



Search  (Economist.com)

Welcome  
My account  
Log out  
Manage my newsletters



Site feedback

Monday December 28th 2009

- Home
- This week's print edition
- Daily news analysis
- Opinion
  - All opinion
  - Leaders
  - Letters to the Editor
  - Blogs
  - Columns
  - KAL's cartoons
  - Correspondent's diary
  - Economist debates

- World politics
  - All world politics
  - Politics this week
  - United States
  - The Americas
  - Asia
  - Middle East and Africa
  - Europe
  - Britain

- Special reports
  - Business and finance
  - All business and finance
  - Business this week
  - Economics focus
  - Management
  - Economics A-Z

- Business education
  - All business education
  - Which MBA?

- Markets and data
  - All markets and data
  - Daily chart
  - Weekly indicators
  - World markets
  - Currencies
  - Rankings
  - Big Mac index

- Science and technology
  - All science and technology
  - Technology Quarterly
  - Technology Monitor

- Books and arts
  - All books and arts
  - Style guide


- People
  - People
  - Obituaries

- Diversions

- Audio and video
  - Audio and video library
  - Audio edition

- The World In
  - The World in 2010
  - The World in 2009
  - The World in 2008
  - The World in 2007
  - The World in 2006
  - The World in 2005
  - The World in 2004

- Research tools
  - All research tools



Business

## The fallout from GM keeping Opel The German charm offensive

Nov 12th 2009  
From *The Economist* print edition

### GM's decision to keep Opel has left Germany fuming

AFTER General Motors' dramatic U-turn on November 3rd over the sale of its European subsidiary, Opel/Vauxhall, its chief executive, Fritz Henderson, came to Germany this week to begin repairing relations with Angela Merkel's government and with the country's angry unions. Both have little option other than to come to terms with GM's decision not to sell a majority stake in the unit to Magna International, an Austrian-Canadian car parts maker, and Russia's Sberbank. But they are still furious with the Americans. Jürgen Rüttgers, the prime minister of North-Rhine Westphalia, caught the popular mood by describing GM's change of heart as "the ugly face of turbo-capitalism."

The German government's frustration is understandable, but it has only itself to blame. With an election looming, it far too blatantly suggested that the €4.5 billion (\$6.8 billion) worth of restructuring loans it was willing to make available was exclusively for Magna/Sberbank because it alone was promising not to close factories in Germany. That meant some 10,000 redundancies would fall disproportionately heavily elsewhere in Europe. When other governments complained about such an obvious breach of competition rules, the European Commission stepped in. The Germans were forced to write to GM on October 17th assuring it that the aid was available to any investor with a viable plan for restoring Opel to health.

GM had never wanted to sell Opel, which is the repository of much of its technology for small cars. After the emergence of the "New GM" from bankruptcy in July, confidence was growing and it had an assertive new board that saw a chance to regain control of a valuable strategic asset. As Mr Henderson emolliently put it, the decision not to sell was a vote for Opel, which took 7.8% of the European market last year, not a vote against Magna.

As part of his charm offensive in Germany this week Mr Henderson said that a €900m bridging loan from the German government that had kept Opel going during GM's crisis would be repaid before the end of the month. Opel, he added, had sufficient liquidity to continuing trading for the foreseeable future. According to Mr Henderson, GM's restructuring plan would be similar to the one agreed with Magna—it did not want to go back to the drawing board—and that under it Opel would become a more independent and entrepreneurial company.

Mr Henderson had another sweetener: rather than the €4.5 billion wanted by

- Comment (4)
- Recommend (32)
- E-mail
- Share
- Print
- Reprints & permissions

Related Items

- Country briefing**  
Germany
- More articles about...**  
The motor industry  
Mergers and acquisitions

Advertisement

**Economist.com**

**Classifieds**

Advisor on justice, freedom and security  
UNDP Armenia

Faculty Recruitment  
Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School

Economist, Energy Economics and Trading Arrangements  
Ofgem

Executive Dean  
Henley Business School

Director General, Policy Research and International Relations

President of University of Illinois  
University of Illinois

Senior Economist, Transport Strategy

Direct your own ad

- Articles by subject
- Economics A-Z
- Special reports
- Style guide

- Country briefings
- All country briefings
- China
- India
- Brazil
- United States
- Russia

My account home

- Newsletters and alerts
- Manage my newsletters
- Manage my e-mail alerts
- Manage my RSS feeds
- Manage special-offer alerts
- More »

- Print subscriptions
- Subscribe to *The Economist*
- Renew my subscription
- Change my print subscription delivery, billing or e-mail address
- Pay my bill
- Activate premium online access
- Report a missing copy
- Suspend my subscription
- More »

- Digital subscriptions
- Subscribe to Economist.com
- Manage my subscription
- Mobile edition
- Audio edition
- Download screensaver
- More »

Classifieds and jobs

- The Economist Group
- About the Economist Group
- Economist Intelligence Unit
- Economist Conferences
- Intelligent Life
- CFO
- Roll Call
- European Voice
- EuroFinance
- Reprints and permissions

**EIU online store**

**Economist shop**

Advertisement

Magna and Sberbank, GM only needed €3 billion from governments to implement its plan. He was less specific about plant closures, only saying that the reduction in manufacturing footprint would have to go further than the plan drawn up with Magna. At least one factory in Germany seems certain to close (Bochum in North Rhine-Westphalia is thought to be vulnerable).


GM now hopes that it can get agreements on funding before the end of the year. It thinks governments in other countries where it has factories will be happier supporting a plan that is not being driven from Berlin and that contributions should be based on levels of employment in each country. That would leave Germany picking up no more than half the tab: good news, at least, for German taxpayers.

[Back to top ^^](#)

**Readers' comments**

Readers have commented on this article (the window for new comments is now closed).

[View all comments \(4\)](#)



Want more? Subscribe to [The Economist](#) and get the week's most relevant news and analysis.

Advertisement