

---

## An Open Letter

---

# Who are the architects of the national crisis in Germany?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the Chairwoman of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity party, addresses the citizens of Germany, who have been shocked by a political earthquake which threatens to shatter the entire postwar political system.*

Unfortunately, the daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* editorial on Jan. 18 was correct in its observation that the party-financing scandal involves "a decades-long practice of systematic and conscious violation of the constitution, the law, and legislation." And, unfortunately, Hans Mundorf was also correct, when he wrote on Jan. 18 in the financial daily *Handelsblatt*, that morality is probably like a system of communicating pipes in which the level of the moral "fluid" is probably the same for all parties. Just think of the millions in tax money which the Green Party in Hesse passed on to certain firms belonging to their own members.

Germany is being shaken by a crisis of the state which is destroying the entire political system. But whoever only poses the question of who knew what and when about this or that aspect of the affair, and who stuck how much into whose pocket, does not see the forest for the trees. It is this "forest" that I want to address, so that it can be seen.

What reason could an arms dealer have, who has been indicted several times and has not been convicted only because of the political intervention of influential friends, a dubious bird such as Karlheinz Schreiber, to boast to the German weekly *Stern*, that he feels like a cat sitting in a box of mice, and that he is the one who decides which of the mice will be eaten first? He was the one who loudly proclaimed that he would name a lot of names, and that the full damage that that would do to Germany was yet to be seen.

Where does someone with the moral integrity of a petty scoundrel get the nerve to attack the entire German political system?

### 'Let us look at the forest'

Let us look at the "forest." Let us remember: It was an open secret that the Federal Republic of Germany was an occupied country up to 1989, a country in which no politician and no party represented in the Bundestag [parliament] would or could have done anything of a fundamental nature, without such action being under the control of, or subject to the ap-

proval of the Anglo-American occupation powers. In fact, there was no chance for a politician to either obtain or maintain political office if he or she opposed this system.

Part of this system, just as in Italy, was the labyrinthine system of illegal party-financing and the frequent payment of bribes out of large industrial contracts, especially armaments and aircraft contracts. We need only recall the Lockheed scandal and other affairs in which [the late Christian Social Union leader] Franz Josef Strauss was implicated.

The same Anglo-American forces who built up the political system in de facto occupied Germany, have now decided to let the house of cards collapse, which they themselves stacked.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the reunification of Germany in 1990, there was a definite potential for Germany to regain its national sovereignty, and that was when Bush, Thatcher, and Mitterrand reacted on the basis of geopolitical considerations, just as Edward VII and Teddy Roosevelt did in the period before World War I. The successors of this tradition, who may be termed the financial oligarchy of the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC), feared that Germany might pursue its natural interests and create growing export markets by rapidly developing the East.

Margaret Thatcher responded with her notorious "Fourth Reich" campaign against Germany and attempted to thwart German reunification with all available means. George Bush, warned by his advisers, Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger, understood that his own opposition to German reunification would destroy long-term American interests in Europe, and so he shifted to a policy of German self-containment.<sup>1</sup>

The first brutal shot across Kohl's bow was the assassination of Alfred Herrhausen, Kohl's close adviser on reunification, by a nonexistent "Third Generation" of Red Army Faction terrorists. The *cui bono*, and the question of who was technically capable of carrying out such an assault, point clearly toward Anglo-American, or Mitterrand's, intelligence services.

The fact that Kohl, and the knowledgeable portion of the

---

1. See Prof. Detlev Junker, "Germany's Unity, Containment, and Integration," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March, 13, 1997.

German establishment along with him, were willing to accept the assassination as a signal, was the beginning of the end of the dream of German sovereignty. The next step was the blackmail by Mitterrand, that France would only accept German reunification on condition that Kohl immediately agreed to the European Monetary Union and the surrender of the German mark.

Once the optimistic mood of the German population over reunification—which could have led to a completely new definition of the East-West relationship for the first time in this century—was broken, Germany surrendered to the dictate of the Anglo-Americans in the “Desert Storm” war against Iraq, and with that, the doctrine that it was not to be economic power, but military power, which would determine world politics.

That was the context in which arms dealer Karlheinz Schreiber appeared on Aug. 26, 1991 in the Swiss village of St. Margarethen, with a suitcase and 1 million deutschemarks in cash, which he handed over to the accountant Weyrauch, in the presence of the Treasurer of the Christian Democrats, Kiep. Kiep, Schreiber claimed in his *Stern* interview, got him the ability to walk into and out of the Pentagon without showing identification. The tank deal with Saudi Arabia went ahead with the full coordination and agreement of Bush. The attractive reward was also the trap for the future: The cat (Schreiber) had planted the cheese in the box for the mouse.

### The Gulf War trap

With the hindsight of 11 years, even a political blind man can recognize the accuracy of what we published in August 1990, half a year before the Gulf War broke out: The war against Iraq, instigated by Bush and Thatcher, was the first Anglo-American attempt to introduce the so-called “New World Order,” and thus a new Anglo-American unilateralism into world politics, in view of the imminent collapse of the Soviet Union.

From the perspective of the United States as the sole remaining superpower, the prospects for Germany, that, in connection with a special relationship with the United States, it would help the East in its economic reconstruction, did not at all fit in the picture. When Thatcher and her minister Nicholas Ridley spoke of a “Fourth Reich,” it was only a new version of the old geopolitical notion of Halford Mackinder, that the power which controlled the “European heartland” would rule the world, and would thus threaten “the Atlantic rim nations,” the United States and Great Britain.

The purpose of the Gulf War was to break the momentum toward German reunification and to destroy the possibility of the economic development of the East, and, in old British style, to bring everything under control with a “splendid little war.” That is precisely what happened with the formation of an Anglo-American-led coalition against Iraq. Saddam Hussein was enticed into the trap by U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie, and he has been playing the role of test case for Anglo-American strategies since then.



*Helga Zepp-LaRouche, chairwoman of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity in Germany. “More than ever,” she writes, “Germany’s interest is that Germany play a positive role in the reorganization of the bankrupt global financial system and the establishment of a just, new world economic order.”*

The war was directed against Germany’s interests in a number of respects, and that this was understood, was reflected in the demonstrations in Germany against the war, up to the point when Iraq’s decision to bomb Israel put an abrupt end to the peace movement. If the Kohl government supported this war nevertheless, then it was only for the purpose of remaining a member of the Anglo-American Club. The great historic opportunity of 1989, which provided the chance for the first time in this century to establish a real order of peace in the world, was missed. And the crisis which is brewing with, and in Russia today, is the result.

### Kohl’s silence

In view of the dimension which this national crisis has already obtained, the question is most often posed: Why does Kohl prefer to give up his honorary chairmanship of the CDU, and why does he let the damage to the CDU escalate, rather than name the names of the so-called “contributors”? The only possible answer is, that the damage to him and to the CDU would be far greater than it already is.

What would happen if it turned out that these “contributors” were not German companies, and if this money was handed to Kohl out of the shadowy circles of, for example, the Iran-Contra affair, or if he had received something like a fund from channels of the Bush administration, so that, in the

context of reunification of the country, the Gulf War, and the Iran-Contra escapades, he could have sufficient maneuvering room for the necessary operations? Kohl, a Chancellor of the occupation powers?

In any case, it is noteworthy that Kohl does often vent his anger against Thatcher, and, to a certain extent, also Mitterrand, in public, but for Bush he finds only words of praise. And he does that, although a part, at least, of the establishment in Germany sees Bush's role quite differently.<sup>2</sup>

Karlheinz Schreiber is a fish swimming in the Iran-Contra stream, as indicated not only by his several businesses in Canada and his close association with former Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, who sits with George Bush on the board of directors of the notorious Barrick Gold company, which is among the beneficiaries of the wars in the Great Lakes region of Africa. Schreiber also boasted that Mulroney would never have become Prime Minister without the money he organized. It is no wonder that the Mulroney group protected Schreiber from being extradited to Germany, and also paid his bail.

Let us not forget that the scandals were launched from Canada, whose governing head of state, and by no means only as a figurehead, is Elizabeth II of England, whose views concerning Germany are the same as those of Thatcher.

## The British role

That brings us to another aspect of the affair, namely, to the role played by Transparency International (TI), the organization inspired by Prince Philip, not only in corruption investigations in Germany, but also in Italy, Spain, France, against President Ezer Weizman in Israel, and other personalities in countless other countries. In its *modus operandi*, TI is entirely an operation of the BAC financial oligarchy, which, in the process of ramming through globalization and Anglo-American unilateralism, aims at destroying every shred of sovereignty of any government which makes any move to protect the general welfare of the population against the assaults of this finance oligarchy. TI draws its knowledge from secret intelligence sources of those who saw a perfect system for control in the corruption of politicians over decades, who now think it is in their interests to explode that very system. Despite the moralistic veneer which its proponents have adopted, TI is interested in anything but investigating corruption. So, the greatest caution is to be taken with respect to the role of the chairman of the Bundestag Investigatory Commission, Neumann.

It is also noteworthy that Prince Sayn-Wittgenstein, of all people, who seems to have a magic touch for miraculous growth of money (in connection with the bank accounts in Liechtenstein, the *Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung* pointed to the warnings of the chairman of the board of the Swiss Central Bank against the cluster risk in daring speculation schemes), is also the founder in Germany of the World Wild-

2. Junker, op cit.

life Fund, also called into life by Prince Philip. Coincidence?

The insolence with which Sayn-Wittgenstein characterizes the morality of the financial oligarchy is typical: According to him, the only unpardonable mistake is to let oneself be caught, or so he told *Bild am Sonntag*.

## No time for gloating

The scandals shattering Germany's political system have to be considered on two levels. On the one hand, there is the global strategic dimension, in which the institutions of the sovereign nation-state are supposed to be destroyed worldwide in favor of the financial oligarchy, which derives its greatest profit from globalization. These forces are dominated by the City of London, Wall Street, and the British Commonwealth. And that is where the architects of the crisis are to be found.

But the second level naturally concerns the morality of politics in Germany. In this system of corruption, in this unbridled arrogance of power, with which the representatives of all of the concerned parties believed they could buy electoral successes with illicit money, there is the reason for these parties' being dominated for a long time by mediocre, petty, unimaginative dwarfs. The notorious negative selections of elites, which was Kohl's method to make sure that his party was purged of anyone who could think, is only marginally more pronounced in the CDU than it is in other parties.

I know what I am talking about. For decades, these politicians, who are now being betrayed by their Anglo-American puppet-masters, have operated against me on behalf of these puppet-masters, and have attempted, not least by means of their control of the media, to prevent the circulation of the ideas I represent. Now they are getting their own kick in the behind.

But this is no time for gloating. The damage to Germany is immense. The frustration and demoralization in the population is severe. A discredited political leadership, which is only preoccupied with its own scandals, a pessimistic population—the greatest danger at this point in time lies precisely in this combination, where Germany needs a leadership with foresight to deal with the imminent and inevitable financial collapse.

There is only one solution: The full truth about the global strategic background of this crisis of the state must come to light. And then we need a new beginning, a policy which is not oriented to the power and privileges of politicians, but to the general welfare of the population and the interests of Germany.

More than ever, Germany's interest is that Germany play a positive role in the reorganization of the bankrupt global financial system and the establishment of a just, new world economic order. And that has been my policy for more than a quarter-century, at the latest since I took part in the federal elections in 1976 as "the Chancellor candidate for a just, new world economic order." It is high time that this become the focus of discussion.