then there were also others, who were extraordinarily successful: Burda, Springer, Augstein, Korf, Grundig, for example, also the great export firms.

Spiegel: Where are the "young men" today, who go "west"?

Schmidt: In the meantime the readiness to accept risks has decreased somewhat. But not only the side of the entrepreneur, but also on the side of the trade unionist and the employee. In general the readiness to accept economic risks has become smaller. Today we also have more to lose than we had in 1950 or 1955. . . .

Never before has a German state put such a high portion of its GNP to technical and industrial innovation as the Federal Republic of Germany.

Spiegel: For example, even in the development of alternative technologies to nuclear energy?

Schmidt: Yes, . . . Even nuclear energy was once an alternative energy to oil and coal, and it also must remain that way. . . . If we continue to have major problems with nuclear energy, then **subsidies for coal in Germany will still have to be inconceivably high** in the future.

Spiegel: And what resulted from this was that you consider the use of nuclear energy and the future development of nuclear technology to be irrevocable, even though the prognoses for energy use must often be revised?

Schmidt: You can perceive that from the fact that if I had suffered a defeat in the Bundestag voting on the continued construction of the fast breeder, then the subject would have immediately come up again for a decision and would have had to have been connected to a vote of confidence. I cannot be responsible for having our energy supply in the 1980s and 1990s caught between the clutches of two monopolies, the oil producers and the uranium owners. . . .

Spiegel: And just as little can it be justified that the Office for the Protection of the Constitution sets up unconstitutional bugs, that the BND (Federal Intelligence Service) reads through wagonloads of mail.

Schmidt: You make me very bitter, and later I will request that all of my bitter answers are printed. What you say is ridiculous. There is no possibility of excluding all possible misuse of law. Then you would have to forbid everything. And then the puppets would dance on the table in Germany.

Spiegel: *You dispute the tendency towards the destruction of basic rights?*

Schmidt: That is rubbish. Your basic rights have not been taken away. Nor mine. Rights have been temporarily restricted for those people who sit in investigative custody under suspicion of murder waiting for their trial, or who have already been convicted of murder but who still remain dangerous. I will remain an opponent of the death penalty until I die. . . .

Spiegel: *What does this mean for maintaining or not maintaining the military blocs?*

Schmidt: I am not at all certain as to whether in the next century, which will also be the beginning of the next millennium, the military alliances that came into being at the end of the Second World War will be the dominating structure in Europe and the world. I myself am really not certain whether they will still have to exist then. By no means do I exclude a change as a result of the process of aetente and of the process directed towards worldwide arms reductions.

Spiegel: *Has our part in the process of detente become more difficult because we have to avoid giving any appearance as though we were allowing ourselves to be drawn into a political encirclement of the Soviet Union, since the Americans have been making eyes with the Chinese?*

Schmidt: In light of the manifold of treaties that John Foster Dulles spun over the world 25 years ago, the Soviet leadership could have had more of an impression of an encirclement policy against the Soviet Union than today.

Spiegel: *How must Bonn react to China's stormy courting for economic contacts, technological know-how and military aid?*

Schmidt: We have a political interest in having the People's Republic of China take a consciously responsible position in the community of nations. As an industrial nation we are interested in selling our wares. We will pursue this policy in relation to other countries of the world. This is directed against no one. We have consistently followed the policy of only supplying weapons inside the (NATO) alliance. We will also hold fast to this in relation to the People's Republic of China.

Count von Hapsburg:

Otto von Hapsburg is a leader of the Pan European Union whose goal it is to break up the sovereign states of Europe into a "Europe of the Regions." It is ironic that his outlook coincides so closely with that of Romanian President Ceausescu. As a ranking member of the "Black International" of feudalist

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

aristocrats, the would-be heir of the Hapsburg empire has important control connections to the various ethnic separatist terrorist organizations in Europe that are the instruments for destabilizing governments. Recently given West German citizenship in the state of Bavaria, Hapsburg is now running as a candidate from fascist Franz Josef Strauss's Christian Social Union in the June 10 elections to the European Parliament. Hapsburg views the European Parliament as the eventual governing body over a balkanized Europe. For the not so long term, Hapsburg dreams of ruling over a reconstituted Austro-Hungarian empire, part of the thinking behind his interest in pulling Romania and Hungary away from the East bloc.

Hapsburg gave the following interview on Jan. 13 to a reporter who made it available to the Executive Intelligence Review for publication.

Ceausescu lines up behind

Romania and Yugoslavia have each issued a series of official statements condemning Vietnam for "violation of the sovereignty" of Kampuchea (Cambodia), by Vietnam's supporting last week's successful uprising against the murderous regime of Pol Pot. Accordingly, headlines around the world once again are proclaiming "Division in the Communist World."

The story, however, should be put differently. Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu's plea for the legitimacy of the overthrown Pol Pot government of Kampuchea is only the latest, and most disgusting, of actions through which Ceausescu has tied himself to the Teng regime in China, Israeli intelligence, and the British Foreign Office.

Ceausescu's diplomatic agenda in 1978 included:

- (1) playing host to Peking's Hua Kuo-feng during Hua's tour of the Balkans to give speeches about "hegemonism," thus throwing down the glove in the Soviets' back yard;
- (2) cheerleading the disaster-fraught "Camp David" negotiations between Egypt and Israel, the separate peace scheme which Ceausescu helped initiate in 1977;
- (3) publicizing his refusal to endorse defense spending hikes at the November 1978 meeting of the Warsaw Treaty