

Schmidt: You make me very bitter, and later I will request that all of my bitter answers are printed. What you say is ridiculous. There is no possibility of excluding all possible misuse of law. Then you would have to forbid everything. And then the puppets would dance on the table in Germany.

Spiegel: You dispute the tendency towards the destruction of basic rights?

Schmidt: That is rubbish. Your basic rights have not been taken away. Nor mine. Rights have been temporarily restricted for those people who sit in investigative custody under suspicion of murder waiting for their trial, or who have already been convicted of murder but who still remain dangerous. I will remain an opponent of the death penalty until I die. . . .

Spiegel: What does this mean for maintaining or not maintaining the military blocs?

Schmidt: I am not at all certain as to whether in the next century, which will also be the beginning of the next millennium, the military alliances that came into being at the end of the Second World War will be the dominating structure in Europe and the world. I myself am really not certain whether they will still have to exist then. By no means do I exclude a change as a result of the process of detente and of the process directed towards worldwide arms reductions.

Spiegel: Has our part in the process of detente become more difficult because we have to avoid giving any appearance as though we were allowing ourselves to be drawn into a political encirclement of the Soviet Union, since the Americans have been making eyes with the Chinese?

Schmidt: In light of the manifold of treaties that John Foster Dulles spun over the world 25 years ago, the Soviet leadership could have had more of an impression of an encirclement policy against the Soviet Union than today.

Spiegel: How must Bonn react to China's stormy courting for economic contacts, technological know-how and military aid?

Schmidt: We have a political interest in having the People's Republic of China take a consciously responsible position in the community of nations. As an industrial nation we are interested in selling our wares. We will pursue this policy in relation to other countries of the world. This is directed against no one. We have consistently followed the policy of only supplying weapons inside the (NATO) alliance. We will also hold fast to this in relation to the People's Republic of China.

Count von Hapsburg:

Otto von Hapsburg is a leader of the Pan European Union whose goal it is to break up the sovereign states of Europe into a "Europe of the Regions." It is ironic that his outlook coincides so closely with that of Romanian President Ceausescu. As a ranking member of the "Black International" of feudalist

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

aristocrats, the would-be heir of the Hapsburg empire has important control connections to the various ethnic separatist terrorist organizations in Europe that are the instruments for destabilizing governments. Recently given West German citizenship in the state of Bavaria, Hapsburg is now running as a candidate for fascist Franz Josef Strauss's Christian Social Union in the June 10 elections to the European Parliament. Hapsburg views the European Parliament as the eventual governing body over a balkanized Europe. For the not so long term, Hapsburg dreams of ruling over a reconstituted Austro-Hungarian empire, part of the thinking behind his interest in pulling Romania and Hungary away from the East bloc.

Hapsburg gave the following interview on Jan. 13 to a reporter who made it available to the Executive Intelligence Review for publication.

Ceausescu lines up behind

Romania and Yugoslavia have each issued a series of official statements condemning Vietnam for "violation of the sovereignty" of Kampuchea (Cambodia), by Vietnam's supporting last week's successful uprising against the murderous regime of Pol Pot. Accordingly, headlines around the world once again are proclaiming "Division in the Communist World."

The story, however, should be put differently. Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu's plea for the legitimacy of the overthrown Pol Pot government of Kampuchea is only the latest, and most disgusting, of actions through which Ceausescu has tied himself to the Teng regime in China, Israeli intelligence, and the British Foreign Office.

Ceausescu's diplomatic agenda in 1978 included:

- (1) playing host to Peking's Hua Kuo-feng during Hua's tour of the Balkans to give speeches about "hegemonism," thus throwing down the glove in the Soviets' back yard;
- (2) cheerleading the disaster-fraught "Camp David" negotiations between Egypt and Israel, the separate peace scheme which Ceausescu helped initiate in 1977;
- (3) publicizing his refusal to endorse defense spending hikes at the November 1978 meeting of the Warsaw Treaty

China is 'national socialist'

Q: How do you view the possibilities for a Greater Europe vis-à-vis France?

A: In France, there are certain weaknesses and uncertainties in the Gaullist movement — people like Michel Debré and Jacques Chirac. I regret that the Gaullists do not yet have a candidates list for the elections to the European Parliament which Pan-Europa could support.

Q: You have just returned from China. How do you view their role internationally?

A: The Chinese will be eminently useful in containing the Soviet Union. You know, the Chinese are not really communists and certainly not like the Russians. They are National Socialists. That is, not like the Nazis, but, you know, with stress on both "national" and "socialist."

The Siberian question as an issue between the Russians and China will be an important determining factor in the near future.

The Chinese are extremely sympathetic to the Pan-European idea and we can most certainly count on them as allies in that respect.

Q: Does that mean that an alliance with China would tend to effectively engage the Russians in the East while giving Europe

the breathing space to strengthen its stand against the East bloc from here?

A: That's it, exactly. Except it would not do to trust the Chinese too much.

Q: Could you comment on the recent events in Cambodia and Iran?

A: I don't think Cambodian Prince Sihanouk will make it to power again, despite his games at the UN. He is flamboyant, but does not have the energy to carry his intentions through to fruition.

In Iran, the Shah has outplayed his role, but the Bakhtiar government is not strong enough to survive. I recently talked to an acquaintance of mine in the Arab League which is soon going to be stationed in Iran. He told me that the Bakhtiar government will fall within a period of six months. Bakhtiar has no support. Once he falls, the extreme left will take over and run things.

Q: There are no other forces in Iran? What about Khomeini?

A: Let me tell you something. Khomeini is controlled by the Russians from top to toe and has always been. He does nothing, writes nothing, says nothing without being ordered by the Rome office of the Italian Communist Party.

China and Pol Pot

Organization, the Eastern European military bloc of which Romania is a member.

The cover for these latest twists in Ceausescu's celebrated "independence" from Moscow is contained in his thesis, stated to French television in a Dec. 17 interview, that "We have come to the conclusion that, despite certain complex international problems, there is no question of the situation deteriorating toward war." In reality, Ceausescu at every turn is abetting the destabilization of nations all along Zbigniew Brzezinski's geopolitical "crescent of instability" from the Red Sea in the Middle East around to Indochina, which creates the danger of war.

Scinteia defends Pol Pot

Ceausescu is using the Vietnam-Kampuchea developments not only to boost China's bogus international campaign to defend Pol Pot, e.g. at the United Nations, but to cook up Eastern Mediterranean and Balkan problems for the Soviets — making another link in the chain of destabilizations. Working with Ceausescu are Tito's Yugoslavia and the Fanfani wing of the Italian Christian Democracy.

As the Kampuchean National Salvation forces, supported by

Vietnam, moved in to topple Pol Pot, the Romanian Communist Party paper *Scinteia* denounced "clashes among socialist countries" and wrote that "there is no argument which could justify the intervention and interference in the affairs of another state." On January 14, that is *after* the new government of the Peoples Republic of Kampuchea revealed the slaughter of millions of people under Pol Pot, *Scinteia* went further: "Nothing can justify support given to elements rising against their own government." Will Ceausescu next apply this judgment, retrospectively, to Soviet Red Army aid to those Romanians who fought in the underground against the fascist, Hitler-allied Antonescu regime during World War II?

Ceausescu went on to snub Soviet President Brezhnev personally. Brezhnev departed from Moscow by train on Jan. 11 to visit Bulgaria, the closest socialist neighbor of Romania. Brezhnev's choice of the rail route had the obvious included purpose of dramatizing Soviet concern with Ceausescu's antics; the train crossed Romanian soil on the way to Bulgaria from the Soviet border. Ignoring protocol, Ceausescu skipped greeting Brezhnev at a station stop and dispatched two underlings with a letter instead.

Q: Then, you would say, there is no salvation for Iran.

A: No, nothing. Iran is finished. But let's go back to China. I was talking with one of the Deputy Premiers of the Red Chinese government. He said that he and everyone else in the Peking government were deathly afraid of going to southern China because there were continual revolts in that region over Peking's continual softness toward Vietnam. There will be a serious explosion in Vietnam over the Chinese refugee question.

Q: I'd like to discuss more about your perspective for Europe. What about NATO?

A: NATO no longer exists except on paper. It is finished and obviously, since the USA is no longer in a position to offer the military defense of Europe, a key aspect in this age of ICBMs for building Europe's defense is one based on the idea exemplified by France's force de frappe. The French defense system was vital for building a strong anticommunist network in Europe as a whole.

Q: What about the battle over nuclear energy?

A: Very dangerous, nuclear power and high technology. Very dangerous indeed. Science cannot be spread out in an unprincipled fashion as the property of the people who would not understand science. But we do need science.

Take Austria, there has been a continuing drain of good young scientists. What we need is to focus on these establish-

ments of nuclear research already existing and finance them in such a way that we can attract all the young scientists of Europe.

The French nuclear program is important with respect to a credible nuclear defense policy for Europe against the Russians.

No matter how much one might detest the ecologists, one must work with them. Their leaders are socialist, but the rest are good, sensible, if somewhat romantic. They have the right idea about nuclear power being dangerous.

Q: Would you comment on the European Monetary System?

A: That and the earlier deal between Schmidt and Brezhnev are indeed dangerous because it weakened Europe's eastern flank. I've only heard of one good definition of detente which I read in the London *Economist* some weeks ago. Detente means the quickest, most dangerous transfer of technology to the Soviet Union enabling the Russians thereby to strengthen their efforts to destroy the West.

Q: How would you deal with this weak flank of East Europe, like Romania and Yugoslavia?

A: You know Hungary and Romania are the only nations in the East bloc whose people are not slaves. An increased dialogue with these countries on all levels bypassing Moscow is necessary so that these nations can be cut away from the Russian sphere of influence altogether. Hungary also. It is the eastern European country closest to going the Romanian way.