

New evidence emerges in the Herrhausen assassination case

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Sensational new evidence in connection with the November 1990 assassination of the former board chairman of Deutsche Bank, Dr. Alfred Herrhausen, has just emerged from an interview with former Pentagon official Col. Fletcher Prouty, conducted by Italian journalist Antonio Cipriani and printed in the Italian daily *Unità*. 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, who was an adviser in the production of the hotly debated film about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and who was himself depicted in the film as "Mr. X," 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. In each case, it was the same small, elite grouping which acted against a perceived threat to their power, a power based on the idea of a *pax universalis*.

Although the relevant 11 pages of Herrhausen's speech contained extraordinarily important and new proposals by the Deutsche Bank representative, nevertheless the *New York Times*, which published portions of the speech four weeks after it had been delivered, not only neglected to include these 11 pages, but failed to even mention their content, despite the fact they were highly newsworthy.

In fact, today, two years and four months after the assassination, when we look back at the programmatic proposals contained in this speech, we can see how dramatically they touch upon the very topics which in the meantime have become the chief areas of tension between the United States and Europe. The "*cui bono?*"—which is the crucial question in any political killing—is now being answered by current developments.

The critical points

Point 1: Herrhausen expressed confidence that economic growth would be stronger in the early 1990s than had been originally foreseen, and that therefore Europe would be in a much better position to deal with a coming recession in the United States.

The conflict: Around the same time, then Central Intelligence Agency chief William Webster stated in numerous studies and speeches, that following the ending of the East-West conflict, the (then still-existing) Soviet Union would no longer remain the main strategic opponent of the United States, but rather that this role would be assumed by the former U.S. allies and current economic competitors of the United States, especially Germany and Japan.

Herrhausen's self-assured statement about Europe's expected gain in economic strength, and on the looming economic recession in the United States, must therefore have been like waving a red flag at the circles close to Webster.

Point 2: The *New York Times* was strangely silent about Herrhausen's proposal for an extensive debt forgiveness program for Poland, and about Herrhausen's call for the establishment of a development bank for financing project-designated investment. Herrhausen was talking about Poland, but the same could have been said of the other highly indebted nations of eastern Europe.

Herrhausen said in his speech: "The indispensable outside assistance should in my view be complemented in depth by a limited-term program, such that foreign investors also have a say in the use of these funds. Thus there should be assurances that the new credit will flow into specific, promising projects. It is therefore advisable that the export guarantees which the German federal government wants to expand, be tied primarily to specific projects. It was actually a proposal from the Polish side, that a team of experts from both countries should research the projects in question, in order to ensure that the costly failures of the 1970s are avoided.

"In this connection, at this year's annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund [IMF] in Washington, I proposed setting up a development bank on the spot—i.e., in Warsaw. Its task would be to bundle the aid and to channel it according to strict efficiency criteria. My vision is that such an institution could function somewhat like the Deutsche Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German Reconstruction Bank), which traces its origins back to the Marshall Plan."

The conflict: Herrhausen's proposal for a debt reduction and for project-linked issuance of credit by a development bank, directly follows the lines of the policy which Lyndon LaRouche called for in his historic speech on Oct. 12, 1988

in Berlin. On that occasion LaRouche forecast that Germany would soon become reunified in the wake of the economic collapse of the Soviet Union, and proposed an all-German plan for the development of Poland.

Herrhausen's policy was the diametric opposite of the "shock therapy" of the "Polish model," which since then has plunged Poland into economic catastrophe. Project-linked financing could have made for a much less painful transition from planned economy into a social market economy. Poland, and implicitly all the other eastern European states, would today have been on the threshold of an economic miracle quite similar to that which the Federal Republic of Germany experienced, through application of the same methods, in the years following World War II.

But that was the last thing on the minds of elite U.S. circles. Shortly after the failed coup in Moscow in August of last year, the CIA published yet another astonishing study. It claimed that, since the nations of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union possess more raw materials and a better educated work force, the further economic development of these countries is therefore not in the interests of the United States, since this would mean the growth of a strong economic competitor. Such economic development has to be "discouraged," the study argued.

A bomb that changed history

The murder of Herrhausen was a watershed in this regard.

In view of the economic catastrophe in Germany's new states, the increasing ungovernability of Poland as a consequence of the IMF's "shock therapy," and similar terrible results in Russia and other members of the Community of Independent States, the question must be asked, whether these dangerous developments would have come about, were Alfred Herrhausen still alive today, so that he might have been able to help shape Germany's policies over the past two years. German Chancellor Helmut Kohl is painfully aware of the fact that within Germany's political landscape, this assassination tore a gaping hole which has not been repaired to this day. According to the German weekly *Der Spiegel* on March 9, Kohl recently complained to people close to him, that among Germany's captains of the economy, nowhere can one find people who, like Herrhausen, think from a social-political standpoint; instead, one only finds mediocre shopkeeper mentalities in Germany's leading layers.

There can no longer be any doubt, that had Herrhausen's policies prevailed in Bonn, the extraordinary historic opportunity which existed with the opening of the borders, would not have been frittered away as carelessly as it has been in the main. The relationship between East and West established at Yalta, could have been put on an entirely different basis, to the benefit of all participating nations. Not only would economic cooperation have developed the East, but it could have stimulated the entire world economy, which instead is now threatened with global depression.

In an earlier statement on Herrhausen's assassination,

Fletcher Prouty wrote the following lines, which should give some pause for thought: "His death at that time . . . and the astonishing circumstances of his death . . . resemble the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963."

"When you consider the great importance of events in the Soviet Union, in eastern Europe, and especially in Germany . . . then the Herrhausen assassination is tremendously significant. We must not allow it to be swept under the rug. . . . Real terrorists don't murder a president of a bank without special reasons for doing so. Most terrorists are paid lackeys and tools of great power centers. Some great power center wanted for some reason to get rid of the board spokesman of Deutsche Bank on that day and in that manner, in order to teach others a lesson. So there is a message in the way he was killed."

Challenger of the 'system'

The strange "failures" in the search following the assassination, when put into the context of the informant Nonne and the sudden deaths of other witnesses, now appear in a somewhat different light than previously. And whereas government officials had been hysterically refusing for years to consider any possible involvement with the Soviet KGB or the East German Stasi in terrorism—which in the meantime has been well documented—now these officials are refusing all the more energetically to investigate any possible component related to western intelligence services.

But it is not necessary to lapse into simplistic formulas about eastern or western control: It can be historically proven that terrorism actually has elements from both sides. It comes from the forces in both East and West, who have thrown in their lot with the condominium policy of Versailles, and with its re-formulation in the form of the Yalta agreement. In the 1920s these were the Anglo-American circles behind the policies of the "Trust," while in the years following World War II they were the forces who, like Bertrand Russell, influenced and controlled the Pugwash process.

The policies of this condominium of Versailles forces has fundamentally shaped the course of the entire 20th century, and was based on the Anglo-Americans' geopolitical idea that any joint economic development of the "Eurasian heartland" would represent a mortal threat to the domination of the world by the "Atlantic rim" countries.

The control mechanism in the Versailles system consisted in the structure of debt imposed on Germany; following World War II, it lay in the Bretton Woods system, the IMF, and the World Bank, which exerted control over world energy reserves and, increasingly, food reserves. Whoever threatened this structure by acting in the interest of sovereign national development of individual nations, was putting his life at risk.

Consider the following examples:

Charles de Gaulle: He was the target of at least 20 assassination attempts, all of which fortunately failed. Among other things, he created France's nuclear *force de frappe* as a count-

er against the condominium's policies.

Enrico Mattei: The late head of the oil company Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi (ENI) wanted Italy to have an independent energy policy. His country was to serve as a bridgehead between Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. Died in 1962, in a suspicious air crash.

John F. Kennedy: He wanted to conduct disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union from a position of strength, and was at loggerheads with the Anglo-American

Israel, Turkey likeliest pawns in new wars

by Joseph Brewda

The U.S. and British governments seem intent on launching a new war in the Mideast by hook or by crook, with Iraq being one, but not by any means the only, possible target. An Israeli strike against Lebanon, a Turkish move into Iraq, or alternatively Syria or Iran, or a U.S. surgical strike against Libya or Iraq, are among the apparent scenarios under consideration. But because the situation in the region has become so unstable, wars unforeseen by even the Anglo-American gamemasters might soon occur.

Israel set to blow up

One way the Anglo-Americans might spark a war is through Israel. The bombing of Israel's embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina on March 17, which left 10 dead and 76 wounded, is being used to whip up the Israeli population into a killer rage preparatory for its own supposedly independent strike against Iraq, Syria, or some other target such as Sudan, possibly by the end of April.

"The Lord will avenge your spilled blood," intoned Israeli Foreign Minister David Levy screamed at the funeral of two Israeli diplomats who had been killed in the embassy bombing. Earlier, Levy claimed that the "Teheran-Damascus axis" was responsible for the bombing, although both governments had denied responsibility. A communiqué by the Iranian-run, Syria-Lebanon-based Islamic Jihad claimed credit for the blast on March 18, only to be contradicted by another alleged communiqué from the same organization a few hours later.

"This is our vow: waging war on them to the death," Levy said, in an apparently general reference to all the enemies of Israel, including Iraq. Earlier in March, Israeli Chief of Staff Ehud Barak called for Israel to go it alone and strike Iraq which, he railed, might soon threaten the region with nuclear weapons. On March 20, the Israeli newspaper *Davar* said an "independent" Israeli strike on Iraq was under discussion as it "more or less suits the interests of both the Israelis and the Americans." There is also talk in Israel of striking Sudan, which the Israeli and Anglo-American press have increasingly labeled as the new world headquarters of Arab terrorism.

In purported response to the bombing in Argentina, the Israelis have also blockaded and isolated the entire Occupied Territory of the Gaza Strip—as they had done immediately prior to the Anglo-American war on Iraq last year. Mean-

In an earlier statement on Herrhausen's assassination, Fletcher Prouty wrote the following lines, which should give some pause for thought: "His death at that time . . . and the astonishing circumstances of his death . . . resemble the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963."

establishment in numerous other policy areas assassinated in 1963. Assassinated in 1963.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: The former prime minister of Pakistan called for the convening of an international conference to discuss debt reorganization. Hanged in 1979.

Indira Gandhi: Before her assassination, she was likewise steering a course toward a new debt arrangement. Assassinated in 1984.

Aldo Moro: With his "government of national unity," he wanted to lay the basis for a sovereign national policy for Italy. Assassinated in 1978.

Detlev Carsten Rohwedder: His policies in the Treuhandanstalt—the trust charged with putting the assets of the former East German regime into productive private hands—moved more in the direction what Herrhausen had proposed for Poland, and contrary to a policy of privatization at any cost. Assassinated in 1991.

This list could be continued with quite a number of others. But the crucial question will be whether people in positions of responsibility stop complaining about the loss of personalities such as Herrhausen, and instead decide to understand the message of which Fletcher Prouty spoke, and to draw the proper conclusions.

Following the sensational revelations by Prouty—who continues to judge the Kennedy murder from the standpoint of someone who witnessed the discussions at the Pentagon at the highest level—the most obvious next step would be to reopen the investigation of the Herrhausen case.