

RIP: The myth that RAF terrorists killed banker Alfred Herrhausen

by Rainer Apel

The official myth created about the unsolved assassination of German banker Alfred Herrhausen on Nov. 30, 1989 has now finally been buried, thanks to the contribution of four public radio stations in Germany. A special report compiled by Deutschlandradio Köln (DLR), WDR, Saarländischen Rundfunk, and Radio Free Berlin, was broadcast on Jan. 7, which consisted of a review of the many noteworthy peculiarities of the case over the past seven years. The forensic investigations immediately after the assassination of Herrhausen were already overloaded with serious mistakes. In the course of the ensuing investigation, the most remarkable developments concerned “state witness” Siegfried Nonne. The circus orchestrated around Nonne’s testimony that “RAF terrorists did it,” illustrates the methods of the official cover-up most drastically.

EIR, almost uniquely among the international news media, has insisted from the start that the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Gang) did *not* assassinate Herrhausen. Instead, we have pointed to the geopolitical stakes that made the Deutsche Bank chairman’s policies, and especially his idea of East-West cooperation for industrial development, *very dangerous* for the British oligarchy. Lyndon LaRouche has often pointed to the assassination of Herrhausen, as a crucial inflection-point in Germany’s history, ensuring that the reunified nation would do nothing to buck the controls of the City of London.

Holes in the ‘official’ story

The “Nonne case” first became public in July 1991, when Nonne testified to police that Red Army Faction terrorists had based themselves in his apartment in Bad Homburg at the end of 1989, and that they had prepared the Herrhausen assassination from that position over a period of weeks. One of the alleged terrorists cited by Nonne, whose names then appeared in August 1991 on the most-wanted posters, was one Christoph Seidler, who, in November 1996, went public with the surprising revelation that he had nothing to do with the RAF, and nothing at all to do with the assassination of Herrhausen. As Deutschlandradio reported, Seidler had turned himself in to German security authorities, and he was interrogated by an investigative magistrate for 10 hours on Nov. 22. Seidler’s name was removed from the most-wanted listings. Another most-wanted “terrorist” on the list, Andrea Klump, now living

in Peru, will probably also soon present herself to the authorities, as the DLR report implied, and her name will also have to be scratched off the list.

The claim that the RAF had carried out the hit on Herrhausen stood on clay feet from the beginning. The terrorist letter, which claimed responsibility for the assassination, did not pass muster for authenticity, nor did the text itself appear genuine. At that time, even the head of the Chancellor’s office, Wolfgang Schäuble, declared that he had doubts about the presumed responsibility of the RAF.

Later, an unnamed “ex”-official of the German Federal Criminal Office (BKA) told the editors of the television documentary program “Monitor,” after a broadcast on the issue in July 1992, that there had been a meeting of experts from several anti-terror authorities on Dec. 4, 1989, during which a certain official of the Hesse State Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Verfassungsschutz), whose code name was “Nordmann,” was instructed to ask his “ex”-informant in the radical networks, alias “Polker,” to find out something about the assassination of Herrhausen. This “Polker” was Siegfried Nonne, who had been put on ice as an informant since 1986 because the Hesse Verfassungsschutz considered his cover among the terrorist demimonde to be “blown.” Still, in 1989, this same Nonne was celebrated as a source with good contacts to the hard-core RAF. In any case, it took until June 1991 before “Nordmann” finally spoke with Nonne, and Nonne was offered DM 100,000 if he testified, as requested, about the role of the RAF. Nonne initially refused; after pressure was put on him, however, in July 1991, Nonne finally agreed to sign a prepared “confession,” according to which the indicated RAF terrorists had planned the assassination of Herrhausen from Nonne’s apartment.

In the course of their journalistic investigations, the “Monitor” team soon found out, among other things, that Nonne’s neighbors had never seen anyone frequenting his apartment at the end of 1989, except for Nonne’s half-brother, Hugo Foeller, who registered the apartment as his legal residence. None of the police investigators had ever questioned Foeller. In January 1992, Foeller lay in a hospital with a serious illness. It was only then that the first interrogation of Foeller took place, on Jan. 21, 1992—the very same day that the authorities presented their “state witness,” Nonne, together with his phony confession to the press. Foeller died on

What EIR said about the Herrhausen killing

In our April 3, 1992 issue ("New Evidence Emerges in the Herrhausen Assassination Case," Helga Zepp LaRouche analyzed the evidence provided by former Pentagon official Col. L. Fletcher Prouty, in an interview with Italian journalist Antonio Cipriani in *Unità*. She wrote: "The key to the motive behind Herrhausen's assassination lies in 11 pages of a speech he delivered in the United States only four days before he was ambushed. The speech contained Herrhausen's vision of a new kind of relationship between eastern and western Europe which would have fundamentally altered the world's future course.

"Colonel Prouty . . . said in the interview that Herrhausen, Kennedy,

former Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro, Italian industrialist Enrico Mattei, and Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme had all been killed for the same reason: They had not been willing to accept world domination by the Yalta condominium."

On July 17, 1992 ("Was Herrhausen Killed by Western Intelligence?"), we looked into the first German TV exposé on Siegfried Nonne. Colonel Prouty told us, "People like Alfred Herrhausen are killed for big reasons. The people that order such executions, at the highest levels, feel sanctified and justified when they order such an act. . . . Herrhausen . . . was not under the thumb of the City [of London]."



Alfred Herrhausen

Our Oct. 2, 1992 issue ("What Went Wrong with East Germany's Economy?") reported that the architect of much of Helmut Kohl's strategy toward the East in 1989 was Kohl's most trusted adviser on economic policy issues, Alfred Herrhausen. That strategy fell to dust when Germany's leaders caved in to the ferocious opposition from Britain and France, backed up by the terror killings.

Jan. 23.

Under the pretext of providing protective custody, Nonne was kept hidden in various psychiatric clinics. One "Monitor" reporter, nevertheless, managed to track him down. Nonne told him that his entire confession was a lie, and that it had been extorted from him. These facts were then reported by "Monitor" in a documentary on July 1, 1992, whereupon our "ex"-BKA official appeared, with the diary notes on the secret BKA meeting at the end of 1989.

In December 1992, a book-length exposé, *The RAF Phantom: Why Politics and Economics Needs Terrorists*, was published, containing plenty of unpleasant revelations. Reviewing all the other murder cases ascribed to the "RAF third generation," and analyzing them from the standpoint of both the motive and the forensically analyzable evidence of alleged proof, the authors showed that there is *no* proof that the perpetrators were an ideologically disoriented group of RAF terrorists who survived underground for 10 years, only to surface for the murder of banker Alfred Herrhausen. German authorities took no action on the *RAF Phantom* revelations, until, suddenly, in March 1994, the authorities searched the offices and homes of the three authors, Ekkehard Sieker, Gerhard Wisnewski, and Wolfgang Landgräber: They were indicted on charges of "revealing state secrets." The "secret," as it turned out, was the attempt of certain investigatory authorities to invent the "state witness" Nonne, and in the same breath, the alleged perpetrators as well.

In August 1994, the "state's witness" charade with Nonne, which had run its course to nowhere, was called off, and by September the indictment of the three authors for revealing secrets was also dropped.

The end of a phantom

Hardly anything happened in the "Herrhausen case" for the next two years, until Nov. 4, 1996, when Christoph Seidler showed up, in an interview with the DLR TV magazine "Der Spiegel," with even more embarrassing revelations for the investigators. Toward the end of the documentary, DLR reporter Paul Kohl posed the question, with which our readers have been quite familiar since December 1989: *If the RAF was not responsible for the assassination of Alfred Herrhausen, who was?*

The DLR documentary provided no answers, but did offer three hypotheses:

1. Herrhausen, the head of Germany's prestigious Deutsche Bank, had wanted a debt moratorium for the Third World, which would have caused problems for American banks, in particular, because they were very exposed, while Deutsche Bank had largely written these debts off, making it less vulnerable. At that point, the DLR claimed that some people have the hypothesis, that Herrhausen planned to ruin the American banks and then buy them up cheap. In any case, Herrhausen had made himself an enemy of American banks.

2. Even before the fall of the Iron Curtain, in the summer

of 1989, Herrhausen wanted to establish a Development Bank for eastern Europe in Warsaw, Poland, and that would have stepped on the toes of the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and the Anglo-American banks, which were hoping to loot eastern Europe's industry as it became privatized. In this respect also, Herrhausen had made himself into an enemy of Anglo-American banking circles.

3. Herrhausen was killed three days after signing the purchase-contract for Deutsche Bank to take over the London investment bank Morgan Grenfell. With that move, Deutsche Bank was penetrating the world investment market, previously dominated by the Americans and Japanese, and threatened to achieve a dominant position in that market.

The beginning of the real debate

The three hypotheses presented by the DLR journalists finally situate the discussion about what truly lies behind the Herrhausen murder, the way it ought have been discussed, before the banker's body was cold, back in 1989. Since the mid-1980s, and especially in the weeks of the first large stock market crash in October 1987, Herrhausen had, in fact, argued for a broad debt moratorium for developing countries. Herrhausen's motivation for proposing such a policy would hardly have been the "free market competition" stratagems insinuated by DLR, for buying up bankrupt American banks. It was obvious, for an intelligent banker like Herrhausen, to warn against continuing unbridled financial speculation, with its utterly unreal demands for debt repayments. Such warnings were voiced at that time by other prominent bankers, including Roland Leuschel.

The crucial point at which Herrhausen was no longer "tolerable" for the Anglo-American world of financial speculation, was not the takeover of Morgan Grenfell by Deutsche Bank, as such; it was the proposal he launched in the summer of 1989 for an East European development bank, dedicated to the real economic reconstruction and infrastructural investment in eastern Europe. A number of Herrhausen's ideas at that time also appeared in a remarkable speech by Chancellor Helmut Kohl on Nov. 28, 1989, on the "10 Point Plan," a speech fiercely attacked by monetarists, free marketeers, and neo-liberals of all colors. That was the threat to the dominant world financial system, which has no interest in real physical investments or appropriate new financial institutions for such investments, and stakes its claim on every penny, which previously flowed into the real economy, for its speculative deals. The battle over money continues down to this day.

But, fortunately, there are apparently also those among the German elites who see no other way out of the global economic depression than to return to the year of optimism, 1989, and to the ideas Herrhausen had at that time. That is the explanation for the fact that the four public radio stations, which are all under tight political control, were given a green light to broadcast this special report.

India, Bangladesh lay basis to integrate East Asia

by Ramtanu Maitra and Susan Maitra

Indian Prime Minister H.D. Deve Gowda was in Bangladesh for two days on Jan. 5-6, to lay the foundation for a developmental hub which will encompass Bangladesh, northeast India, Nepal, and Bhutan, and work toward integrating South-east Asia with the subcontinent through a rail and road transportation network.

Prime Minister Deve Gowda's visit to Bangladesh, his first bilateral state visit since he became premier last July, was of vital importance strategically for the region and politically for Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina Wazed.

The Bangladesh prime minister just concluded a 30-year agreement on the thorny Ganga River water-sharing with India (see box). Earlier, Indian Minister for External Affairs Inder K. Gujral, who played an important role in bringing about the agreement, had announced that India's relations with its smaller neighbors will not be based upon "reciprocity," but on "New Delhi's generosity." The signing of the water agreement with Bangladesh—which opened the sluice gates to the Farakka barrage on the Ganga River, a step long demanded by Bangladesh—is acknowledged as a major success of the new-found "Gujral doctrine."

Even so, forces in Bangladesh hostile to India were in the process of orchestrating political unrest against her government, in the wake of the water agreement. Deve Gowda's visit assured a large section of Bangladeshis that the water-sharing agreement was signed by Delhi not simply as a sop to Dhaka, but as part of an overall economic development in the region which includes Bangladesh, northeast India, Nepal, and Bhutan.

Subsequent to the signing of the water-sharing agreement between Dhaka and New Delhi, the king of Bhutan has responded positively to the Indian proposal to join a sub-regional plan for sharing river water and power with India and Bangladesh. The sub-regional approach, Sheikh Hasina said, is "necessary to achieve faster cooperation in areas such as trade and commerce, production and transmission of power, and harnessing vast natural resources."

Aside from the water dispute, the relationship between Bangladesh and India has been severely impaired by the geopolitical manipulations of major powers in the area. As a result, a hostile Bangladesh, financially and economically de-