

Schmidt: Building a foundation for the next century

'Peace has a concrete meaning only for those who know what war means'

There can be no doubt that over the last two years Helmut Schmidt has developed into one of the greatest statesmen of this century. His opponents particularly have had to take increasingly embittered note of that fact.

In the United States there are few who would not be glad if President Carter exhibited the potential to go through a similar process. Those Americans who complain about the failure of leadership of this Administration (and not only this one), however, are only rarely willing to make the intellectual and emotional effort to discover the roots of the greatness to which West Germany's Chancellor has grown.

The difference between the two nations and their leaderships is simple: Germany has twice already been the battleground for world war, and that is an experience that the United States has, happily, never yet undergone. It is the threatening certainty of the danger of a third, this time nuclear, world war that, more than anything else, gave Helmut Schmidt the strength to realize his world-historic initiatives of this year — the 25-year treaty that he concluded with Leonid Brezhnev in May, and, in collaboration with France's Giscard d'Estaing, the launching of a new, gold-backed monetary system.

Both these closely linked initiatives are based on the recognition that a nuclear war can only be prevented if the world economic crisis is overcome by a "Grand Design" program, that is, a global development program based on the most advanced technologies, in which close economic cooperation between East and West represents the only sure foundation for detente. And precisely because Schmidt has acted so decisively this year, his person is now perhaps the most important barrier to a total confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact states.

Japanese Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda, during his recent trip to Saudi Arabia, directed an urgent appeal to the world, in which he compared the current situation with the eve of World War II. This assessment is shared down to the finest detail by Italy's Prime Minister Andreotti, the Vatican, French President Giscard d'Estaing, Chancellor Schmidt, and Soviet chief of state Brezhnev.

In the United States, on the other hand, which bears a special responsibility in this extremely dangerous crisis, not one responsible politician has yet been heard from.

Granted, the U.S. did take part in the European theater of war during the last two world wars. It was also engaged in wars like Korea and Vietnam. But

never was its territory, and thus its entire population, subjected to modern warfare. And therefore the population and its political leaders have no sensuous understanding of the unspeakable horrors of a world war, of the terror of bombardments, of the grieving over dead, the hopeless sight of the rubble, a horror that has already been deeply engraved on the consciousness of the population of East and West Europe over generations.

Helmut Schmidt made this explicit in a speech — which the press greeted with deadly silence — on May 5 at a reception for Brezhnev.:

"In this century Germans and Russians twice took up arms against each other. Particularly the last and most horrible of all wars brought immeasurable suffering to the people of both nations. We, the political leaders, must therefore make sure — this is our mandate and at the same time our political legitimation before history — that this is never repeated. I am convinced that the farmer in the Ukraine thinks no differently about this than does the miner in the Ruhr.

"The memory of the war cannot, however, stand as an unbreachable wall between us. Despite all the horrors, despite all the misery, wars have brought our peoples comparable experiences and similar insights. I'm thinking of the words that one of your poets wrote:

"The word peace can have a concrete meaning only for him who knows what war means; and if there is anything conceivable for which I can be thankful for war, it is that it has bestowed on me the understanding of the word peace."

"This, I know, is as true for you, Mr. Secretary-General (Brezhnev), as it is for me."

What is expressed here is the driving motor behind the agreement between Brezhnev and Schmidt. Anyone who doubts it either has no notion of history, or is insane in the clinical sense, in the sense of losing his grasp of reality — like Zbigniew Brzezinski, British columnist and intelligence stringer Robert Moss, and others who immediately began to chatter about "self-Finlandization."

The broader problem is that there exists a profound blindness in the United States to the connection between the political processes directed by monetarist policy and the developments toward war. It was recognition of this fact that made it possible for Helmut Schmidt to achieve a complete break with the conception he presented to the West German Bundestag in May 1976: that the way out of the economic crisis was to be found in the methods of John Maynard Keynes and Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht.

In the last two years Schmidt was confronted with a flood of developments that had unignorable parallels with events before the First and Second World Wars, and that above all made explicit that there was a point of irreversibility beyond which tendencies toward war could virtually not be stopped — namely, when the constellation of forces that motivated a war-prevention policy was decisively weakened. In those two years Schmidt had to learn in an often grueling fight what it meant to defend the interests of his country, the Federal Republic — the fight for the Federal Republic's nuclear-energy policy, the fight against the dollar crisis. The stronger Schmidt grew, the heavier the fire from the opponents of his policies, from countless internal destabilizations to terrorist assassinations of his closest advisors and friends, like Jürgen Ponto and Hanns-Martin Schleyer. Where a weaker personality would have capitulated under this incredible pressure, Schmidt grew to greatness. And he learned, as not many other Germans have, to overcome the trauma of German "lack of history," enforced on them by British psychological warfare experts like Hugh Trevor-Roper, to discover the historical basis for two catastrophes in this century, and also the historical roots for the policy of a humanist republic.

The dynamic before the World Wars

Toward the end of the 19th century an alliance had formed, based on technological and economic cooperation, between Russia, Germany, and France, whose success would have led to enduring peace and a permanent economic boom in Europe. Count Sergei Witte, the son of a German-born industrialist in the Caucasus and the Finance Minister of Russia from 1892 to 1903, wanted to transform Russia into a "hot-house of capitalism," and hoped to realize this with the help of particularly French and German capital and know-how. Witte's model was the American economic boom, and, with regard to the anti-British McKinley Administration, he saw Germany's role as that of middleman between Europe and America.

On the French side, Foreign Minister Hanotaux followed a policy that would have integrated the French economy with the blossoming industry of Germany's Rhineland, a concept that Adenauer took up once again in the 1920s. Particularly after Bismarck was discharged, the influence of German industry on the policies of Kaiser Wilhelm opened Germany for such a trilateral alliance, which was expressed in, among other things, the decisive German support for the Krueger Republic in southern Africa. On the occasion of a German state visit to St. Petersburg in 1898 Witte expressed his policy as follows:

"Above all we must strive to create an enduring alliance between Russia, Germany, and France. When these states finally ally firmly and unshakably with each other, then doubtless other states on the conti-

nent will join this central alliance, and in this way will be created a united continental alliance that will free Europe from those burdens that it has placed on itself by its own inner dissension. Then Europe will become great and bloom again."

It was precisely this continental alliance that the British monarchy and aristocracy feared would end the era of British imperialism. Certainly there were battles over colonies, as the tensions with Russia over Persia, Afghanistan, and Manchuria make clear. But it was far more this newly strengthened self-consciousness of the continental Europeans wanting to pull away from England's financial control that brought the aristocrats and Black Guelphs to counter-attack. In France the "Dreyfuss Affair" led to a destabilization of the government, in which Hanotaux was forced to resign. England succeeded in manipulating Russia into a war with Japan, which first weakened Witte's position and then finally, via the British-incited "Revolution" of 1905, led to his resignation. Meanwhile the American President, McKinley, was murdered by a British agent. After all of Germany's anti-British foreign allies had thus been eliminated, it was easy for England to turn Germany to an anti-Russian course, and at that point nothing more stood in the way of World War I.

The outcome of the First World War brought the British Guelphs no successes, despite the Versailles Treaty forced on Germany. The dream held by British geopoliticians like Cecil Rhodes and Houston Chamberlain of ruling Russia, the "Eurasian heartland," was nullified by Lenin's successful revolution. Moreover, Lenin's policy was based on technological and economic progress to a far greater degree than before, under Count Witte. Lenin's plan for "Restoration of the World Economy" that Chicherin brought with him to the Rapallo Conference after Genoa in 1922 contained not only many far-reaching proposals for German-Soviet cooperation, such as the creation of a new world monetary system on the basis of an international gold unit, but it was above all an explicit revision of the Versailles Treaty, that had once again threatened to consolidate the rule of the Black Guelphs over continental Europe. On the German side it was Hugo Stinnes, Otto Wolff, and other representatives of mainly Ruhr industry, as well as the head of the Reichswehr, General von Seeckt, and General von Schleicher, who concurred with the Rapallo policy. The British aristocracy feared that from this beginning a new "Grand Design" would develop, that would also draw in France, Japan, and the United States, and therefore gave the green light for the project that turned out to be the most consequential intelligence operation in history.

It was directly the British aristocracy and its Black Guelph allies, the Bavarian royal family of Wittelsbach, that sought out and built up Hitler and the rest of what later became the Nazi leadership, with the help of Chamberlain protégé Karl Haushofer. Haushofer

dictated the text of *Mein Kampf* to Hitler word for word while the latter sat in prison, and as a result the book is nothing but a *volkisch* recapitulation of what British geopoliticians had long ago cooked up in the interests of British imperialism. All aspects of Nazi ideology — the myth of the superiority of the Aryan race, the theory of “blood and soil,” and so on — were simply the concrete application of British studies of the cult of Apollo and Dionysus to the national particularities of Bavaria and Austria. An ancient concept, but so effective that it is still being used by the same Black Guelphs, as we will see.

It was the same Hjalmar Schacht whom Milton Friedman so hotly defends today whose initiative, with Haushofer, is to thank for the fact that the British Round Table Cliveden Set, Neville Chamberlain, and Winston Churchill decided, after Hitler's electoral defeat in 1932, to bring Hitler to power.

The parallels to the situation today are only too obvious. The same British aristocratic circles and their Black Guelph allies are, with the same ideas, on the way to provoking a third world war. And therefore it is particularly significant when Helmut Schmidt stresses again and again that the transfer of government power from his Social Democratic-Free Democrat coalition to the Christian Democrat-Christian Social union opposition would be a disaster. The reason for this disaster is named Franz Josef Strauss.

CSU head Franz Josef Strauss, for whom scandal is the political method of choice, and his friend Otto von Hapsburg are intimately associated with the circles following an international strategy with one clear goal: to destroy the new European Monetary System, the EMS, at any price, and to eliminate all of its supporters via scandals, government crises, and terrorist assassination.

The latest party conference of Strauss's Christian Social Union has just one parallel: Hitler's appearance at the Sportpalast. In the Munich Gymnasium, before a crowd of 20,000, with floodlights beamed on the speakers, the *volkisch* spirit was called to life. Men in *lederhosen* stood on their chairs and cracked long whips, as the slogan was declared: Let the whips crack, to drive the spirit of the Reds out of Bavaria. And in the speeches of Strauss and his minion Goppel: “We need law and order, we Bavarians need love of homeland, we Bavarians have a 1,500-year history, in all those centuries our way of thinking has not changed, we must be proud of our Bavarian roots.”

Here is the applied version of the British studies of the cult of Dionysus; here is how it is possible to keep a backward population under total control with a simple mythos based completely on superstition.

The basis for Strauss's success is the same that helped Hitler to success in Bavaria. The population in the rural areas of Bavaria work predominantly as small farmers, peasants, and to this day have not completely freed themselves from a belief in feudal structures. It is thanks to the Black Guelph-controlled

tabloids, the “rainbow press,” that this peasant population finds the latest bedtime stories about Princess Margaret a subject worthy of discussion, and the networks of Archbishop Lefebvre are responsible for the fact that part of Franz Josef Strauss's electoral base actually believes that World War II occurred only because Our Lady of Fatima predicted it would in 1917.

Strauss's electoral base is to West Germany what the Shi'ites are to Iran, and they have the same mother: the British secret services. And it is also no accident that Strauss's house organ, the *Bayernkurier*, retailed the Chinese thesis that World War III is unavoidable on the same day as did Lord Allport in the British press.

Humanist tradition

The meeting between Helmut Schmidt and Giscard d'Estaing in Aachen was without doubt one of the happiest events of these difficult times. Not only because it reflected the firm decision of the two heads of state to counter the threat of war with the rapid realization of the new monetary system, but also because the two leaders called upon the spirit of Charlemagne, the founder of both Germany and France. Both leaders were consciously carrying forward the inheritance of Adenauer and de Gaulle, but the bond between the French and German peoples goes much deeper. In citing Charlemagne, Schmidt and Giscard pledged themselves to the thousand-year-old humanist tradition of the city-builders.

Charlemagne has an important place in that tradition. He brought to an end the phase of dark barbarism in Europe with the spread of technology and, in the tradition of the early Neoplatonics of the Catholic Church, particularly St. Augustine, laid the basis for a never-before-seen system of education of the population. The achievements of Charlemagne were possible above all because of his work with the Caliph of Baghdad, Harun al Rashid. Through trade and the importing of technologies created by the Arab renaissance, the economy achieved considerable expansion, and the strategic alliance with Harun al Rashid assured stability for Charlemagne's empire.

Even if Prince Saud and Prince Faisal did not officially participate at the Aachen meeting, nevertheless this historic Islamic-European bond from 1,200 years ago was reflected in the talks, a bond lately strengthened by the ties of the EMS to the Arab Monetary Fund.

Anyone who has followed Helmut Schmidt's speeches and interviews of the last few months will have noticed something else as well. They reveal not only an intensive study of the Hanse — a significant example of the progress that produced urban culture — but also Schmidt's particular interest in the ideas of the American Revolution. In an interview with the *Herder Korrespondenz*, a journal close to the Vatican,

Schmidt directed a ringing appeal to the American population on the occasion of the Fourth of July to return to the spirit that is expressed in the American Constitution.

This calling upon the great humanists of the past for the political fight today is more than mere historical allusion. It is a necessary component of self-conscious action on the basis of reason. Schmidt — who, as even the most hostile press, such as *Der Spiegel*, must report, has been asking himself over and over again in recent months what of his policies will be of enduring value — could happily declare in Aachen that with the realization of the EMS he had laid the foundation for the next hundred years.

A great politician is one who, beyond the day-to-day tasks and the considerations of power politics, takes on, as the leader of a nation, the responsibility to achieve a decisive contribution for the development of humanity as a whole. That Schmidt has thereby grown conscious of the humanist tradition, and therefore understands his own actions not just in themselves, but as part of the successive development at successively higher levels of the history of mankind, means that he has probably come very close to the secrets of the Neoplatonist humanist elite.

That Schmidt and his allies are today standing up for a global development program on the basis of the most advanced technology reflects not the advice of distinguished economists and “power brokers,” but the fact that Schmidt recognizes that material progress alone cannot solve the moral crisis into which the West has fallen since the 1960s.

Continuous technological and economic progress is indeed the prerequisite for bringing men out of bestial conditions, but that is not the end in itself. On the contrary, it is much more the case that the development of humanist thought has made material progress possible, and thereby effected the ennobling of men to the highest level of human spiritual-intellectual quality, to reason.

Most important, what Schmidt has begun to do since Brezhnev's visit is to give the German population a reason for the life of each individual, by giving the Federal Republic a national purpose: German technology for the development of the world. With Schmidt the Federal Republic has ceased to be an occupied country for the first time since the Second World War, and has begun to develop real consciousness of itself as a sovereign humanist republic.

The rocketing increase in Schmidt's popularity since the beginning of this year — noted by the British press with the greatest annoyance — proves that the majority of the population is demanding such a humanist policy with all its might. Aside from excrescences such as Strauss's electoral base and the so-called left, whose acceptance into the Social Democratic Party (SPD) after the student upsurges of 1968 is regarded by Schmidt's *Kanalarbeiter* faction in the party as the biggest mistake in the recent history of the SPD, the majority of the German population is genuinely humanist. This is expressed not only in the fact that the Federal Republic built itself up into one of the strongest industrial nations in the world after World War II, but above all in the widespread humanist education of the population. Even if certain “left” reforms have threatened this education since the end of the 1960s, the majority of the population has, to varying degrees, at least in its youth been introduced to the works of Schiller and Goethe, of Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven, and to the moral values transmitted in those works. Granted, for most in the population the fostering of this tradition is usually thought of only on holidays, but the precise identification of one's “better self” with that experience of a particular time in one's life is the prerequisite for the development of a people, which can then be tremendously encouraged by a humanist leadership. When a child has heard even once in school Schiller's notion of “the beautiful soul,” chances are that later, as an adult, he will still look up to the ideal of passionate action on the basis of reason, as Schiller defined it.

And although Helmut Schmidt's policies have the greatest significance for the maintenance of peace, it is perhaps even more important that he has given the population of the Federal Republic a great task in its dealings with the world. The Soviet Union, France, Italy, the Arab states, Japan, and certain countries in the Third World have set out on the same path, and with them the Federal Republic has achieved a unity of principle that is the only basis for lasting peace. This league of sovereign humanist republics, underwriting together the development of the world, must be expanded as quickly as possible. The biggest question now, as Helmut Schmidt knows, is whether the United States can be brought into that alliance before world war occurs.

—Helga Zepp-LaRouche
Chairman, European Labor Party