

Thatcher co-thinkers aim terror against Germany

by Nora Hamerman

On the night of July 31, as she prepared to leave Great Britain to visit U.S. President George Bush, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher went on television and admitted that she supported the substance of an anti-German outburst made last month by former Trade and Industry Minister Nicholas Ridley. "I think apart from the way in which Mr. Ridley said it, some of the things he said . . . were in tune with people's feelings, because naturally some people, particularly those who lived through the last war, feel a number of apprehensions."

Ridley was forced to resign after he was quoted in a newspaper interview July 12 saying that moves toward joint European monetary policy were "all a German racket designed to take over the whole of Europe." Most offensive of all, Ridley said, "I'm not against giving up sovereignty in principle, but not to this lot. You might just as well give it to Adolf Hitler." Ridley's remarks, studded with insulting references to "the German *people*" as "the problem" in themselves, were the first official endorsement for a drumbeat of British warnings that the freeing of East Germany from the Communist dictatorship would somehow revive Hitler's Third Reich.

RAF right in tune

Thatcher's words confirm what she had previously denied, but many Germans and others suspected—that Ridley said what Thatcher thought. Curiously enough, this line was simultaneously echoed in Germany itself by the Stalinist hardliners of the Red Army Faction (RAF) terrorist gang, also known as the Baader-Meinhof.

In a letter confessing responsibility for the July 27 bomb attack that nearly killed Bonn Assistant Interior Minister Hans Neusel, the RAF charged that he was a "symbol of the unbroken political continuity of the Third Reich and German fascism." The letter speaks of "imperialism in its West German version reaching out to grab for annexation of the territo-

ry of the G.D.R.," the former Soviet-occupied zone of East Germany, and slandered the upcoming all-German elections for parliament as aiming for "a new Reichstag of the Fourth Reich."

The RAF is also circulating a pamphlet which asserts:

- that Hans Neusel and the French ministry of the interior launched the TREVI (international coordination group against terrorism, founded in 1985), and that Neusel has been overseeing the training by the West German GSG-9 anti-terrorism brigade of special Turkish police squads operating against the Kurds. That is why Neusel was attacked on July 27;

- that Neusel is the "personified, though indirect, embodiment of the continuity of German fascism from the Third Reich to the Greater Germany that is heading towards the Fourth Reich." He has been overseeing state efforts to crush terrorist underground bridgeheads in Europe like the Groningen and Hamburg Hafenstrasse squatters and the Copenhagen Christiania compound;

- that West Germany is the flagship of the "Europe 1992" effort, enlarged by the conquest of the formerly socialist bloc in Eastern Europe, to build a "F.R.G./Western Europe world power" which is stabilizing the imperialist power bloc against the "Trikont," the Third World. The socialist bloc ceases to be a base of support and solidarity for the Trikont;

- that the conquest of Eastern Europe by the new "F.R.G./Western Europe world power" is the third assault by German capitalism in this century, carried out this time not by military weapons, but by weapons of business and politics. This is to consolidate the European power bloc for its intentions of launching a new round of looting of the Third World; and

- that the Socialist government in Spain of Felipe González is becoming a special target of the "anti-imperialist"

offensive because it is trying to profile itself as a “reliable member of the core states of the European power bloc.”

Why the violent reaction?

On July 28, Lyndon LaRouche commented on the British establishment’s obsession with “Fourth Reich” nightmares. “We have a process on the continent,” he reemphasized, “such that whatever happens to the Soviet Union, its pieces, and as a whole, that this part of the world, of Eurasia, and also Eastern Europe, will not survive, without the success of the reunification of Germany, as a keystone of the economic expansion of what is presently Western, continental Europe.”

Moreover, “without the double-digit rate of growth in Eastern Europe, which can be achieved rather credibly, simply by an effective reunification of Germany, and the high, single-digit rate of growth, which can be achieved and sustained (these are both real growth, not just nominal growth) in Western Europe, as a side effect of the same process, it will not be possible both to meet the urgent requirements of coping with the physical economic crisis to the East of Western Europe, and also to generate the means for meeting some of the Third World crisis, the revival of the U.S. and British economy, and so forth.”

He continued: “Without that growth, the situation for the Soviets is sufficiently hopeless, that . . . we are looking at the threat of war, in which Moscow turns to whatever remains of its own military capability, which would be the dominant capability of the world at that time, to find, by military means, a solution which is not available by other means.”

Improbable as it seems, Moscow finds itself indebted, primarily to Germany, and to Japan, not merely for goods, but for investment goods, in order to develop infrastructure, agriculture, and industry. Therefore, LaRouche noted, “the Russians find themselves perversely caught having a self-interest, in the success of what Helmut Kohl, the Chancellor of Germany, is sensibly attempting; and an even greater interest in the success of what I have proposed, to the same effect.

“On the other hand, this produces a violent reaction, from the Anglo-Americans, who see this relationship between Russia, or Moscow, and a Western Europe centered upon the German-dominated Triangle, as being the long-feared danger, as [19th century geopolitician] Karl Haushofer would pose it, of the Eurasian land mass ganging up against the poor shreds of the Anglo-Saxon Rim countries.”

But the geopolitical aspect is “only a part, though a significant if incidental part, of a general character of the Anglo-American Establishment, at this time.

“First of all, the Establishment at the top is dedicated to the revival of, and revenge for, the pagan imperial Roman Empire, against the putative destroyer of that Empire, Christianity, and also, the Judaic Ten Commandments. . . . In fact, in the extreme, the Establishment, including elements such as the leadership of the Anglican Church and other churches, including the leadership of the Church of Scotland,

are openly advocating the Anti-Christ, as is Prince Philip, for example, with his tendency toward the Gaia worship proposition,” LaRouche said.

“So, they’re gnostic, or, actually, outrightly satanic, in this *passion* for revival of pagan Rome: the Emperor Diocletian’s pagan Rome, or that of Julian the Apostate, as much as Tiberius and Nero.

“The second feature of this, is ecology, this insane cult ecology, bordering down to animal rights terrorism, which is a commitment, sort of a revival of the Code of Diocletian, as a commitment to the global empire.

“Thirdly, on about the same level as the commitment to geopolitical cult insanity, is a cult commitment to what I have delighted in describing from a Tokyo vantage-point, as the ‘American flea market economy,’ or, in Germany, we call it the *Flohmarktwirtschaft*,” LaRouche said, referring to the Adam Smith school of pillage. “So, we have these four tenets which I’ve indicated, of the Anglo-American Establishment’s policy, against what they see as a tendency for the emergence of the Eurasian land mass around a successful German development concept.

“Obviously, the Anglo-Americans wish to do two things: sink the German economy, stop the unification, at least to the point of making it a failure, or a crushing failure for Germany, and pitting Germany against Moscow. That’s the game plan, with the U.S. probably taking the Russian side this time, against Western continental Europe.”

Reunification process speeds up

On Aug. 3, West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and his East German counterpart Lothar de Maiziere answered the efforts of the Anglo-American oligarchs and their RAF co-thinkers with an initiative to move up, from Dec. 2 to Oct. 14, the schedule for the all-German elections.

The move, promoted with references to a “state of emergency,” must be seen as a preemptive step to shore up the economic and political side of the unification process before the expected inflationary and recessionist effects of the crisis in the Mideast (and in the U.S.S.R.) hit Western and Central Europe.

Remarks by Kohl’s chancellor minister, Wolfgang Schauble, in a radio interview Aug. 4, hint that such broad strategic considerations—not economic pressures as such—are what was discussed in the secret surprise meeting between Kohl and de Maiziere on July 31—the date of Thatcher’s “Ridley” confession. Schauble said the earlier election date has the main purpose of “creating clear conditions” for unity of the two Germanys, which is to be completed as soon as possible.

While the economic-social situation in East Germany is increasingly unstable, it is far from being a real emergency. The original election date of Dec. 2 had already been promoted with reference to the worsening economic-social crisis situation in the Soviet Union.