

---

## History of Germany

---

# Strauss raises a double-edged theme

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The thematic lead-item in the Jan. 19 edition of the leading West Germany conservative daily, *Die Welt*, is a full-page interview with Bavaria's Minister-President Franz Josef Strauss. *Welt* headlines the interview with a quote from the text of the interview: "Who criminalizes the Germans, falsifies history."

On first reading, Strauss's remarks are sensible and accurate. The facts of the 12-year Nazi period must be faced, but these facts must be placed in two contexts. First, Nazism is not the natural outgrowth of German history. Second, we must not overlook others' part in bringing the war about, nor overlook some very wicked things done by the Soviets and others during and immediately following the war. Strauss emphasizes, the issue is not one of interpreting or reinterpreting Germany's history; the issue is getting at the historical truth.

So far, so good. Strauss has not adopted the more precise view of the Nazi period widely circulated in Germany by the Schiller Institute and Patriots for Germany, but what he has said is not inconsistent with what Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the Schiller Institute have been saying for years. Formally, Strauss is right; however, Bavaria's minister-president is a sly fellow, whose well-orchestrated utterances, such as this one, always have some very practical purpose in view.

During recent two years, especially since left-winger Richard Burt's appointment as U.S. ambassador to Bonn, the news-media discussion of "Germany policy" has usually been focused on the possibility of reunifying divided Germany, through agreements ing authority in East Germany. Whenever the discussion of German culture and German history is raised by politicians in Germany today, one must wonder whether these symptoms of Germany consciousness are winds blowing westward or eastward.

The problem is, that West Germany believes that the United States is now in the process of abandoning strategic commitments to Western Europe. The U.S. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts in defense budgets, the mad ravings of

Sen. Sam Nunn, Henry A. Kissinger, and their cronies, and the left-wing spoutings of Ambassador Burt, promote these fears. The mood, even within traditionally conservative currents in Germany, is "The U.S. is abandoning us; we must think of coming to terms with the neighboring monster to our east." To those veering toward such views, closer ties with Moscow and East Berlin may be a distasteful prospect, but, perhaps it is survival. Not all whose thoughts drift in such directions these days are persons inclined toward softness toward Bolshevism.

Naturally, any sensible person, German or other, wishes to see the artificial division of Germany ended some day, and the sooner this is practical, the better. Polish nationalists may be nervous about this subject, but they also know that a unified Germany would be crucial to greater independence, even perhaps total independence for Poland. This question dominated West Germany's internal political life, until President Kennedy flinched in face of Khrushchov's gamble, and allowed Khrushchov's Walter Ulbricht to cement the division of the two Germany's with the "wall." Stalin offered such unification in a famous 1952 note, which both Konrad Adenauer and Social-Democratic leader Kurt Schumacher turned down for good reasons which apply today. Yet, the desire for reunification lingers on, and has been artfully exploited by Moscow during the period since the fall of the Helmut Schmidt coalition government.

Submission to "Finlandized" status would be less painful for Germans, if the process of reunification were thrown in as bait by Moscow. So, one reads the Strauss interview as a defensible statement in and of itself; but, one wonders whether this is preparation for a post-election discussion of gradual decoupling from the military functions of NATO.

Americans, especially those associated with policy-making circles, must look at this matter from a different standpoint than does Herr Strauss. First, as a matter of background, we must consider some very important facts which fully support the argument which Herr Strauss delivered in the Jan. 19 interview. Second, we must use those facts to

help us in defining our strategic commitments toward Western Europe today.

### Who is to blame for Nazism?

The famous legal coup d'état which put Adolf Hitler's Nazis into power, was ordered from London and New York. Brooklyn, New York's Weimar finance minister Hjalmar Schacht put Hitler into power. Schacht was, from the beginning, a creature of the U.S. Morgan financial interests, and was steered in financial policy from the Bank of England throughout his career under both the Weimar and Nazi governments. Schacht went to London, to secure backing for putting Hitler into power, and then went to New York City, to rally backing from interests centered around Morgan and the pro-Nazi Harriman family.

The special importance of New York bankers, was that during the late 1920s and early 1930s, German debts had been converted in a "debt for equity" scheme, to the effect that New York banks then virtually owned Germany's industry. So, when, on his return from New York, Schacht ordered German industrialists, mostly opposed to Hitler up to that time, "An die Kasse!" those industrialists were unable to resist orders from New York City.

Until about 1938, New York and London continued to give support to the Hitler regime. Hitler's persecution of the Jews, and other horrors, were consistently suppressed from U.S. citizens by publications such as the *New York Times*. The shift began in 1938, when Germany's head of military intelligence, Admiral Canaris, warned the British government that German physicist Otto Hahn, et al. had discovered the secret of the atom bomb. Roosevelt was informed confidentially on London's orders. The decision was made then to prepare to go to war with Germany, before Nazi Germany developed such a bomb. Then, the New York press ceased covering up for Hitler's crimes.

On such grounds, the popularized view of "German national guilt" was always essentially a fraud. The guilt was international, and the leading circles among the Allies were as guilty of creating Hitler and organizing the war as anyone. Naturally, when the Allies became the victorious occupation forces of postwar Germany, the leading New York City and London circles which had backed Hitler until 1938 were in a position to rewrite history, leaving out mention of their own complicity, and laying all the blame neatly on a German people who, for the most part, had had no say in much of anything during the time New York and London were putting Hitler into power. (After 1934, the only force which could have eliminated Hitler was the German military. That German military repeatedly sought cooperation from abroad for such a coup, usually through Canaris's channels, but the Allies did not wish the German military in power, and therefore acted repeatedly to make certain it did not occur.)

This is not a matter of "reinterpreting" World War II history; it is a matter of dumping shopworn, lying propagan-

da, and telling people generally the truth, at long last. The issue involved is a highly practical one: not to repeat the same old mistakes all over again, in some new disguise, not to make the same mistake with Moscow today that we made with Hitler in the early 1930s.

The truth becomes much nastier when we scratch more deeply. Hitler was a monster, much worse than even professional Nazi-haters of the postwar period to date imagine. Hitler did intend to exterminate the Jewish population of Europe, and would have simply killed every Jew in reach

### What Strauss wrote

"He who criminalizes the Germans, falsifies history," is the headline of a full page interview with Franz-Josef Strauss, the head of the Christian Social Union, in the West German daily *Die Welt* on Jan. 19.

"I call for a commitment to national identity, for an upright walk through the present toward the future and for the regaining of a self-evident and European-oriented patriotism. . . .

". . . After the war, one chalk-circle after the other was drawn around us—with the catchphrase 'mastering the past.' Especially certain masochistic forces belong to this current, thinking that this is compensation and self-cleansing. I say: Worshipping national identity is a catastrophic mistake—but the denial and destruction of national identity is as bad. A population of 60 million nationalists would be horrible, but a population of 60 million nihilists would be as horrible.

". . . We must find our own interest, instead of constantly asking—I put it ironically: Do the Americans agree? Will France agree? Are the British glad? Isn't the Pope against that? Will the Kremlin leaders knit their brows? Will Israel blame us for that?—The 'Morris dance' of the cowards is the final result of this.

"All nations with a healthy national identity . . . never lost the ability to walk upright. The Germans lost it. They have been the most feared and hated nation, they have later become the most scolded nation which was subjected the most to re-education attempts. . . .

"Hitler brought barbarism back into politics in this century. But the Germans were not the only ones to do so. . . . One cannot limit the history of Germany to the 12 years of Hitler's dictatorship, and one cannot characterize the crimes of the Nazis as an exclusive mark of the Germans only, and for all time libel the Germans with a criminal character. Whoever does so, falsifies history and sins against the Germans."

outright, had he not been warned that he needed the slave-labor of these Jews, and so, for the most part, he worked them to death in slave-industries rather than killing them outright. Less known, is the fact that Hitler also planned to exterminate Christianity, too, a venture he planned to undertake once he had defeated Russia.

So, the truth about the history of Nazism consists of two leading questions. First, who is responsible for putting the monster Hitler into power? Second, who is responsible for creating such a monster in the first place?

Who created Hitler? Was it Austria? (There is one famous Austrian politician who refers to Beethoven as an Austrian and Hitler as a German.) Was it perhaps that renegade Benedictine abbot who drilled the young Hitler in the precepts of the Nazi cult? Was it the Bavaria-based Thule Society, which adopted and built the Nazi Party, and which, through Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Professor Karl Haushofer, selected Hitler to be groomed as the hand-picked leader of the Thule Society's Nazi project? Was it the influence of the Russian anarchist Bakunin's crony and co-thinker, the composer Richard Wagner? Wagner was a project of the Thule Society circles, and Wagnerian opera was the model used for drilling Hitler in an irrationalist sort of oratorical style.

Take the case of the satanic Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the closest match for Adolf Hitler and the Nazis in recent events. The Khomeini dictatorship, shortly after coming to power, published a book of Khomeini's religious instruction, a collection largely devoted to the proper etiquette in performing acts of anal sodomy. (How widespread is the reservoir of AIDS carriers in Soviet central Asia?) It is a fact, that Zbigniew Brzezinski's Carter-Mondale administration organized the coup d'état which brought Khomeini's dictatorship to power, and that Washington, Israel, and European states have supported that avowedly terrorist, worse-than-Nazi regime even more shamelessly than Hitler was supported during most of the 1930s.

What created the monster Hitler was a movement which came to the surface in naked form beginning approximately the 1880s, the movement which its ideological leaders, Friedrich Nietzsche and Britain's Aleister Crowley, called a movement to end the "Age of Pisces" (Christ, Socrates), and bring into being the "Age of Aquarius" (Dionysos, Lucifer, Satan). This movement is usually described in short hand as the "New Age" movement of such fellows as Bertrand Russell, H.G. Wells, Robert M. Hutchins, Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, and Stanford's Willis Harman. It is also the movement of the prophet of Russian fascism, Fyodor Dostoevsky. Hitler was nothing more nor less than a "New Ager" in full bloom, just as was Richard Wagner, and the Thule Society associated with Wagner and Hitler.

Bolshevism and fascism were both directly creations of this "New Age" movement, as is the rock-drug-sex counter-culture of today. Those wealthy families which sponsored the "New Age" projects, then, and today, saw these lunatic, satanist cults as battering-rams to be used in destroying the

conceptions of man and society associated with the Golden Renaissance and the American Revolution. They wished to return a largely depopulated world to political and social arrangements rather like the form of feudal order which existed in Europe during the first half of the 14th century. This was chiefly the same wealthy and aristocratic interests behind the 1815 Treaty of Vienna, which had made Russia "the policeman of Europe" from 1815 until the Crimean War.

In Versailles-looted Germany, various lunatic anti-technology currents feeding into Nazism were built up around demoralized, rootless German veterans of World War I, and demoralized youth. The 19th-century Romanticism which Madame de Staël and others had brought into post-1815 Germany, and that more degenerate form of Romanticism called "modernism," were used as the starting-point for building up fascism in such forms as the initially pro-Soviet "national bolshevism" of Gregor Strasser and Joseph Goebbels. The looting of Weimar Germany by the terms of Versailles terms of reparations, threw Germany into that depressed state of "cultural pessimism," in which such wild political movements flourished.

It is not too difficult to transform any population of European civilization into a fascist movement and state, if one uses the same ingredients which the Allies and "New Ager" combined forces to introduce to Weimar Germany, including extreme measures of pessimism associated with depressed economic conditions. The modern radical "ecologists" is precisely such a fascist countercultural movement.

What created Hitler, therefore? Hitler, like Bolshevism, was a creation of an international policy-making structure, which continued in power after the defeat of Nazi Germany, and which, as the case of Carter's installation of the Khomeini dictatorship shows, is either perpetrating or at least condoning the same, and even worse crimes against humanity all over again.

At the close of World War II, and so far to date since, the West has done absolutely nothing to uproot the causes for Hitler's regime. By making Germans in general the scape-goats, we have drawn attention away from the actual root of the problem, roots within the same policy-making structures which created the mythical version of "German collective guilt."

Who is to be blamed for the crimes against humanity perpetrated by and in Iran? Shall we speak of the "collective guilt of the Iranian people," shall we speak of the Jimmy Carter and Zbigniew Brzezinski which brought Khomeini to power, or shall we speak of the policy-making structure which deployed the mere Carters and Brzezinskis, and which, otherwise, tolerated that policy? When a state falls under a dictatorship, such as Hitler's and Khomeini's, do not blame the people subjugated to that dictatorship for what ensues; blame the policy-making structure which places such dictatorships in power. Blame, above all, most concretely, those elements of the policy-making structure which have sponsored the "New Age."