

Helga Zepp-LaRouche on RAF terrorism

Who benefits from the terrorism of the so-called Red Army Faction? Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed this question in an article in EIR, April 3, 1992, titled "New Evidence Emerges in the Herrhausen Assassination Case." Here are excerpts:

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 . . . 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*. . .

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. . . .

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. . . .

Shortly after the assassination of Rohwedder, the spokesman of the office of the Federal Attorney claimed that the "hard core" of the RAF operated "like a secret service." Members of the "commando level" used coded messages and modern secret-service equipment. And, contrary to the experience of the '70s, the perpetrators left no clues at the scene of the crime.

The RAF self-dissolution declaration has unleashed a barrage of interpretive efforts in the German media, along with the proliferation of old myths about the RAF and international terrorism as a "sociological phenomenon." No one seems to have given much thought to the fact that terrorism is a form of irregular warfare, in which the issue of the "interested third party" is always foremost, as Prof. Friedrich von der Heydte emphasized in his standard work on the subject, *Modern Irregular Warfare*.

Following the collapse of the communist system in the East, a number of facts have surfaced concerning the close relationship between terrorists and the intelligence services of these countries. The connection between the RAF and the Stasi (East German intelligence service), shown in many documents now available, provided enough evidence to convince

even stubborn empiricists of the intelligence-service control of terrorism. The degree to which intact networks of Eastern intelligence services have gone to work for Western services, is not known. There is, in any case, a lid on any consideration of the possibility that there is also a Western-controlled terrorism.

What is certain, is that leading people among the "industrial faction" of the Federal Republic of Germany were assassinated, and the killers were not called to account. It is unpardonable that politicians do not have the courage to pose the question, "*cui bono?*"—who benefits? That concerns the issue of the "interested third party" which profits from the killings. There is a lack of courage—as in the case of the assassination of Herrhausen—to think about the implications of the statements of former Pentagon official Col. Fletcher Prouty, who told an Italian newspaper in an interview after the assassination: "Terrorists do not kill the president of a bank without a special reason for it. 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."