

Assassination of Rohwedder benefits free market ideologues

by Rainer Apel

The man in charge of privatizing the industry of what used to be East Germany, Detlev Rohwedder, was murdered by a sniper in his Düsseldorf home on April 1. This meant the death of one of the most capable industry leaders united Germany possesses at this critical time, a man holding one of the most sensitive positions in the country. Chairing the Treuhand state holding company since late August 1990, Rohwedder was responsible for 8,000 former state-run companies of eastern Germany, employing 6-7 million workers.

Born 1932 in the city of Gotha, in the East German state of Thuringia, the former official in the West German government (1970-78) and former executive of Hoesch Steel (1980-90) seemed quite qualified for the job of heading the world's single largest industry holding company and overseeing the privatization of its most productive parts. This, at least, was his original mandate, when he took over with the perspective of doing that job for a period of four years.

The mandate ran into grave trouble, however, when privatization didn't work as had been planned. One main cause was the fact that the Western nations boycotted substantial investments in industry, not only in eastern Germany, but in the rest of the former East European trading community.

Rohwedder toured the United States at the end of last year to organize investors for some of the Treuhand firms. There was a well-coordinated boycott of that effort, however, with administration officials advising Americans against investments in east Germany.

Moreover, the Bush administration would not support the July 1990 German initiative for a multibillion-dollar aid program for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, to stabilize production and trade there. The German proposal met the same cold reception in London, and the remaining months of 1990 and the first two months of this year were shaped by the Gulf war mobilization of the Anglo-Americans, assisted by the French. Investments in, or aid to Eastern Europe were not an issue under such circumstances.

Growing unrest

Had the West launched aid programs for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in time, the industry of east Germany, which traditionally played the role of the chief supplier of heavy machines, railway cars, machine tools, optical equip-

ment and other high-tech products, would have had favorable conditions for its integration into the Western economy, as the Treuhand had envisaged.

But it did not happen, and certain free market illusions that were woven into the state holding company mandate gave the final blow to the original concept. Not being able to offer employment and production to most of the 6-7 million workers whom they commanded, Rohwedder and his Treuhand were faced with the outrage of tens of thousands of workers who walked out in protest in numerous east German cities.

Just five days before his death, Rohwedder complained in an interview to the daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* that a systematic "defamation campaign" had been launched against him and the Treuhand. He said that he had taken the job in hopes of assisting the rapid rebuilding of east German industry, but this made him many enemies. Political adversaries had begun to denounce him with epithets such as "hangman" or "slaughterer."

When labor protests came close to reaching the size of the late autumn 1989 mass protests that helped to bring down the hated East German communist regime, the government in Bonn reacted—rather late—and modified the Treuhand mandate so that it would still proceed with the privatization priority, but at a moderated pace and in accordance with political considerations about social, economic, and financial consequences.

No 'purist free market approach'

This reform created a new danger for the ideologues of the free market. Modest as it was, the Treuhand reform, which Rohwedder helped to design, posed the "threat" of turning away from the British-authored free market system, returning instead to the traditional system of industrial investments organized in a mercantilist mode that made the German economy a success relative to the other economies in the West.

In an address to a gathering of industrial managers and bankers in Pforzheim, West Germany, on March 28, Rohwedder said that a "purist free market approach would never work in east Germany," endorsing continued state management of at least the heavy industrial sector for an extended period of time.

The London *Financial Times* of April 3 denounced the

new German government policy as an "excessive abuse of market principles in the coalition's current attempts to turn the Treuhand into a *super-ministry* with priority given to industrial policy rather than privatization."

When this *Financial Times* verdict went to print, Rohwedder had already been dead for more than 12 hours.

The British attack on the Treuhand had its supporters in Germany: On Good Friday morning, terrorists had ransacked

and committed arson against an office of the Treuhand in Berlin, leaving a pamphlet behind that declared war on the "super-agency Treuhand, which has to be crushed."

And the sniper who killed Rohwedder three days later left behind a pamphlet from the Red Army Faction terrorist gang, which justified the murder as part of the struggle against the "Greater Germany imperialism," for which the Treuhand allegedly was a symbol.

LaRouche: pawprints of an Anglo-American operation

Lyndon LaRouche had this comment on the Rohwedder assassination on April 2:

The assassination of the German official, Detlev Rohwedder, by terrorist mode last night, is of a pattern of several events, including the British-directed terrorist assassination of the banker Alfred Herrhausen in 1989, and the targeting of Jürgen Ponto and Hanns-Martin Schleyer in 1977, the period in which I was targeted by the same people. It is also characteristic of events of the early 1920s, especially the point that every leading Western signator to the Rapallo agreement, save Britain's Lloyd George, was assassinated, including the head of the German AEG Walther Rathenau. Then we go back to the 1880s, on into World War I and World War II.

The pattern here is consistent. Today, in speaking of who is responsible for the assassination of Herrhausen, Rohwedder, and so forth, we would say: the Anglo-American faction behind Nicholas Ridley, Sir Peregrine Worsthorne, and Conor Cruise O'Brien.

The issue is the Mackinder-Milner geopolitical issue, of Eurasian development in opposition not only to British perception of Anglo-American interests, but specifically as a *threat* to the integrity of the satanic New Age doctrine, which embraces the mind of Mrs. Thatcher, George Bush, et al. . . .

The thing to be emphasized in this, is the case of Czar Aleksandr II. Now, without going into great detail about the personality of Czar Aleksandr II himself, the facts remain that the czar intervened against Britain and France in 1862-63, to threaten to make war in Europe, if Britain and France continued their plan to use the British puppet, the Confederacy, to destroy the United States. That was conjoined with Aleksandr's reforms, a kind of stepwise revival of Peter the Great's Leibnizian reforms in Russia, and led to the emergence of the Hanotaux-Witte axis, with two railroads prominent in the whole process: the Paris-

Vladivostok railroad, and the Berlin-Baghdad railroad.

In 1880, 1882, in response to this agreement from Hanotaux, the circles of Aleksandr II and Count Sergei Witte, the Anglo-Americans reacted (particularly the British at that point; they got their American dogs in line later on) by beginning a wave of murders and support for Mazzinian type ultra-radical, disruptive operations, including general waves of assassination. The wave of terrorism was launched by the Anglo-Americans, using opponents of the Alexandrian reforms, for example, in Russia, the so-called neo-Petrine reforms in Russia. This led right in to World War I and World War II as a Thirty Years' War.

When, after World War I, certain forces typified by the Rapallo arrangement began to move again, in a natural, logical way, to try to rebuild a shattered Europe, a shattered Eurasia. Boom! Assassinations again. Again from the Anglo-Americans—very much American at this point.

Then we go into the postwar period. We have the fight against de Gaulle and Adenauer, which comes to a head at the same time as the assassination of Kennedy in 1963; the unleashing of radicalism in 1963 inside the United States, the LSD-25 operation, the Beatles, the whole kit-and-kaboodle. And again, these waves of assassination. . . .

We have the two forces. The so-called Anglo-American reform, flea trade (and I emphasize the "I" in flea), is the pantheistic, satanic doctrine of George Bush's new world order, which was really given to him by the British. That dogma is the enemy of freedom, the enemy of mankind. Wherever that dogma goes, the worst result must ensue. And simply because some Germans, just out of common sense, realize that infrastructure is important, that the economy doesn't function without infrastructure, and that Europe must have a rational system of transportation, cooperation, and so forth, the Anglo-Americans strike and say, "No," as they did from 1880 on, and as they did again from the 1920s, against the Rapallo authorship, and as they did with the British assassination of Ponto in 1977, the British assassination of Herrhausen in 1989, and what looks to be the pawmarks of an Anglo-American assassination operation against Rohwedder last night.