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‘Fourth Reich’ attack on Germany

by Mark Burdman

Not since the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the initiation, at that point, of a “Germany is the new Fourth Reich” black propaganda campaign by the British government, by Anglo-Irish curmudgeon Conor Cruise O’Brien, and by British co-thinkers in François Mitterrand’s France, has there been such an intensive anti-German campaign, as is now coming from London. Now, as then, the most strident spokesman for this view, is Baroness Margaret Thatcher.

From Oct. 8-9, her ladyship was a featured speaker at a meeting, in Colorado Springs, Colorado, of the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation Association and the Foundation for International Policy. Other speakers included former President Bush, former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov, and former French President Mitterrand. Mitterrand rarely travels these days, because of his terminal prostate cancer, but he exerted himself to come to Colorado Springs, with full medical team, “out of friendship for George Bush,” he declared.

According to an Oct. 10 Washington Times account, Thatcher’s central theme was that a strong, united Germany now wants to “dominate Europe.” She raved that Germany’s “national character is to dominate. There is something in the character of the German people that led to things that never should have happened. Why was it that the German people let Hitler do the things he did? This is something I still fear. Even to this day.”

Her words were so blunt, that even Lawrence Eagleburger, Bush-era acting secretary of state and top figure at Kissinger Associates, Inc., commented, “I was a little surprised she was quite so public about it.” Of course, neither Eagleburger, nor others in attendance, would have had the integrity or guts to remind Mrs. Thatcher of the role of the British establishment, and the City of London, in installing Hitler into power in the early 1930s, nor of the role of host George Bush’s father, Prescott Bush, in that same filthy business. Be that as it may, Thatcher’s position is now the prevailing, and publicly stated view, of leading quarters in the British Conservative Party.

A desperate oligarchy

The British hysteria about Germany is rooted in several factors. First, it is symptomatic of the state of mind of a British oligarchy that knows that the global financial system on which it has based its power, is disintegrating, and which therefore tends to lash out in all directions. As a subset of that phenomenon, Britain’s own political arrangements are set for a number of shocks, with anticipation throughout establishment circles that the John Major government will be slaughtered, whenever general elections are held. Elections must be held, by law, by the autumn of 1997 at the latest, but could take place much earlier.

Second, the British elites, as reflected in a number of commentaries in the British press, are increasingly obliged to concede it as likely, that the anti-British U.S. President Bill Clinton will be re-elected in November 1996. This would mean, obviously, a relative weakening of the Conservative Revolution/Gingrich forces in the United States, upon which Britain has counted, together with the networks of George Bush and Sir Henry Kissinger, to counter the American President’s foreign policy approaches. Clinton has dumped the so-called “special relationship” with Britain that had been cultivated so assiduously during the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, and has cultivated what he calls a “unique relationship” with Germany, in order to stabilize the situation in Russia, and other countries to Germany’s east.

That is directly related to the third factor. The British, ever-sensitive to the prevailing winds, sense, correctly, that German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and the German political class more generally, are in the midst of a strategic shift. Whereas, in past months, Kohl was quite willing to appease London’s wishes, and to balance out his relationship to the United States, by maintaining close links to Britain, things now are changing. Germany, more than any other country in the West, is sensitive to what is happening in Russia. The Germans know that the Russians could undergo a nasty turn. Under such conditions, the typical German reflex is to seek closer relations with both the United States and France, as security against what is happening to the east. Should that German-French-American combination consolidate, and achieve some approach for stabilizing Russia by dumping the Thatcher-Bush “International Monetary Fund reform” policy, the chances will increase for Britain’s nightmare scenario to come into reality: a coalition for develop-
ment of what British geopoliticians call “the Eurasian heartland.”

**Strongest attack on Germany since 1937**

The Thatcherite anti-German view was put on full display at the annual Conservative Party conference in Blackpool, England, which occurred during the week of Oct. 9.

The most raving speech at the event was made by Conservative parliamentarian Bill Cash, who boasted to *EIR*, in an Oct. 19 discussion, that his was “the strongest speech on the question of Germany that was made at a Conservative Party conference since 1937”—i.e., the time of the Hitler threat to Europe. His speech was entitled “A German Europe,” in which he railed, Thatcher-style, about German plans to “dominate” Europe, and about how Germany is systematically creating “economic satellites” across western Europe. Cash insists that the German “political class,” typified by Kohl and his immediate circle of advisers, is trying to drag behind him the German “commercial classes,” who are supposedly more reticent to move in such a direction. Cash foresees this as leading to “disorder, authoritarianism and possibly fascism, and war” in Europe.

Cash’s base of operations is the London European Foundation. Significant amounts of cash are pouring into that institution from the ample coffers of Anglo-French magnate Sir James Goldsmith. Goldsmith is busily funding an anti-European insurgency movement across Britain, by pouring some $30 million into a new “Referendum Party” that he has created. The first person to agree to run on his ticket, in a local parliamentary election, is Sir Alan Walters, Baroness Thatcher’s monetarist guru.

Barely less strident in Blackpool, were statements by two ministers of the British Cabinet, Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind and Defense Minister Michael Portillo. Both blasted “European integration” and “Brussels,” the latter a reference to the headquarters of the European Union. But such attacks barely veiled the real target: Germany. Portillo proclaimed that British soldiers had not died in World War II, in order to see the emergence of a Europe dominated by Germany now.

So virulent was Portillo, that even the same London *Times* that had featured the original “Germany is the Fourth Reich” diatribes by Conor Cruise O’Brien in 1989-90, advised Portillo on Oct. 12 to tone down his “anti-European vulgarity.”

One other channel for anti-German bile, is the new Conservative 2000 Foundation, a think-tank set up by former Welsh Secretary John Redwood, who unsuccessfully challenged Major for leadership of the Conservative Party in July. Redwood, like Goldsmith and others, is upgrading his profile in Britain, in anticipation of the expected coming slaughter of John Major.

Redwood visited the United States in mid-September. He had meetings in Washington and New York, set up by John O’Sullivan, the editor of the Buckley family’s *National Review* magazine, who is very close to Thatcher. On a number of occasions, Redwood indicated to his U.S. audiences and interlocutors, that his main goals would be to “restore the special relationship” between Britain and the United States, the which has been badly damaged during the Clinton administration, to increase the transatlantic interchange of Gingrich-ite ideas, and to expand the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), to include countries in Europe that subscribe to “free trade” policies. On Sept. 13, he met Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), praised him lavishly, and promised to bring his “revolution” over to Britain. He also had meetings with Conservative Revolution fanatic Sen. Phil Gramm (R) of Texas and Conservative Revolution moneybags Arianna Huffington. Later on Sept. 13, he spoke before the Mont Pelerin Society-front Heritage Foundation. He also had a private dinner in his honor, given by senior fellows of the American Enterprise Institute. The guest list included the leading lights of the U.S. “neoconservative” movement, including father-and-son team Irving and William Kristol, among others.

After a day and a half of meetings in New York City, Redwood raised the funds to open a branch of his foundation in the United States.

**Fighting ‘Prussian Germany’**

The Tories were called to account by various commentators for the London *Guardian*, which usually speaks for the opposition Labour Party.

In an Oct. 11 article, *Guardian* economics editor Will Hutton poked holes at British Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind’s appeal, at the Conservative Party annual conference in Blackpool, for Britain to take a greater distance from continental Europe, and to prioritize, instead, a “transatlantic free trade pact” with the United States, modelled on NAFTA.

Wrote Hutton: “This was a direct appeal to the mystic vision that Britain must maintain its island role, as a seafaring trader looking to the ocean—and not mess about with European entanglements. . . . The intellectual underpinning of this approach is thin; indeed, it amounts to little more than the belief that Britain’s destiny is permanently to fight Prussian Germany.” He cited various “populist Tory historians” who are “given yardages of print in the Conservative (and largely foreign-owned) press, that is justified only by the prejudices to which they skillfully pander. In their version, the European idea is necessarily a vehicle through which Germany is deliberately setting out to dominate Europe. What Hitler’s divisions failed to achieve in 1940, Helmut Kohl will achieve with the deutschmark in 1999.”

In any case, Hutton stressed, the United States has no interest in a special arrangement with Britain, but is more
concerned with maintaining good relations with Germany, while treating Britain as a "second-order power of little strategic importance." As for "free trade," the fact is, that NAFTA has been a disaster for American workers, and there is a national backlash against it in the United States, he wrote.

Egos, reactionaries, and romantics

Following this, London School of Economics think­tanker William Wallace wrote a Guardian commentary on Oct. 19, calling on the British opposition parties to begin a campaign to counter the hysterical anti-German "patriotic card" being played by the Conservatives.

Wallace derided the "Euroskeptic right" among the Tories as "an extraordinary crew of inflated egos, reactionaries, and romantics." Their "nationalist" campaigns are "trumpeted" by the press of Hollinger Corp. chairman Conrad Black and by the Rupert Murdoch media chain, while "some of their funding comes from a French millionaire member of the European Parliament, Sir James Goldsmith, and from U.S. right-wing groups. Their rallying cry of resistance to German domination is carried in newspapers which supported good relations with Nazi Germany in the thirties, but which oppose closer integration with democratic Germany today."

Wallace repeatedly punched holes in the anti-German, anti-European arguments of these Tories, often showing them to be crass hypocrisy, or outright lying. Often, the British themselves were involved in promoting the very European institutions they are now attacking. Otherwise, the British are significantly dependent, in the military, economic, and other spheres, on Germany and other European countries. Furthermore, the Tory right has made a fundamental miscalculation: "Their preferred alternative is to return to the dependence on the U.S., euphemistically labelled 'the special relationship.' They refuse to acknowledge how far the U.S. Congress has moved away from its old Anglo-Saxon dominance, or to absorb repeated messages from Washington, that it prefers a relationship with an effective European grouping—or, failing that, with Germany first, with France, and then Britain, in Germany's wake."

Wallace's motivations, to be sure, are not entirely honorable. Back on July 10, he had written an earlier Guardian article, calling on Rifkind, newly installed at that time as foreign secretary, to make upgrading relations with Germany his top foreign policy priority, and to prioritize an "Anglo-German" axis in Europe. He argued that "there is no escape from the centrality of Germany in British foreign policy." Formerly with the London Royal Institute of International Affairs, Wallace is a spokesman for that part of the British foreign policy establishment, which wants a "soft" approach to the Germans, to better manipulate Germany from within. Nonetheless, his later polemic is very much on target.

Mitterrand's threat of war

The "Fourth Reich" propaganda is also being revived in France, in a curious way.

François Mitterrand is another veteran of the 1989-90 "Fourth Reich" campaigns. Astonishing new revelations about this have been published by former special Presidential adviser Jacques Attali, in his new book Verbatim III, available only in French. Attali meticulously documents Mitterrand's views, in the period immediately before and after the fall of the Berlin Wall. On Nov. 30, 1989, Mitterrand met then-West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, and told him: "Either German unification occurs after European unity, or you have a Triple Alliance—France, Great Britain, Russia—against Germany, and it all ends up in war."

Mitterrand also engaged in frantic, unsuccessful diplomacy with Gorbachov, Thatcher, the then-East German regime, and others to prevent, or at least postpone, German reunification, Attali demonstrates.