

# As crisis deepens, rare truths are spoken of in Britain

by Mark Burdman

Considerable political turmoil is erupting in Great Britain. Within elite circles, the question is less “whether,” than “when” Prime Minister John Major will be dumped, likely to be replaced by the Labour Party’s Tony Blair. Several Thatcherites, including writer Paul Johnson and Tory Party chief fundraiser Lord McAlpine, have either jumped ship and come out overtly in favor of Blair, or have recommended that the Tories drop out of power, and become the opposition party again for a number of years.

The tumult brought about by the impending end of the Thatcher-Major era is worsened by the crises hitting some of Britain’s most stalwart institutions, including the recently collapsed Barings Bank, and the currently imploding Lloyds insurance company. These events are symptomatic of the global trends toward disintegration of a speculative-ridden financial system that has long had the City of London as one of its chief bastions.

Under such conditions, one reflex of the British elites has been to increase instability and tensions around the rest of the globe. But there is another phenomenon as well. The consensus around crucial historical, strategic, and philosophical questions that has prevailed inside the Establishment over a significant period of time, shows signs of cracking. Certain British influentials feel emboldened to speak truths that have long been buried, or are normally regarded as taboo in “respectable” quarters.

## ‘Nazism started with a handful of clever Englishmen’

For example, in the April 30 weekly London *Sunday Telegraph*, mouthpiece of the Hollinger Corp., for the upcoming May 8 Victory in Europe over Nazism celebrations across Europe, commentator Mary Kenny argued that the British tendency to blame Nazism solely on “German characteristics” must be tempered by the fact that Nazism itself was largely the product of *British* racist-eugenicist theories. Kenny’s argumentation cut against the grain of decades of British propaganda portraying the Nazi Holocaust as a function of so-called “German collective guilt.” While she might have identified how British interests placed Hitler in power in the first place, that she went as far as she did is revealing of the policy brawls now taking place inside the U. K.

Her article was entitled, “How British Theories Fuelled

Nazism.” She wrote: “Most people would agree that one of the objectives of celebrating victory over Nazi Germany is to pledge that it should never happen again. But the advent of National Socialism . . . was not a simple phenomenon due to a single cause. Neither can it be ascribed merely to peculiar characteristics of the Germans. . . . The truth is, a major component in the rise of the Nazi ideology came from England itself: the cult of eugenics, which underpinned the entire structure of race theory.” She charged that “four Englishmen, notably, were responsible for popularizing the theory, later taken up by the Nazis, that some superior human beings were fit to live and breed, while some inferior human beings contaminated society by their very genes.”

The first of the four is Charles Darwin, who begat “social Darwinism,” i.e., the notion of the “survival of the fittest.” According to Kenny, “the second man to popularize the theories adopted by the Nazis was Francis Galton, who founded the science of eugenics.” After outlining some of his lunatic “eugenic” ideas, Kenny wrote that “God played a good joke on Francis Galton and made him infertile; his notion of an aristocracy of brains makes one grateful, too, that the British aristocracy is no such thing.”

Her third culprit is Karl Pearson, an admirer of Karl Marx, and close to the Fabian Society grouping around Bernard Shaw and Beatrice and Sidney Webb. His idea was “social imperialism,” that a nation could not advance unless “the better stocks” flourish. He warned, at the turn of this century, that Britain was declining because of the proliferating genes of “the habitual criminals, the professional tramp, the tuberculous, the insane, the mentally defective, the alcoholic, the diseased from birth or from excess.”

Pearson, she noted, had a big influence on the Germans, as did Houston Chamberlain, “one of the first to inspire the German race theorists,” with his notion of the “dominant folk-nation, dominant because of its superior genetic gifts. He launched the theory that Aryans were born to rule, and believed that Germans were the highest form of Aryans.”

Kenny indicated that the four were not weird mavericks, but in the mainstream of a trend within the British Establishment: “The theories of a superior race and of eugenic excellence were supported by a wide range of extremely respectable [sic] people, from Winston Churchill to the Haldanes and the Huxleys, and including, tragically, some distinguish-

ed Jews. The Nazis seized on the entire canon of eugenics, and made them a main prop of their hateful ideology of racial superiority and *Lebensunwertes Leben*—‘life unworthy of living.’ The first victims of Nazi death camps were mentally handicapped children.”

When the British insist, as V-E Day nears, that “it must never happen again,” she concluded, “we must be aware that it did not *start* with stormtroopers goose-stepping over Europe: It started with a handful of clever Englishmen developing the idea that some genes were better than others.”

### The Churchill-Mussolini friendship

One would expect that, as the 50th anniversary of the defeat of Nazism approaches, the British would enthusiastically support Winston Churchill, the man around whom so many mythologies have been built respecting his ostensibly stalwart leadership in “rallying the population to defeat the Hitler menace.” But quite the reverse has happened.

On April 29, the London *Times* publicized new revelations from Italian historians, suggesting that British intelligence agents killed Italian dictator Benito Mussolini, so that he wouldn’t be around to reveal the details of his close relationship with Churchill. The friendship with Mussolini certainly belies Churchill’s “freedom-loving” image.

The paper reported on work by historian Franco Bandini, who claims that Mussolini was “shot by English agents, to prevent him from revealing secret negotiations he had held with Churchill.” The *Times* cited work by journalists for the Italian magazine *Panorama*, who have insisted that when Mussolini was arrested, “two cases of documents were seized, one of them supposedly stuffed full of documents of his negotiations with Churchill. These were taken first to the Dongo town hall, and then to an inn, the Albergo Bazzoni, at the nearby town of Tremezzo. British Intelligence, upon learning of the dictator’s capture, officially mirrored the view of the Americans that he should be tried for war crimes. ‘But the existence of the Churchill-Mussolini papers in the hands of Il Duce justifies more than a little doubt over British motives,’ the magazine claims. ‘Was it by chance that the Albergo Bazzoni was bombed by two RAF [British Royal Air Force] airplanes on April 30, leaving dozens of dead and wounded?’ ”

This story intersects a controversy now erupting in Britain, about the purchase from the Churchill family, by Britain’s National Heritage Lottery, for the equivalent of \$18 million, of the private papers of the late Winston. The deal was correctly characterized by British critics, as a way of providing fabulous new—and unearned—wealth to such Churchill descendants as current Conservative parliamentarian Winston Churchill II, and as a gross misuse of public funds. The head of the Lottery is Lord Jacob Rothschild, a business partner of George Soros, Sir Jimmy Goldsmith, and other disreputable characters.

As the rotten deal was being publicized, Winston II put

out a statement warning that “selfish immigrants” with “hungry mouths and bellies” were seeking to come to Britain “on banana boats.” These comments revived the controversy he had set off in May 1993, when he claimed the British way of life was being undermined by a “relentless flow” of people from the Indian subcontinent. The London *Guardian* correctly emphasized on April 29 that Winston II is squarely in the tradition of his racist grandfather, who once called Indians “the beastliest people in the world, next to the Germans.”

### Yes, the ‘Triple Entente’ exists

Elements of the truth about other strategic realities are also beginning to emerge. For example, *EIR* has emphasized the importance of the pre-World War I Triple Entente relationship between Britain, France, and Russia, as a geopolitical model today for British thinkers and their epigones like Henry Kissinger, as they try to counter the increasingly close relations between the Clinton administration and Germany. Lo and behold, a British commentator working for the Hollinger chain of newspapers told a conference on the Balkans, that fashioning such an axis is precisely the aim, now, of the British Foreign Office-centered policy elites in London.

During the week of April 17, a conference on Bosnia-Herzegovina took place in Ankara, Turkey, hosted by Turkish President Suleyman Demirel and Vice Prime Minister Hikmet Cetin. One speaker there was Noel Malcolm, who writes for the Hollinger-owned *Daily Telegraph* and *Spectator* magazine. According to the Bosnian TRWA news agency, he spoke about the “unofficially but firmly renewed alliance among Britain, France, and Russia,” and said that the actions of Paris and London come from a “panicked effort to restrict German influence in Europe.” As an example of how things work, Malcolm reported that on Feb. 5, 1994, after the massacre at the market in Sarajevo, French Defense Minister François Léotard, then in Moscow, appealed to his Russian counterpart, Pavel Grachov, to unite French and Russian efforts to “stop the pro-Bosnian policy of the U.S.” A second example, is a confidential 1993 document written by the British Foreign Office, stressing the important “Russian contribution” to resisting the American initiative for lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia. The document asserted that the British and French could afford to be diplomatically “reserved” about this subject, as the Russians’ veto would accomplish what were required.

Malcolm was backed up at the conference by other Britons opposed to British government policy in the Balkans, including Oxford historian Norman Stone.

Within the British intelligence-spook world, certain tremors are also being felt. In its latest edition, the leftist-maverick magazine *Lobster* published a piece attacking the British press for its incessant attacks on President Clinton, singling out such key operatives as the London *Sunday Telegraph*’s Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, Hollinger Corp. head Conrad Black, and former London *Times* editor Lord Wil-

## Stalemate on a shifting front

The move on May 2-3 by Croatian troops to seize the stretch of the Zagreb-Belgrade highway held by Serb forces, and to retake the Serbian-occupied areas of Western Slavonia, is not, in itself, of great military significance; it risks, unless there be a popular explosion against the status quo in Croatia, to be yet another of President Tudjman's diversions to cover up his secret agreements with Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic.

Western Slavonia, which was occupied by about 15,000 Serbians, is of no particular interest to Serbia; it is a salient, about 400 square kilometers; a major thrust by Serbian forces coming up over the Bosnian border into Serbian territory inside Croatia proper would be needed to expand it. In truth, the Serbian General Staff is quietly euphoric at being able to redeploy men back onto other fronts in Bosnia, their front line now having been shortened by about 200 kilometers. The U.N. "brokered" the passage at Bosanska Gradiska of 5-6,000 Serbian soldiers, "fleeing" the Croatian advance, back into Serbian-occupied areas of Bosnia, where they can get back to mounting a major campaign against the reorganized and increasingly well-armed Bosnian Army.

It is a virtual certainty that the Serbian forces were tipped off by Tudjman's men about the Croatian offen-

sive: A ceremony at Jasenovac, on the front line, was cancelled and the town of Okucani was abandoned without a shot being fired; there are almost no reports of casualties on either side; 600 Serbian troops surrendered. Since the Serbians occupying Western Slavonia have about twice the tanks of the Croatians, and can call to their aid both the Yugoslavian People's Army and the Serbian forces over the border in Bosnia, they would not pull out unless the pull-out is a plan. Also, there was no sign of movement from the Croatian side, to join forces with the Bosnians and cut the Brcko corridor, the Serbian life-line, in many places less than 500 meters wide, which joins Serbia proper, to her occupied territories.

Why then did the Serbians fire Orkan rockets, armed with cluster bombs, on May 2-3 into the center of Zagreb? The first short answer is, it was lunch-time in Zagreb, and the Serbian leadership likes to kill unarmed civilians. It was, also, a reminder, timed to second the European Union's statement threatening to sink economic cooperation with Croatia, that Tudjman must not break the rules of the game, and move to break through the Unprofor lines and retake East Slavonia and the Krajina.

But there are unpredictable factors in this whole affair. The Croatian people, emboldened by the tactical success in Western Slavonia and enraged over the terror bombing of Zagreb, are clamoring for action to retake Vukovar and Knin. Second, the government of Bosnia has refused to renew the cease-fire, in expectation of great military activity this summer.—Katharine Kanter

liam Rees-Mogg. *EIR* has continually reported on the role of these three in the various anti-Clinton campaigns.

Editor Stephen Dorril wrote: "One of the strangest and longest media sagas has been the British press pursuit of Bill Clinton. It has been the British papers, principally the *Telegraph*, clearly at the instigation of Canadian Conrad Black, and then hot on the trail, the American/Australian-owned *Sunday Times*. . . . The U.S. press did eventually pick up the stories after they had been 'surfaced' in Britain. They were mostly the product of the *Telegraph's* Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, who relied to a great extent on the material pumped out by fringe groups on the extreme right of the Republican Party.

"This anti-Clinton campaign has become a conspiracy-laden industry worthy of the outer fringes of the JFK assassination. In an extraordinary series of articles in the *Times*, William Rees-Mogg showed his obsession with the minutiae of the Vincent Foster suicide, whose death, according to the former editor of the paper, bore the marks of 'professional criminals.' Rees-Mogg wrote about the exit wounds as if poring over the autopsy photographs of President Kennedy.

As a true conspiracist, he wrote, 'where the story becomes really worrying, is when one reaches the six suspicious suicides, not to mention a murder or two' [emphasis added].

"Just to show that even apparently rational and intelligent people can believe just about anything, Rees-Mogg backed up his article with a mind-blowing illustration. If anyone on the left had used a similar graphic, I am sure that he would have been the first to call for the men in white-coats."

Later in the magazine, in a section exposing "Spooks," there appeared a short biographical item on Evans-Pritchard, taken from "the Schiwer Institute in the United States" (evidently a mis-rendering of "Schiller Institute," founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche). This institute "claimed that Evans-Pritchard, who has been at the forefront of promoting the 'Whitewater' affair, 'made no secret of his close relations with the British Secret Intelligence Service, known as MI6.' A stringer in Latin America in the '80s and contributor to the *Economist*, later the *Daily Telegraph*, he admitted that his father was in MI6 during the war." This is the first detailed report on the "Clintongaters" to appear in the British media, and one of the few such accounts outside of *EIR*.