



## Foreseeable consequences of irresponsible policies

**Western politics is solely seeking ways to maintain its existing hegemony, not peace. This is a path to disaster.**

*René Zittlau*

Wed 16 Jul 2025

### Introduction

We live in a rapid succession of events and decisions of historic significance. Many of them have the potential to influence developments in the world. It is disturbing when political decisions of great importance no longer seem to be based on a rational analysis of the pros and cons, but to an alarming extent on emotions, snap decisions, religious interpretations, beliefs of all kinds, and poorly concealed political and economic dependencies.

The course of events influences our mental state and our feelings. Both have a significant influence on how we perceive the world and thus on our reactions and decisions, both large and small. The “rumbling in our stomachs” that we feel when we hear the news is therefore no coincidence. Despite all our inherent and learned rationality, we should know how to interpret our feelings and emotions in order to make the right decisions.

## **Facts and emotions**

It feels wrong to praise a US president for ending a war that, according to all available information, he planned single-handedly and made possible in the first place by supplying weapons. Furthermore, his statement that he intends to allow the president of the illegally attacked country to live for the time being raises more than just slight doubts about his moral and intellectual suitability for office.

It feels wrong to praise and appreciate the same president for his commitment to the Gaza Strip. For it is this commitment that enables the actions of a politically and morally out-of-control state called Israel. To classify this orgy of violence as anything other than genocide insults the intellect of every educated person and trivializes the historical definition of the term.

The UN now speaks of well over 50,000 dead, the vast majority of whom are women, children, and elderly people. A few days ago, a US university, citing Israeli (!! ) investigations, concluded that approximately 400,000 people have disappeared without a trace in the Gaza Strip as a result of Israel's unimaginable and excessive brutality – out of a total population of two million people before October 7, 2023. To clarify once again: 400,000 missing persons and well over 50,000 proven murders represent around 25 percent of the population of the Gaza Strip. 25 percent of the population of Germany is over 20 million.

**At what percentage does genocide begin?**



It feels even more wrong, downright grotesque, when you see the same US president and Israeli war prime minister praising each other for their lies and war crimes in the news these days. What goes through the mind of one man when he nominates the other for the Nobel Peace Prize against the backdrop of the realities in Gaza, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen ...? According to everything we now know, on June 13, 2025, Israel and the US, along with their supporting “partners,” deliberately violated all internationally agreed, legally binding rules for the prevention of war. Simply to achieve religiously embellished and politically highly questionable goals by military means for geopolitical and economic reasons. Partners of this kind are, in legal terms, accomplices.

**Wikipedia describes this situation as follows (English translation of the German Wikipedia entry “Komplizenschaft”):**

**Complicity** (*Latin: cum plectere = closely intertwined*) means aiding and abetting and is defined in criminal law as a three-step process consisting of deciding to commit a crime, planning it, and carrying it out.

WIKIPEDIA

It feels wrong when the military and political allies of the aggressors Israel and the US—namely France, Great Britain, and especially Germany, which is rapidly seeking orientation in the darkest times of its own history and preparing for war against [Russia, which remains “our enemy”](#), and is becoming increasingly **warmongering**—have the audacity to [not condemn Israel for its completely uninhibited attack](#), but instead condemn Iran for defending its country. Chancellor Merz's reasoning smacks of political schizophrenia and bodes ill for his future work in government: Israel has the right to “defend its existence and the safety of its citizens.”

Who attacked whom here, Herr Merz?



Incidentally, the Chancellor's argument is in no way supported by international law, as international law expert and former UN mandate holder Prof. Dr. iur. et phil. Alfred de Zayas explains in detail in an [interview with “Zeitgeschehen im Fokus”](#). What is more, Zayas emphasizes:

*“Friedrich Merz is apologizing for aggression, apologizing for war crimes, apologizing for crimes against humanity, apologizing for genocide. Unless I am mistaken, such apologetics constitute a crime under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany.”*

[ALFRED DE ZAYAS](#)



With arms deliveries to Israel, Germany, alongside the US, has qualified itself for a place in the dock of future tribunals.

Friedrich “dirty work” Merz and Johann “Russia will always be our enemy” Wadephul have brought a “quality” to German foreign policy that far surpasses the war rhetoric of a woman like Baerbock.

Against this backdrop, it feels equally wrong when Bundeswehr General Freuding, Inspector of the Army and responsible for coordinating military cooperation between the Bundeswehr and Ukraine, announces in the middle of Kiev on July 11, 2025, in German field uniform, [in an interview with the public broadcaster ZDF](#) (from min. 13:20):

*“Today we witnessed the signing of an agreement between the Ukrainian industry and the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense, which is financed by Germany. We only initiated this program at the end of May, and by the end of this month, the Ukrainian armed forces will receive the first long-range missile systems.”*

#### GENERAL FREUDING



This is yet another example of the depths from which German politics views history and the present. Because when deciphered, the facts joyfully announced by Freuding read as follows:

The German arms industry has established production facilities in Ukraine for the manufacture of long-range missiles based on German technology for use against targets in Russia. Since the German government is financing this production, this contract is not, in fact, a contract between “the Ukrainian industry and the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense,” but rather a contract between the German arms industry and the German state to supply Ukraine with German weapons of aggression free of charge. So it is not even a joint venture.

The reason for this legal construct is obvious: Germany wants to at least try to conceal its direct involvement in the war against Russia. The German political and military leadership should be reminded once again: The Federal Republic of Germany crossed the line that six or seven years ago was considered legally certain to prevent its involvement in the war. Only Russia's restraint and objective analysis currently determine the point at which Germany will be declared a de facto party to the war.

It feels completely wrong and alien when Chancellor Merz, at peace with himself, announces from the stage of the German parliament—and the vast majority of parliamentarians agree—that he has no interest in solving the biggest problem currently facing peace in Europe. Where else but in government should everything be done to preserve peace? But Germany's dwarfed politicians have the Chancellor announce: “The means of diplomacy have been exhausted.” (from minute 6:15). He did so knowing full well that since taking office, he had done nothing, absolutely nothing, not even the smallest step, to give diplomacy in the form of direct talks with Russia even the slightest chance.

As a reminder, **diplomacy** is the art and practice of negotiating between authorized representatives of different groups or nations.

When the head of a country's government deliberately acts in such an undiplomatic, even anti-diplomatic manner, then the behavior of General Freuding in Kiev becomes understandable.

The German head of government, who seems to have completely forgotten history, would do well to take one of his predecessors as a role model. He was by no means soft-hearted, but was considered very experienced and realistic in the diplomacy of his time. [Otto von Bismarck](#) said in his Reichstag speech on March 19, 1878:

*“I don't think that peace can be achieved by acting as a referee when opinions diverge (...), but rather in a more modest way (...) as an honest broker who really wants to bring about a deal.”*

## OTTO VON BISMARCK

However, if the will is lacking ...

### **Conclusion: It's time for change**

Does it feel wrong?

It IS wrong!

A policy so unwilling to avert harm from the people — and which even seems to desire such harm — cannot be praised. It must be criticized, condemned, and opposed.

For it destroys the foundations of the painstakingly negotiated international order that has enabled not only Europe but large parts of the world to coexist largely peacefully for decades. This order found its home in the UN and its sub-organizations in the years since 1945. This global, peace-promoting treaty also included many cultural, sports, educational, scientific, trade, and economic organizations.

None of these structures are perfect. And yet, despite all the weaknesses inherent in the UN's veto system, for example, despite the often grueling political balancing acts it entails, and despite its abuses, which are often enough felt and seen by all, we must remember the following: The UN, with its treaties and its flaws, is the only recognized, global security system. Its destruction without at least an equivalent replacement would destroy the foundations of coexistence between states. This would inevitably lead to a return to the law of the jungle, to the rule of might, and thus to the destruction of what has hitherto been considered “civilized.”

This completely unrestrained, cynical disregard for even the most fundamental international norms practiced by the US, Israel, and the West as a whole, and the recklessness and hypocrisy that this reveals, must and will have consequences. It is forcing those who do not want to become victims of this policy and who do not regard their neighboring state as an enemy but as a partner in overcoming the problems at hand, and treat it accordingly, to rethink their previous positions toward the West.

All these realities are crying out for change. Both internationally and nationally, paradoxically, changes at the global level currently seem more likely and feasible than at the national level.

In other words, it is likely that necessary political changes at the national level in Western countries will be forced by the new, changed geopolitical realities rather than by domestic power shifts resulting from the domestic political interplay between the various political currents represented in parliaments and the actions of an extra-parliamentary opposition.

ARTICLE TAGS:

Analysis   Merz, Friedrich   Netanyahu, Benjamin   Freuding, Christian   Wadehul, Johann  
Germany   France   Gaza   Great Britain   Israel   USA   Ukraine   Zayas, Alfred de