

It is time to name Herrhausen's killers

by Michele Steinberg

On May 4, 1999, in Germany, Barbara Meyer, a wanted terrorist, gave herself up to the German authorities. Meyer had been sought as an alleged leader of the Baader-Meinhof/Red Army Fraction (RAF) terrorist group, and was charged with murdering Deutsche Bank chairman Alfred Herrhausen in November 1989. It is clear now, that she had nothing to do with the Herrhausen assassination. The same was established for two other alleged Baader-Meinhof/RAF "leaders," charged with killing Herrhausen, Christoph Seidler and Andrea Klump, who surrendered to the German authorities in 1996. As with the assassination of Italian political adviser, Massimo D'Antona on May 20, 1999 in Italy, Herrhausen was killed by intelligence professionals, using a terrorist label as a cover.

The following report is drawn from an Aug. 14, 1998 feature in *EIR*, assembled by Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche and a team of *EIR* historians and writers in Germany, that included a dossier on the Herrhausen assassination by Rudiger Rumpf. In that feature, Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche released her private correspondence, previously kept confidential, with government officials in Germany, about the perspective for political and economic reunification of Germany, based on the economic plan drawn up by her husband, American statesman and Democratic Presidential pre-candidate, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. She also discusses the "Ten-Point Program" for German unity, laid out by German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, on Nov. 28, 1989. Days after he released that plan, Kohl's adviser and personal friend, Alfred Herrhausen, was assassinated.

The LaRouche plan for integrating the former communist nations into an economic recovery, was akin to the ideas that Herrhausen espoused. It was these policies that the British financier oligarchy, led by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (now Baroness), was determined to stop.

As the battle for Germany reunification unfolded, Thatcher, and her lackey President George Bush, unleashed a propaganda assault against Germany, claiming that a unified Germany posed the threat of a "Fourth Reich."

Thatcher, Bush, the late President of France François Mitterrand, and then Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov used wars, in Iraq and the Balkans, and assassinations as political tools to prevent a challenge to their tottering financial system and control. This Thatcher/Bush-dominated alliance is the infamous "New World Order" to which Bush referred in Janu-

ary 1991, as Bush launched the "Desert Storm" war against Iraq—a British-initiated precedent for the "globalized" NATO, used in today's Balkan catastrophe.

An understanding of the Herrhausen case is crucial, because in this case, the cover story crumbled, exposing a hoax concocted to protect the real authors of a "geopolitical assassination." His murder was of no less strategic importance than the assassination of John F. Kennedy in 1963 (see box).

Murder as a tool of geopolitics

On Nov. 30, 1989, three weeks after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Alfred Herrhausen, the chairman of the Deutsche Bank of Germany, and the closest adviser to German Chancellor Kohl, was killed in a terrorist bombing. The bombing shook the republic, and changed the course of history. Herrhausen's assassination was blamed on a "third generation" of the "Red Army Fraction," a left-wing terrorist group created in the 1970s. But it was soon exposed that the new RAF was a "phantom," a concocted lie to cover for the real authors of the hit on Herrhausen.

When, in 1989, the public was sold a package of pseudo-information about the assassination of Herrhausen, based on the ostensible claim of the RAF that they had carried out the bombing, the veneer seemed plausible. The RAF, after all, had a long history of being an underground guerrilla outfit. Why shouldn't this gang of terrorists, which had fought the state for two decades, have also killed the head of the most important bank in Germany?

In the spring of 1990, the newly elected (and last) government of the (East) German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) began a series of arrests and extraditions of RAF terrorists long sought by West German authorities. It soon turned out that these people, whose faces adorned the terrorist wanted posters hanging all over West Germany ("Warning! Armed and Dangerous!"), had not only "visited" East Germany; they had lived there as citizens of East Germany, in the grayness of everyday socialist life. After a bit of chatter in the media about whether East Germany had been the string-puller behind terrorism in West Germany from the beginning, it turned out that Gen. Erich Mielke's East German State Security (Stasi) had, in fact, now and then, provided protection, and had helped the terrorists escape. But he could not be called the initiator or contractor for the RAF "first and second generations."

In the many subsequent trials against former RAF members, most of whom have now finished serving their sentences, the prosecuting attorney was never able to present any evidence of East German support for the terrorist group in the period *prior* to their becoming "citizens of East Germany," where they fled to as fugitives.

The West German government had always denied having known that the RAF cadre were staying in East Germany, but evidence shows otherwise.

The authors of the 1992 book *RAF Phantom: What Do*

*Politics and Business Need Terrorists For?*¹ printed for the record, the government's reply to a question posed by WDR West German Radio on July 5, 1990: "The office of the Chancellor first learned that 'RAF' members were staying in the G.D.R. at the time of the arrests in June 1990." The authors published the dossier-entry of the Terrorism Department of the Federal Criminal Office (BKA), dating back to 1986, demonstrating that the government's claim could not be true. They showed (p. 383) that the West German government's denial of having entered into an agreement with East Germany was also not credible. The authors' remark in this connection is significant: that the chief of the Federal Intelligence Service (BND), Klaus Kinkel (who became Kohl's last Foreign Minister), personally attempted to dissuade a "Stern TV team" from broadcasting a report on government agreements between the West Germany and East Germany on former RAF members. Kinkel is reported to have said that such agreements would be "*de jure* tantamount to support for a terrorist association."

Kinkel's remark cannot be dismissed easily. *RAF Phantom* also cites remarks by George A. Carver, the former CIA mission chief (1976-79) at the U.S. Embassy in Bonn (p. 381), in an interview with West Berlin's daily, *Tageszeitung*, on March 27, 1992. Carver left no doubt that West German authorities had known about the former RAF members in East Germany as early as the beginning of the 1980s. This point, said Carver, had been the subject of discussion between American and West German intelligence services.

But if the wanted RAF terrorists were known by Western intelligence services to be living in East Germany in semi-retirement, then who was carrying out the RAF terrorism in West Germany for which they had been blamed since the mid-1980s, and who created the "third generation"?

On July 29, 1998, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, in an article entitled "The 'RAF' Consists of Three People," reported on a study by the Cologne Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV), on "The Dissolution of the RAF," following the RAF declaration in April 1998 that it was dissolving. The 38-page study reports that even some of those highest on the wanted list since 1985 may not have even belonged to the



Deutsche Bank Chairman Alfred Herrhausen (center) talks with German Foreign Ministry officials during a visit to West Germany of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov, June 15, 1989. Five months later, Herrhausen was assassinated.

RAF. This includes Andrea Klump, accused of involvement in the Herrhausen murder. Who committed the assassinations, if it was not this gang of "desperadoes"?

Massive security breaches

Witnesses at the site of the Herrhausen assassination, according to authorities, reported having seen at least a dozen people around the site at that time, so that a considerable number of people were presumably involved in preparing and carrying out the bombing. But, according to their own statements, authorities do not know who these people may have been. Astonishing, since the entire area around the site of the assassination was under close surveillance because of Herrhausen's stature, by local police, the State Criminal Office, and private security services.

One week following the assassination, Interior Minister Wolfgang Schäuble refused to provide the Interior Committee of the Bundestag (lower house of parliament) with any information, claiming that anything he said might interfere with the ongoing investigation.

On Dec. 7, 1989, Richard Meier, the former president of the BfV, was questioned by the Bundestag Interior Committee. He was sufficiently informed to be able to testify that "a walking tour of the immediate vicinity of the site of the attack, one-half hour prior to Herrhausen's drive through the site, would have revealed to a schooled eye that two young men,

1. *Das RAF—Wozu Politik und Wirtschaft Terroristen brauchen*, Gerhard Wisenewski, Wolfgang Landgrüber, and Ekkehard Sieker (München, Drömersche Verlagsanstalt, Knauer, second printing, 1997).

dressed in jogging outfits, and each with an earphone, i.e., in radio contact with each other, were attending to a bicycle.” Meier drew sharp criticism when he testified that the advance vehicle of Herrhausen’s convoy had been “withdrawn.”

For whom was Herrhausen a thorn in the side?

U.S. Col. L. Fletcher Prouty (ret.), exposed a crucial matter in interviews with the Italian newspaper, *L’Unità* in 1992 (see accompanying box). Prouty points out that the key to the assassination of Herrhausen was contained in the first 11 pages of a speech which Herrhausen had intended to deliver in New York on Dec. 4, 1989. In that speech, Herrhausen outlined a revolutionary proposal to found a bank for the development of Poland, modelled on the German Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, which had played a crucial role in the postwar economic reconstruction of Germany.

This new bank for Poland was to be financed by funds from Western banks. Poland was to be enabled to participate in a Western-financed reconstruction—which was highly improbable at that point in time, since Poland was straining under an enormous foreign debt burden, and it could not have freed itself under its own power. The foundation for the kind of economic development which Herrhausen foresaw for Poland, would have been the renunciation by Western banks and countries of their claims to the payment of the outstanding debt: a monstrosity of a proposal—for the financiers. Clearly, this proposal went hand in hand with that which Lyndon LaRouche had made one year previously in Berlin.

With this speech, Herrhausen would have called into question the prevailing management policy regarding the growing, catastrophic debt crisis. The policy of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, all of the commercial banks with the exception of Deutsche Bank—a policy directly contrary to that of Herrhausen and LaRouche—was clearly not to develop the overindebted countries, Poland among them.

Instead, by means of so-called structural and “financial reforms,” these countries were ostensibly to be enabled to service their unpayable debt—at the cost of the lives of their citizens.

Two months before his assassination, at the IMF annual meeting, Herrhausen had expressed his conviction that the only chance to end the debt spiral consisted of at least a partial debt moratorium—not only for Poland—and provision of financial means for the economic development of indebted countries. For that, Herrhausen drew the fire of the world of international finance against him.

Biographer Dieter Balkhausen quotes Herrhausen, who had left Washington quickly following one such meeting, as saying that the air was “full of lead.” Herrhausen hinted on other occasions as well, that he saw himself in the role of “reformer”—about whom Machiavelli had warned: Such a

person would have as adversaries those who profit from the old system, while those who stood to profit in the new system would give only half-hearted support.

Deutsche Bank was in a rather unique position in the world of international finance, because over many years, the bank had used its profits to write off its foreign liabilities almost completely. A serious public debate would have revealed the fact that the most highly indebted countries, in Ibero-America, for example, were in fact unable to pay their debts, and other banks, the competitors of Deutsche Bank, would have inevitably had to write off their bad debts as well.

Herrhausen was not himself the inventor of this extraordinarily progressive policy. Deutsche Bank board member Werner Blessing was known, years before Herrhausen, for his public criticism of the debt-crisis recipes of leading banks and financial institutions. Balkhausen notes that Herrhausen was impressed with Blessing’s attitude on this issue. Blessing, who was responsible for North America on the Deutsche Bank board, had announced in 1987 that Deutsche Bank planned to intensify its operations in the U.S. market, and would have become the second-largest bank in the United States, after Citicorp. Blessing died of a heart attack in 1987.

Adviser to the Chancellor

Herrhausen had significant influence with Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and it is well-known that he had shaped the views of the Chancellor with respect to upcoming reunification. (See *EIR*, Aug. 14, 1998, for Kohl’s Ten-Point Program.) The same influence was undoubtedly present in Kohl’s views concerning an economic and monetary union, for which Kohl thought that a political union of European states was a precondition, but that this union was still far in the future.

In July 1998, Kohl published previously secret government documents which show that on Nov. 27, 1989, Kohl described the difficulties with, and his reservations against a premature fixing of the time schedule for the economic and monetary union, to an impatient French President François Mitterrand, who was also insisting on the need for the Four Powers to agree to a possible reunification of Germany. Kohl is reported to have insisted that the “large divergences in stability developments” would endanger the “actual achievement of the divergence goals in the first stage” of a monetary union. On Nov. 30, Herrhausen was assassinated, while Mitterrand, on that very day—his letter arrived in Bonn on Dec. 1—demanded categorically, that “we make decisions in Strasbourg, which obligate us unmistakably to . . . economic and monetary union.”

Kohl’s capitulation was not long in coming. On Dec. 5, he retreated from his position, and conceded to let the resolution pass at the upcoming meeting in Strasbourg planned for Dec. 9. There, Kohl agreed to the resolution to establish a governments’ conference one year later to implement the monetary union—against the interests of Germany, as U.S. Secretary of State James Baker acknowledged three days later, accord-

Herrhausen condemned financier oligarchy

In July 1992, in an article entitled “New Evidence Emerges in the Herrhausen Assassination Case,” Helga Zepp-LaRouche wrote, “Sensational new evidence in connection with the November 1989 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*.”

Zepp-LaRouche’s article provided quotes from the “missing 11 pages,” where Herrhausen challenged the international financier oligarchy. She quoted from Herrhausen’s 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,” Herrhausen said.

“In this connection, at this year’s annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund 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.”

Equally shocking were the statements by Colonel Prouty, quoted by Zepp-LaRouche from Prouty’s interview with Italian journalists in 1992:

“His [Herrhausen’s] 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 chairman 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.”

ing to the Dec. 18, 1989 *Der Spiegel* (*RAF Phantom*, p. 108). This is the background to the betrayal of German interests which Kohl made public in 1998.

While the criticism of the policy Herrhausen had articulated had not yet exploded at the time of his assassination, that changed radically in the spring of 1990. The sabotage launched by the British government under Thatcher against Bonn’s efforts for reunification, culminated in the “Fourth Reich” propaganda campaign against Germany invented in Britain, and the shameless attempt to equate Kohl’s and Hitler’s ambitions.

Compared with the tremendous destruction of the two world wars, “low-intensity warfare” operations, also known

as terrorist warfare, cost relatively little. If one can successfully enforce one’s will upon an adversary with little expenditure of force and money, then that manifests a far greater mastery of the tools of power, with which a political victory can be achieved. It is crucial in such operations that the form of the murder—of a more or less brutal execution of an adversary who plays a strategic role—contain a message, as Prouty correctly noted. The message was: You cannot protect yourself against us, the perpetrators, because we commit our atrocities in public, and we cannot be attacked.

But the recent exposure of British control of terrorism could finally bring to an end this reign of blackmail and low-intensity war against Britain’s own “allies.”