

# Why certain British elites hate Germany

by Mark Burdman

Conor Cruise O'Brien, the more-Anglo-than-thou Irish commentator who initiated the lying propaganda campaign in the British press soon after the opening of the Berlin Wall, to the effect that a unified Germany will become a threatening "Fourth Reich," seems to have a soft spot in his heart for a real fascist regime: Ion Iliescu's dictatorship in Romania. On July 21, British influential Jessica Douglas-Home charged in a column in the *Daily Telegraph* of London, that O'Brien was among the leading apologists in Britain for Iliescu, going so far as to defend Iliescu's deployment of miners to beat up demonstrators in Bucharest.

Douglas-Home stressed that Iliescu is utilizing propaganda themes and methods reminiscent of such 1930s fascist Romanian groups as the League of the Archangel Michael. Not only is Iliescu willing to encourage Romanians to seek scapegoats among gypsies and Hungarians for the country's problems, but he is "like Hitler" in his talk of "outside forces" threatening Romania and Europe, she said.

While O'Brien, Britain's recently ousted Minister of Trade and Industry Nicholas Ridley, and their ilk put out nonsense about an emergent German "Fourth Reich," the fact is that Romanian elites have believed that Romania would be the "Fourth Rome," following the collapse of the "Third Rome" in Moscow. The late dictator Nicolae Ceausescu certainly believed that myth (Romania="Roman-ia"). Iliescu has done absolutely nothing to impede, and has likely even encouraged, the activities of an overtly racist-chauvinist group called *Vatra Romanesca*, which has grown into a mass-based organization since Ceausescu's execution in December 1989.

## 'We prefer Hitler'

Insofar as Germany and the Germans are concerned, O'Brien and his co-thinkers are now admitting what their real policy is: to weaken the positive sides of German culture and economic policy, and to *encourage Nazi-like irrationalism*, so that Germany becomes less of a threat to British control and manipulation in Europe.

On July 20—the anniversary of the failed assassination attempt against Hitler by German resistance figures in 1944—O'Brien authored his latest diatribe, warning that "the domineering component in the German character" is being linked to "those other habits which have put Germany

ahead," such as being hard-working, enterprising, and so on. This is occurring in the context of a new "explosion of national pride that must accompany reunification." And what is the real danger? "The German national character is no worse than those of other nations; indeed, in many ways it is better (if we agree to treat the 12 years of the Third Reich as an absolute aberration). But the ways in which it is better make it exceptionally dangerous when its domineering tendency gets out of hand."

O'Brien is enunciating precisely the justification that leading British circles, typified by Winston Churchill and the mandarins of the British Foreign Office, gave for not supporting the German anti-Hitler resistance during the Second World War. In essence, that 1940s British view—stated publicly on more than one occasion—was, "We prefer Hitler to the available alternatives."

O'Brien's soul-mate Peregrine Worsthorne took matters one step further in his lead editorial for the *Sunday Telegraph* July 22. Worsthorne cited his stepfather Montagu Norman, the evil, late head of the Bank of England, as an authority for the view that Germany is more dangerous to Britain when Germans are good than when Germans are evil. Stated Worsthorne: "My stepfather, Montagu Norman, who as Governor of the Bank of England had done so much to help the German economy after the First World War, lived just long enough to see the earliest beginnings of the German economic miracle after the Second World War. Norman was a profound admirer and ill-weather friend of Germany, which made me all the more surprised to hear him say, shortly before his death: 'I always knew we would beat the bad Germans; but I wish I could be so sure that we will do as well against the good Germans.'"

The truth is that it was Norman himself who ensured that "the bad Germans" were put into power. He and his banker friends in the orbit of the Brown Brothers Harriman bank, were instrumental in bringing Adolf Hitler to power. As for Norman's "help to Germany after the First World War," that must refer to his having sponsored Nazi Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht's rise to power.

"Forty years later it is all too clear what he meant," Worsthorne went on. "So long as the Germans relied upon the vicious side of their national character to bring them European supremacy, Britain would always prove their match. What a different story it would be if they learnt the wisdom to tap their virtues instead. How right Norman has proved to be. . . . The burden of Germany's virtues might bear down upon Britain even more heavily than the burden of Germany's vices.

"In the course of doing good, Germany will make just as many enemies as ever it did in the course of doing harm, and America may well be one of the enemies, as might be Russia. Sooner or later, it is going to be balance of power politics all over again. This could be the opportunity for Britain, which knows about the balance of power."