

DEMOCRATIC IDEOLOGY, TERRORISM and WORLD DOMINATION

Rudolf Steiner said the following on Oct. 28th 1917 (GA 177): "It is interesting that the excellent statement was made in 1910 [by Francis Delaisi, *La Démocratie et les Financiers*, 1910]: '*... that big capital has succeeded in creating out of democracy the most wonderful, the most effective, the most flexible instrument for the exploitation of the population as a whole. We usually imagine that the men of finance are opposed to democracy – the author in question says in his book – but this is fundamentally mistaken. On the contrary, they lead it and consciously promote it. For it is this – meaning democracy – that provides the screen behind which they conceal their method of exploitation, and they find in it the best means of self-defence against any popular resentment that may arise.*' This shows how someone who has woken up sees that the main thing is not to make loud speeches proclaiming democracy; the main thing is to see clearly the reality of the situation ... namely, from how few centres of command events in the world today are steered and directed ... [The average person] cannot attend [to these things], because they are smothered and buried under the – well, the same public life that is ruled over by the press ..."

Political expert and freelance journalist Wolfgang Eggert has written a series of highly interesting books on themes of compelling relevance today. Of his most recent: *First Manhattan, then Berlin*, Emmy Prize winner Saul Landau, professor at the California State Polytechnic University writes: *Anyone who wants to know how extreme fundamentalism overlaps with current US policy should read this book.* Wolfgang Eggert was interviewed by *Muslim-Markt* on the burning problems in the world. We hope that his startling revelations and clarifying analyses will bring the satisfaction of new insight to our readers. And we know – do we not? – that even the most unpleasant perspectives on the future have to be confronted with our powers of understanding.

Muslim-Markt: Mr. Eggert, looking at the list of your publications, one might be inclined to think that you are what is known as a 'conspiracy theorist'. How do you answer this criticism?

Wolfgang Eggert: My main area of research is the activity of organized crime, lobby-groups, intelligence services, political Lodges, military undercover operations, Apocalyptic sects, geopolitical networks. All of these frequently interwoven groups work deliberately in a concealed and conspiratorial manner. Whether it be deception or murder, the bribing of journalists and politicians or the undermining of their reputation and career, the organizing of putsches, pogroms, terror attacks and wars: conspiracy is a part of their day-to-day business. Investigative researchers into this subject have to be conspiracy theorists, otherwise they are no more than court chroniclers.

MM: The media are of a different opinion.

W.E.: To understand the facts one needs to be aware of the influence exercised on the so-called free press. At the end of the 1940's the CIA launched a real programme, "Operation Mockingbird", for the infiltration and manipulation of the media scene. The special budgets for the influencing of public opinion have, since then, amounted to billions of dollars annually in the CIA.

Investment in the market is done via broadcasting or holding companies, and more rarely through individuals. As an illustration of the latter case, Silvio Berlusconi's vertiginous rise to the role of global player in the media business took place directly from the P2 Lodge of the CIA. The Israeli billionaire Haim Saban took over in a single swoop in 2003 the TV broadcasting companies Pro7, Sat1, Cable 1, N24 and the ddp news agency. Saban's entourage liked boasting of its connections with Mossad, the Israeli intelligence service. Robert Maxwell too, the European press tycoon, was a Mossad man until shortly before his death. Maxwell played an influential part in the founding period of the German Springer concern. The Springer firm is known to insist that each employee must put his signature to five basic principles of the company, the second of which demands "support of the Israeli people's right to live" while the third requires "support of the trans-Atlantic alliance and solidarity in the free community of shared values with the U.S.A.". These words could also stand as a motto above the desk of Rupert Murdoch. The neo-Conservative Australian was the proprietor of a small newspaper when he made friends with the CIA's representative in Australia, Ted Shackley. From that moment onwards Murdoch's rise was steep and spectacular. Today hundreds of newspapers, TV and radio stations worldwide belong to the Murdoch concern. Similarly with Berezovsky and Gusinsky.

So much for the top boardroom level. Of course the horn of plenty, full to overflowing, of the intelligence service also lets a certain amount trickle further down. Money goes to chief editors and the members of broadcasting councils; trusts controlled by the intelligence service give grants; think-tanks hand out invitations and travel tokens. 'Carrot' is available in huge amounts.

MM: ... only carrot?

W.E.: ... and 'stick', too, of course! Have you never wondered why so many press publications of the old Left are pro-American today? There is a very simple explanation for this: When in the beginning of the 1990's the CIA snatched the sensational Rosenholz files from under the nose of Chancellor Kohl, they found themselves in possession of full information on covert Stasi operations in the Federal Republic. This included the identities of the many collaborators of the MfS (East German Intelligence) in the West German media. In order not to lose their reputation and their pensions they have ever since worked free of charge for the CIA. Anyone who refuses to do so is exposed. There are actual cases where this has happened.

"The CIA controls everyone of any importance at all in the mass media," were the words of William Colby, the former head of the CIA at the time of the fall of the Berlin wall. When he was once asked whether the CIA has ever told its undercover people in the press what they are supposed to write, he replied: "Certainly, it happens all the time." Control of the rank and file is a part of the political game, especially in periods of tension like the present. Even clamours for war need mouthpieces. This is the function of the media.

MM: In your work you are mainly concerned with intelligence services.

W.E.: As a trained historian I have always had to do with the great turning-points in our history. The most striking and physically enduring upheavals, without question, are wars. If you make a sufficiently intensive study of the way wars begin, you will automatically find that they don't just "happen" like an accident at work, or fall from Heaven as Divine retribution. If you take your research seriously, you will discover that there is always a warmongering side who stands to gain from the violent conflict. And this is the one that has planned the conflict long in advance in strategic planning circles set up for the purpose. Right down to an event that will trigger the outbreak of war, while at the same time legitimizing one's own actions and bringing one's opponent into an unfavourable starting position. It is up to the intelligence services to carry out this important task. They lay and ignite the coil that leads to war. It was always like this, wherever you look: The assassination in Sarajevo of the successor to the Throne, as the act leading to the First World War; the attack on the Gleiwitz radio transmitter, which was to justify Hitler's invasion of Poland; the Lavon affair, when Israeli agents under a false flag bombed American bases in Egypt, in order to draw the USA onto the "right side" in the lead-up to the Suez War; the fabricated Tonkin incident, which seemingly gave America the right to launch the Vietnam War; Kuwait's provocation of Iraq and the green light given by the Pentagon to Saddam Hussein regarding military action against his neighbour state, in order to lend Bush Senior's first oil-Desert Storm the semblance of an "act of liberation"; the bombing of a tower block in Russia, blamed on Chechen extremists, which justified Putin's military engagement in the Caucasus in 1999; the kidnapping of two Israelis to lend legitimacy to the last war in the Lebanon. Each one of these incidents was a chess-move instigated by intelligence services. Secret services and their machinations have to be considered if one is to understand the central core of historical dynamics.

MM: In a publication of 2003 you accuse military genetic research of bearing some responsibility for the outbreak of epidemics such as AIDS. What would be the motivation for such a thing, when everyone in the world suffers from these epidemics?

W.E.: Records that remained classified for decades show that, on 9th June 1969, Dr. McArthur, acting head of the research department of the US Ministry of Defense, requested an endowment of \$10 million. He said that with this money a new kind of virus was to be developed, which destroys the immune system of the infected organism and does not react to preventive therapy. The funds were granted and the research work was taken up in utmost secrecy in high-security laboratories. The most capable scientists at that time, among them the later "discoverer" of the AIDS virus Robert Gallo, contributed to the project, which was planned to reach its conclusion within 10 years. It was after the lapse of precisely this length of time that the first HIV cases appeared in the USA. The chain of evidence seems in many respects to be beyond question, including the aspect of recombination of the virus. The outcome was the first genetic weapon in human history; though it was as yet unfinished because, unlike its present-day successors, it cannot kill selectively according to region or race and spreads indiscriminately.

For this reason I would not hold any US Government department responsible for the release of the virus, not even the secret service-military complex. The groups involved are more likely to operate above or beside the state, and pursue in part Malthusian, in part religious aims. Jewish and Christian Messianists akin to Shoko Asahara, who released poison gas in the Japanese underground railways, because he hoped in this way to bring closer the prophesied end of the world. There is just one difference: Asahara was a largely isolated sectarian guru. In contrast to this, like-minded people who share his Biblical convictions stand on the threshold of power – in America, England, Israel.

MM: One month before the 11th September 2001 you published a book with the title "In the Name of God – Israel's Secret Vatican as the Fulfiller of Biblical Prophecy". Was your book already 'outdated' one month after publication?

W.E.: No. Of course, I had no foreknowledge of the 11th September. In the book I am discussing the character of groups that stand above the state, and their influence on history in general. ...Beginning with the French Revolution and continuing to the end of Clinton's term of office. "Israel's Secret Vatican" is more an outline of basic principles.

What I did foresee was that the Apocalyptic groups in the religions were working via their political networks at preparations for the 3rd World War. And as is the case in every war, a concrete triggering event was needed, and that was the 11th September 2001. Actually, 9/11 fits quite naturally into the list of the campaigns I have already mentioned, whose purpose is to ignite a war. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the preparatory period leading up to this terrorist coup we find the traces of secret service activity.

MM: A year later, your book "Attack of the Hawks" came out. Why, in your opinion, does German policy today stand so strongly on the side of the hawks?

W.E.: I first asked myself this question when the pro-Government US news channel Fox News announced on the 12th September 2007 that the Germans were supporting America's plans for a war on Iran. The subject of the broadcast was a Security Council meeting in Berlin set up specifically for discussion of the Iran question. The Federal Government was reported to have said that for national economic reasons it was withdrawing from the joint anti-Iranian sanctions campaign, while at the

same time it was encouraging America to bomb Iran's nuclear installations. Fox had been told this by diplomats from various countries.

Assuming this is not a deliberate falsehood put out by the Murdoch company, but a leak based on the truth, we see here in its most blatant form the swing in our – still social-democratic as it has always been – foreign policy. I can only explain this behaviour as the result of US pressure to accept Germany as a permanent member of the World Security Council only on condition that it supports current US policy ...

MM: Your latest book "First Manhattan, then Berlin" claims that there is a risk of a successful terrorist attack in Germany. What is your evidence for this?

W.E.: As I already mentioned, I view Messianic networks as one of the driving forces of human history. Events occur, which are exclusively the work of these radical sects, one such event being the assassination of the Israeli head of State Rabin. It is possible for them to exert the strongest influence, particularly on the explosive situation in the Middle East, which they wish to escalate to the prophesied War of Armageddon. One of the vehicles used is Israel, where leading politicians like Benjamin Netanyahu, when they are facing far-reaching decisions, seek the advice of occult rabbis. On the other hand, in America, following in the wake of George W. Bush, fundamentalist Christians have taken over the White House. Every week, Apocalyptic Bible scholars are invited there and to the Pentagon, to hold bizarre meetings in which Biblical guidance on their daily tasks is given to politicians and military leaders. This dangerous vision of having been chosen by God has been current for a considerably longer time in influential circles of the British establishment. Many Masonic lodges, which are known to exert a strong influence on public life in the United Kingdom, are convinced that the mission of the Jews to lead the world to its revealed end came to a conclusion with the crucifixion of Jesus, and has passed on to the British.

MM: You often mention Christian and Jewish groups in one breath ... ?

W.E.: Common to both the Christian and the Jewish groups is the fact that they appeal to the authority of the Bible, citing prophecies whose content they espouse as a political task, or they uncover, by means of decipherment codes, secret double meanings in the Holy Scriptures. In both camps 9/11 is regarded as fulfilled prophecy, on the evidence of passages from the Bible. In both camps there are whisperings about the coming of a parallel event, let us call it 11/9. A nuclear attack is repeatedly mentioned ... and Berlin. When my book came on the market in November 2005, this horrific picture seemed to lie in the far distant future. This has now changed; the warnings of neo-Conservative politicians and State-supporting media are reaching us every week in the German language. In style and content they are like the propaganda in the USA: When the big bang comes – so runs the 'briefing' for the trusting man-in-the-street – the culprits will be Muslims. It could be so, in fact; but who in the terrorist background is pulling the strings that keep everything in motion, of this – for very good reasons – we hear precious little.

MM: You say, among other things, that the interests of extreme fanatics who misuse Islam as a justification for their actions, coincide surprisingly often with the interests of the hawks; How do you explain this?

W.E.: You mean the symbiosis between radical Muslims and intelligence agents? Let us take the best-known example: Osama bin Laden and al Qaida. Both of them are creations of American geopolitics. When the White House decided, during the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, to win the Cold War, a central pillar of this undertaking was the plan to prepare a new Vietnam for the Russians in Afghanistan. To achieve this end, the Pentagon poured billions into the mobilizing of an Islamist army whose task was to wage a civil war and make life uncomfortable for the pro-Moscow government in Kabul. They succeeded in this, and when the Russians came in "to help", they had fallen into the trap. The war in Afghanistan with its heavy losses was a thick nail in the coffin of the Soviet Union. And the grave-diggers there, were the mujaheddin. The collecting and transit post for the Muslim fighters in Afghanistan was called al Qaida. Its organizer was Osama bin Laden, who stood on the payroll of the CIA under the name Tim Osman. He and his people were trained, paid and armed in America.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, this collaboration is said to have been brought to an end by a series of attacks by al Qaida on American installations. This seems to me to be an alibi set up to disguise the fact that the collaboration continued. The fact is, that Washington overcame the vast Communist empire, not in order to liberate the people there, but to open up its markets and resources. And the chief resource targeted was the oil that is extracted in the southern semi-autonomous republics of the former USSR. The attempt was now made, by means of putsches, civil wars and rebellion procured with money, to remove these Muslim regions from the Russian sphere of influence. And who appears again as a main asset in these battles which, almost without exception, were serving the geopolitical interests of the Americans? Yes, quite correct: bin Laden's bearded warriors of God. They would soon be running riot in the Balkans, too, when the USA was pursuing its geostrategic interests there in the mid-1990's. In this connection – as has been confirmed by investigative reports of US Congress – the Americans were working as close allies of al Qaida; hand in hand with them.

The Clinton government outwardly declared Osama bin Laden the "Most wanted Terrorist" and offered astronomical sums for his capture. The reality behind all this hue and cry was experienced by a number of Islamic states when they came forward with the information: The man you are looking for is in our country. Do you want him dead or alive? – In each of these cases extradition was obstructed by the American government. Sudan, which insisted most strongly on his extradition, was taught a lesson in the form of an aerial bombardment. The reason given, by way of provocation, was that Sudan was supporting terrorism.

Meanwhile, Osama alias Tim had, under the eyes of American and English intelligence, official business and residential addresses in London. In 1996 he was a guest of the British overseas intelligence service MI6, who employed the restless jack-

of-all-trades as a subcontractor for an assassination attempt on Muammar Gaddafi by the "Libyan Islamic Fighting Group", a cell of al Qaida. For his part, the Libyan head of state had just pledged a princely sum for the capture of bin Laden. I could continue for a long time the story of the coalition between al Qaida and the secret service-military complex in the West. It reaches right down to the time of the 11th September. The government-controlled radio station in France "Radio France International" and the daily newspaper "Le Figaro" revealed that as late as July 2001 Osama bin Laden was undergoing kidney treatment in the American hospital in Dubai – where he was visited at his sick-bed by the local CIA contact. Do you feel like a 'second helping'? – At the beginning of July 2002, after the terrorist flights of New York and Washington, the American Time magazine stated on the authority of high-ranking circles within European intelligence, that Abu Qatada, the spiritual head of the al Qaida network, lives with his wife and children in the North of England. In a safe house made available to him – together with a generous allowance – by the British intelligence service.

Bin Laden, al Qaida, Mujaheddin are all children of the USA. The Taliban are a direct consequence. And to the exact observer these groups have been working, without exception, in the interest of the USA. They are still doing so today, if we accept the Pentagon's word that bin Laden people were behind the 11th September. Why? Well, the neo-Conservative power centre in Washington had the military campaigns against Afghanistan and Iraq firmly on their agenda when Bush seized power. But they knew that such an openly imperialistic venture could only be pushed through on an international level if – so the neo-Conservatives were saying in the year 2000 – a new Pearl Harbor were to take place. Do you see? The troops were all prepared, and 9/11 was the opener of the door to war. Now Iran is on the agenda. The American secret service apparatus is financially rich, but slow in movement and poor in mind and spirit – they are fond of repeating themselves. So the world can now prepare itself for the next opener of the door.

MM: Why was there no terrorist provocation before the beginning of the Iraq war?

W.E.: Because the engagement in Iraq could still be associated, on the feeling level, with the 11th September. The memory of the violence of 9/11 was still very much alive. It had presented the White House with a huge surplus of emotion, which Bush could continue to draw upon. Hence the persuasive power of the horror-picture – "the mass-murderer of American civilians is lurking in fact or at least symbolically in the vicinity of Baghdad". These were, incidentally, the words of American former Senator Gary Hart who today, himself, warns of a terrorist attack provoked, or even contrived, by the CIA. The second part of the propagandist falsehood that led to war focussed on the weapons of mass-destruction with which Saddam was allegedly threatening the Western alliance – and Israel.

This is now repeating itself. The campaign on the mass-destruction theme is already in full swing. Not, however, the al Qaida campaign, significantly enough. This would not be easy. After Afghanistan and Iraq the wars of conquest for the "capture of bin Laden" are starting to wear thin. Also, here in Germany, the influence of the red-green Schroeder government's campaign against the Iraq war, which raised doubts as to the genuineness of 9/11, continues to be felt. Despite all the support we give, we are still looked upon in the USA as unreliable allies. This is what causes me concern. A series of attacks with dirty nuclear devices in America and Germany, the sources of which could be traced back to Iran, would suit the hawks in the White House admirably at the present time. In the first place, German public opinion, the government and even the opposition would be tied to US policy for the foreseeable future. And secondly, an attack with ABC (atomic, biological or chemical) weapons would provide Cheney & Co. with just the smoking guns they were searching for in vain in Iraq; and in addition it would justify implementation of their war-plans against Teheran. Thirdly, an act of this kind provides a pretext for revoking the US Constitution – whereby the neo-Conservatives would avoid certain defeat in the 2008 elections.

MM: You write not only about the present, but also the past, and you claim that there were certain interests at work which – to put it simply – kept Hitler alive. Is there in your opinion a thread of continuity from those events on into our own time?

W.E.: There is, quite concretely, a thread where the political destiny of certain leaders is concerned. Let us take the example you have suggested – Hitler. In the 1920's the powers that would later be the victors and, together with them, a large number of elite groups were interested in the rise to power of someone who would carry out the National-Socialist programme. Imagine to yourself what it was like at that time: Lenin had risen to power in the Kremlin. For the capitalists of this world his regime of state ownership represented the worst imaginable scenario. Leading concerns such as the Shell petroleum company had invested vast sums in Russia, which were now suddenly lost. Just like Ford, the king of the American motor industry, the head of Shell also gave large sums to Hitler, in the hope that he would come to power and defeat the Soviets in a war. The same policy was pursued by influential sections of British Conservatism, which was deeply disturbed by Lenin's anti-colonial campaign. India, Egypt, Ireland, half the Empire was in turmoil because the Reds were using the treasures of the Tsar to finance world revolution. And so, as I said, Hitler also received support from the English. Finally, there was a card in the game, that was going to "play a trump". This was the unspoken 'common sense' understanding between Roosevelt and Stalin that a war unleashed in the heart of Europe would ultimately benefit only those powers with the biggest hinterland: America and Russia. It was clear that if they held together they would win a new world war and greet one another with a handshake in the middle of an exhausted and ruined Europe. This is exactly what happened. The support by means of which Roosevelt kept alive the collapsing Soviet regime after 1941 was breathtaking in its scope. But it bore interest, because the USA was able to install its bases throughout the world and replace England as a world power. This is the reason why Hitler was so fundamentally important for this game. His programme of national self-sufficiency, with its goal of taking over Soviet Ukraine, was a guarantee of war; while the political physiognomy of National Socialism offered those directing it behind the scenes a perfect target for antipathy, a platform which continually built itself up in support of the argument that war is "inevitable". And so long as Hitler was alive, the war continued. After Pearl Harbor each new day of Hitler's rule brought the Americans and Russians one kilometre closer to the heart of Europe.

MM: ... and today?

W.E.: In its imperial strategy America is pursuing today the same policy towards Iran as it did towards Germany in the past. How is the White House to justify a war against a densely-populated state that is inclined towards the West? It cannot be done, and that was the situation in Germany in the 1920's, just as it applied to Iranian development before the presidency of Ahmadinejad. The US geopoliticians were confident that his rise to power would give them what the rise of Hitler had delivered 'carriage paid': namely, a fully effective target for Western hostility. Build-up of weapons ... antisemitism ... anti-modernism ... military ambitions. True or not, the slogans sound familiar. As do some of the aims: Shell financed the NSDAP because it wanted, via Hitler, to get to the oil resources of Russia. And today? According to the CIA's "World Factbook" Iran possesses, with 133 gigabarrels, the second-largest reserves of conventional crude oil. There are enough strategic papers of the neo-Conservatives showing that these are the resources they wish to acquire. G. W. Bush is in the oil business, just as a part of his administration only entered politics via oil lobby associations; they are all well able to judge the value of the claims that have, for years, been made with American flags.

This is the reason why the White House so dexterously supported the election of Ahmadinejad to the presidency. In the weeks before this fateful election the news was sent out that the Pentagon was flying American fighter aircraft from Iraq and Afghanistan into Iranian airspace in order to test the location of radar defence systems in the event of a war. There can be no doubt that the wave of indignation in Iran influenced the approaching election to the disadvantage of the up-and-coming pro-Western reformers. Added to this is the fact that, in a remarkable coalition extending from the White House to left-wing circles in Europe, the Iranians were called upon overwhelmingly to boycott the election. Many left-wing and liberal voters followed the call. The traditionalists, on the other hand, had little reason to do so. Hence the victory of the Right, which seems to me to have been the purpose of the exercise.

Is the Iranian head of State therefore an agent of American imperialism? No, as little as Hitler was. But without realizing it he is playing their game. This could be truly fatal, if seen from the perspective of "God is with us". While Hitler and his entourage were largely free of religious sentiment, Ahmadinejad – like Olmert in Israel or Bush in the USA – is the leader of a nation that sees itself as an integral part of Divine providence. And just as the Evangelicals in the American government are firmly convinced of the Second Coming of Christ, and just as the Conservative political establishment in Israel dreams of the coming of the Messiah, so the Shiite Ayatollahs await the descent from Heaven of their own Teacher, the Mahdi. The problem lies in the small print: The earthly birth of each one of these saviour figures is proclaimed to take place on a wave of blood. Only global destruction brings salvation. Only the end heralds the beginning.

MM: What you say is not quite convincing, because according to that logic Iran should withdraw from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, drive the Jews from their own land and do whatever else will bring about an escalation of war.

W.E.: That Teheran is behaving more passively in comparison with Washington, is beyond doubt. This does not contradict my assumption of belief in the Mahdi, since it is widely understood among its adherents that their Muslim traditions forbids warmongering. Nevertheless, his coming is awaited and will be joyfully welcomed. On the level of feeling, this leaves little room for an all-out attempt to forestall the impending catastrophe that is associated with his Coming.

MM: Is it not possible that the USA – like every great power in the history of great powers – has, in Iran, found for the first time an opponent who, ideologically at least, cannot be so easily defeated? In spite of the 'Bild-Zeitung' there is considerable sympathy for Ahmadinejad even in Germany, though it may only be admitted behind closed doors.

W.E.: Unfortunately, the decision will fall on the battlefields and not, as in ancient India, at the gates of the universities. And so America, if Armageddon cannot be prevented, will at some point suffer defeat in a conflict with China. But here we are predicting the unpredictable.

Militarily, Iran by itself would not stand the faintest chance against the USA. Maybe it would succeed in open battle, in conflict man to man – who knows? But the Americans have not engaged in warfare of this kind for decades. And why should they? If need be, they bomb the enemy from an unreachable altitude of 10 or 20 kilometres, until the land down below has been reduced to a Dresden or a Hiroshima. Then the brave "liberation troops" appear on the scene. Iran's only chance would lie in an intervention of Russia. But even this eventuality would not help to win the war, because a trial of strength between Washington and Moscow would lead in the medium term to the Gog versus Magog scenario of the Biblical Apocalypse. Culminating in a global nuclear holocaust – with no victor.

MM: And do you see no hope of a solution?

W.E.: One of the contradictions in our democracies is the fact that here the media control the State (and thus the commonweal) and not vice-versa. It is therefore possible for a single wealthy investor to influence elections, guide decision-making, determine voting, bring political careers to an end, while he himself does not even need to be a citizen of this country. The neo-Conservative cabal in England, America and Israel makes intensive use of this strategic advantage. The Muslim world, parts of which are very prosperous, ought not, perhaps, to hand it all over to their most radical opponents.

Translator's Note:

The above article appeared on the following website: www.muslim-markt.de and was published in the Dec. 2007/Jan. 2008 issue of *Symptomatologische Illustrationen*, Basel. The editor W. Lochmann prefaced the article with the Rudolf Steiner quote and his own introductory comment.