

---

## Special Report

---

# Great Britain's elites prepare new racist, Hitlerite order

by Mark Burdman

While international attention has been focused on British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's rapidly worsening domestic political problems, a dangerous process has been unfolding in the United Kingdom which has much greater historical significance. The British Establishment is preparing the way for establishing a fascist authoritarian regime in the United Kingdom. In a typical British fashion, this regime would take control after a post-Thatcher, Labour Party-led government has been brought into power for a period of time, and would be allowed to make a mess of things, fully discrediting the option of a nominally democratic alternative to Thatcher and the Tories in the process.

Two parallel trends indicate that a move toward fascism is in full swing. First, the British press has begun to more and more openly flaunt a Hitlerite racist and genocidal worldview. A landmark Nov. 26 *Sunday Telegraph* editorial by Peregrine Worsthorne projecting a "final solution" for the so-called "black sub-class" in the United States (see *Documentation*) is only the most blatant case of this. Complementary editorials have appeared in other publications, heaping contempt on a "new underclass" in Britain and lauding the superiority of "Anglo-Saxon values."

The second trend is the increasingly open endorsement of the paganist-satanist New Age movement by Queen Elizabeth II's appointed head of the Church of England, Archbishop of Canterbury Dr. Robert Runcie. Earlier in this century, New Age ideas not only paved the way for Hitler and the Nazis to take over Germany, but also were part of the core philosophy and ideology of the Nazis' leading circles. Then as now, as New Age values of "ecology," "small is beautiful," and hostility to scientific progress and development are implemented, the drive to eliminate those "excess populations" becomes inevitable.

The period of Mrs. Thatcher's woes coincides with hysterical articles in the British Establishment press warning darkly about a new "Fourth Reich" emerging in a future, reunited Germany. This is a classical example of the psychological phenomenon known as "projection," since it is the British themselves who are creating a new Hitlerism.

### The fall of Thatcher

The process of dismantling Thatcher is going very quickly. The *Sunday Times* of London published an opinion poll by the MORI polling agency, showing the opposition Labour Party ahead by 14 points, the worst showing for Thatcher in almost a decade. A growing number of Britons polled want Thatcher to step down from power, either immediately or at least before the next planned general elections, which are projected for 1992. According to the Nov. 26 *Sunday Express*, a "fierce campaign is emanating from the House of Lords" against Mrs. Thatcher, being led by former Foreign Secretaries Lord Carrington and Lord Pym, former Attorney General Lord Rawlinson, and others.

For the first time in her 14-year-rule, Mrs. Thatcher is being challenged for leadership of the Conservative Party. Even if the challenging candidate, Sir Anthony Meyer, is such a non-entity that he is derided as "Sir Nobody" in the pro-Thatcher press, he is in fact acting as a stalking-horse for some more prominent figure, or figures, who could emerge at an early future date to challenge Thatcher. Smelling decay within Tory ranks, opposition leaders are going after her with unprecedented virulence. David Steel, ex-head of the since-disbanded Alliance party, denounced Thatcher Nov. 24 as a "rabid old lioness," while Labour Party spokesmen Denis Healey and Gerald Kaufmann have labeled her the "Ceausescu of the West," and "the Ceausescu of the NATO alliance," respectively.

City of London insiders see Thatcher collapsing faster than anyone can presently imagine, in a manner reminiscent of the dramatic devolutions in a Shakespeare tragedy. Various scandals could be uncorked at any moment. Also, the shrill "nanny"-like Mrs. Thatcher has a habit of being her own worst enemy. Some in London talk jokingly about establishing a "Ministry of Banana Skins," to prevent more Thatcher fiascos of the sort that occurred in and around the resignations of Chancellor of the Exchequer Nigel Lawson in 1989 and Defense Minister Michael Heseltine in 1986.

Meanwhile, the British economy is rapidly devolving from its status as "the sick man of the West," to that of the

“terminal AIDS patient of the West.” By the week ending Nov. 25, the pound sterling was plummeting to below 2.80 German deutschmarks, after having fallen over 7 pfennigs against the DM the week before. The British currency is collapsing both because of Mrs. Thatcher’s political difficulties, and because Britain is suffering from a unique combination of high inflation (over 7%), high interest rates (16%), and universal expectations of severe recession in 1990.

In the past weeks Britain has begun to suffer the worst food price rises in over five years, and this is only a harbinger of much higher food price rises to come.

One joke making the rounds in London is that Thatcher’s shrill proclamations of worship for Mikhail Gorbachov are not only to be explained by some peculiar psychosexual obsession out of the pages of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, but also by crasser practical considerations: “If Gorbachov falls from power, Thatcher falls.” Similar pragmatic considerations have led Thatcher’s 10 Downing Street to circulate virulent propaganda, through British press conduits, against a new German “Fourth Reich,” in order to divert attention from her own woes.

### Anglo-Saxons and lovers of Hitler

If relevant British elites have to look for a “Fourth Reich,” they need only look in the mirror. On Nov. 26, the same day as Worsthorne’s *Sunday Telegraph* piece, the *Sunday Times* ran a lead editorial entitled, “The British Underclass,” which was directed inward, against Britain’s own “sub-class.”

It argued against those in Britain who say more must be done for the British poor, by claiming that a “new underclass” had grown in the United Kingdom, which has “cut adrift from society and has no intention of rejoining it, no matter how generous the welfare state or how much well-off people are penalized for being successful. It is characterized by drugs, casual violence, petty crime, illegitimate children, homelessness, work avoidance and contempt for conventional values. . . . It could become proportionally larger than it is in the United States, where it had a head start. . . . No amount of income redistribution or social engineering can solve their problem. Their sub-lifestyles are beyond welfare-benefit rises and job-creating schemes. They exist as active social outcasts, wedded to an anti-social system. . . . The problem will inevitably get worse.”

The paper demanded revival of the notion of “social stigma” against such people, as well as the strengthening of “social order” through “a new spirit of family and community.”

The other side of this coin, is a campaign of chauvinist articles extolling the superiority of “Anglo-Saxon” values. Writing in the City of London’s *Financial Times* Nov. 24, “Lombard” column writer Martin Wolf said that the dramatic developments in Central and Eastern Europe could not be attributed to “universal Western values,” but rather to “Anglo-Saxon values. Their triumph in this century is owed to

one Anglo-Saxon power, the United States of America. . . . It looks as though the half of the globe dominated by the Anglo-Americans has now won a second great victory.” In Wolf’s chauvinist revisionism, the first half of this century has been defined by continental Europe’s penchant for war and totalitarianism, while the second half has been characterized by the triumph of “global economic institutions” such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. “Europeans should never forget the difference between the first and second halves of this century, between the world they made for themselves and the world they have made under American tutelage,” he wrote.

The U.K. is “the mother country of Anglo-Saxon values,” albeit one, Wolf concluded nervously, with increasingly intractable internal problems of its own.

Worsthorne, writing in the *Daily Telegraph* Nov. 29, said that “British nationalism” was thriving, while French nationalism was dying out, because, in contrast to the French, “the British have not lost faith in their political institutions, whose unbroken existence goes back for centuries rather than decades. Moreover, [the British] have a much-loved monarchy and a national Church.”

Is it any accident that the BBC ran an interview on Nov. 26 with Lady Mosley, widow of Sir Oswald Mosley, head of the 1930s British Union of Fascists? To the dismay of many British Jews and others, Lady Mosley talked of Adolf Hitler’s “mesmerizing” eyes and “fascinating and interesting” ideas, and her own doubts about the extent of the Nazi anti-Jewish Holocaust. Is it a mere coincidence, that Mrs. Thatcher has lauded Mikhail Gorbachov with the same word “fascinating”? Although neither the British prime minister nor Gorbachov may remain in power long enough to enjoy it, an “Anglo-Saxon” alliance with the Great Russians to eliminate “inferior races” seems very much on the agenda.

It is perfectly lawful that Britain is revising its *military* doctrine to accommodate such a worldview. On Nov. 28, Admiral of the Fleet Sir Julian Oswald, recently appointed Her Majesty’s First Sea Lord, told a *Daily Telegraph* interviewer that Britain had to maintain its naval strength, despite an ostensible lowering of the Soviet military threat, because of a whole series of new threats, including the destabilizing effects of rapid population growth and the movement from the countryside to the cities in much of the Third World.

### The New Age Church of England

As for Worsthorne’s “much-loved monarchy and a national Church”: On Nov. 25, the *Times* of London’s religious correspondent Clifford Longley wrote an article under the title, “In Search of the New Age,” extolling Archbishop Runcie’s recent call for the Church of England to “engage” New Age values, and to take the New Age movement “seriously.”

What Longley was referring to was a speech made by Runcie in mid-November, before the Senior Evangelical-Anglican Commission (SEAC) in northern England, decrying those who were exaggerating the danger of New Age values and who were claiming that the New Age was part of some elaborate conspiracy. Runcie said New Age values were in fact rather more "benign," and that elements of such values, particularly those pertaining to "ecology and conservation," should be brought into the Church of England's teachings.

Wrote Longley: "So far, it seems, no member of the British Government has yet uttered the words 'New Age' in public. The Archbishop of Canterbury certainly now has; and so it will only be a matter of time before a Minister does too."

At the northern England SEAC event, Runcie had specified that the essence of the New Age is "the astrological progression, associated with the start of the third millennium,

from Pisces to Aquarius." Noting this, Longley wrote: "What interested Dr. Runcie about it was its religious aspect, and the nagging thought that New Age thinking corresponded better to the spiritual needs of the present than orthodox Christianity could hope to do. His advice to the church was to adopt the New Age agenda for itself." Longley added: "The New Age is undoubtedly green."

Various books have appeared in Britain, drawing the connection between New Age paganism and ecologism and Nazi ideology. One was Oxford writer Anna Bramwell's *Ecology in the Twentieth Century*, published earlier this year. In mid-September of this year, when Runcie had given a greeting to the Canterbury Festival of Faith and the Environment, he was attacked by Church of England traditionalists for supporting "Earth worship, pagan meditation, witches, and the like."

One last thing should be kept in mind, especially in light of the 1936 abdication of the pro-Hitler King Edward VIII.

## Fascism as a Victorian value

*U.S. economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche issued the following comments on Nov. 27.*

The morning dispatches from the British press, notably from the fellow who is quite literally a bastard, Peregrine Worsthorne, indicates that Britain is headed very rapidly toward a new fascism. While some people like Conor Cruise O'Brien were talking about a Fourth Reich in Germany, we find that in Germany the spirit of freedom is effective, while in Britain, it's a joke; the danger of fascism shows most quickly. My estimates are as follows:

First of all, what we have is Worsthorne's repeated reference to a black or predominantly black underclass in the United States which is going to be virtually exterminated by what Worsthorne refers to as Victorian values. His father of his own illegitimate birth is typical of the Victorian values he has in mind.

But otherwise we have the same in other aspects of the British press—the same kind of mood, the same ugly social Darwinism with emphasis upon AIDS and drugs as means by which the underclass or sub-class, as Worsthorne calls it, is about to be wiped out by its black, Victorian values.

What he is talking about is essentially what Worsthorne's illegitimate father, the Montagu Norman of the Bank of England who advised the architect of German fascism, would have admired and did admire in his time in the post-Versailles era which gave us fascism on the continent of Europe and gave us World War II! . . .

Now usually whenever the British economy is in deep, deep trouble or someone is sending it into deep trouble, they bring either Liberals, in the old days, or the Labour Party to power to replace the Conservatives, under whom the disaster developed. The Labour Party brings the economy into a virtual state of collapse or proximate collapse, the which establishes the authority again of the Conservative Party. So the Labour Party is stuck out with the harsh ring of disaster around its neck when the British people say, "Get thee gone for the time being," and the Conservatives come back in.

So, what we seem to have is a desire on the part of some to pass the mantle of government from Thatcher, who caused the disaster, to a Labour Party, presumably under Neil Kinnock, which would then act out the disaster which Mrs. Thatcher has created, and by bumbling social-democratic incompetence, bring Britain to the very worst; at which point, perhaps, this Britain brings back the Conservatives or something else and implements something that would make Maggie Thatcher's union busting seem a mild affair.

So Britain, as the *Telegraph* and *Observer* and so forth [have indicated] . . . on a conscious level is headed toward fascism. At least for the moment. Fascism is a Victorian value? How interesting!

The Church of England is constitutionally obliged, by arrangements of the late 17th and early 18th centuries converging on the 1701 Act of Settlement, to defend the values of Christianity. Since Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II is the formal head of the Church of England, it is not inconceivable that Runcie's advocacy of the anti-Christian, Nazi New Age could provoke a constitutional crisis in Britain greater than that of 1936.

---

## Documentation

---

# It's springtime for Hitler in Albion

*On Nov. 26 the editorial of the Sunday Telegraph of London asserted that there would be a "final solution" for what it called the "black sub-class" in the United States, because this "sub-class" lacks the "Puritan and Victorian" virtue of "self-control" to deal with the spread of drugs and AIDS. Author Peregrine Worsthorne, the paper's former chief editor and presently lead editorial writer, said that this "black sub-class . . . is proving itself, in the darwinian sense, unfit to survive."*

*The Sunday Telegraph editorial is an extended elaboration of an argument first put forward in shorter form in the London magazine Encounter. In its November 1989 issue, Encounter published a "New York Notes" column by editor Anthony Hartley, in which Hartley talked of the "sub-class" in New York that was, in his view, killing itself by its inability to deal with the AIDS-and-drugs cycle. Hartley asserted a new "darwinian survival of the fittest" doctrine premised on whether a group or class of people possessed or lacked "self-control."*

*Worsthorne's editorial reads in part:*

Emphasis by a certain politician on the Victorian values of work, thrift, temperance and above all self-reliance and personal responsibility has received short shrift recently from bishops, progressive pundits and suchlike who have all preferred instead to promote the virtues of care and compassion. Developments in the great American cities are now giving a new and lethal twist to this debate. For what these developments are now demonstrating is that Victorian values have become quite literally matters of life and death. If you don't have them, you perish.

The sub-class in America, overwhelmingly black, doesn't have them and because it doesn't have them, those

two modern scourges, drugs and AIDS, are decimating it. . . . What basically the black sub-class lacks is self-control. The zenith of the civil rights movement coincided with the worst excesses of permissiveness. Thus the first generation of truly emancipated blacks came into their own at a time when the respect for Victorian values was minimal. Schools all taught self-expression, not self-control. . . .

No cultural background could have been more guaranteed to compound all the other difficulties of the black sub-class which has proved miserably incapable of adapting to the new social threats, AIDS and drugs. First came the drug addiction which weakened self-control to the point where no precautions were taken against AIDS. Once AIDS was contracted, recourse was had to even more conscience-dulling drugs, which destroy all inhibition or guilt about passing the AIDS virus on. Thus was set in motion a vicious circle: inner-city areas like the South Bronx are being depleted of their population—a new and horrible kind of final solution.

A few years ago, pessimists were predicting that drugs and AIDS would prove no less lethal for the middle class than for the sub-class. In the event, however, they have not. For the middle class is beginning to adapt. Faced with these new challenges, the middle class has been able to reactivate its Puritan heritage—or enough of it to survive—in the nick of time. But the sub-class, having no roots in Puritan culture, is proving itself, in the Darwinian sense, unfit to survive.

There is a lesson here which far transcends the particular problems of AIDS and drugs. Only a little self-control is needed to avoid these dangers and the likelihood is that the great bulk of most advanced societies will meet the challenge. . . .

What [Mrs. Thatcher] basically stands for is Puritanism. . . . Temporarily, she is quite undone. Even so, if it is Puritanism that the country needs, who can possibly doubt that even Mrs. Thatcher wounded is still the best bet?

I write as a Conservative. But I think I would reach the same conclusion were I not a Conservative. For the question is more moral than party political. The "survival of the fittest" is not a popular phrase these days. It is associated with eugenics, social Darwinism and other nasty things. But all that it implies is an ability to adapt to the changing environment, and the quality most in need of emphasizing in the mass consumer societies of today—more than brawn and even more than brain—is self-control. . . .

Market economics were never at the center of [Thatcher's] creed. At the center was, and increasingly is, the view that society and the state can do no greater service to people—particularly ordinary people—than to encourage them at every stage in the virtues of self-control; and no greater disservice than to promote the virtues of compassion and caring at the expense of the old Victorian values. This is a lesson too late for the doomed blacks in the Bronx to learn. But not too late for those other recently emancipated people in Eastern Europe whose need for it is even direr than our own.