Who really runs Air Force Intelligence

Zionism, cultism, and the 'New Dark Ages' policy

The following article is a report on the results of an investigation conducted by the Security Section of the U.S. Labor Party into the corruption of U.S. Air Force Intelligence by the British strategic perspective of a "New Dark Age" — a plan to reduce humanity to a condition of savagery based on the "Brave New World" model of Aldous Huxley, H.G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell.

Discoveries made in investigation of Jim Jones's Peoples Temple cult have forced a fresh study of foreign influences in the second largest of the U.S. official intelligence agencies, Air Force Intelligence. There is no question but that Air Force Intelligence is very dirty; the question is: How dirty?

The facts already in our dossier on Air Force Intelligence would be sufficient to prove probable cause for a major congressional investigation. This much is conclusively established. *Fact group number one:* influential elements within Air Force Intelligence have been and are under proportionately heavy influence by foreign governments, notably British and Israeli governments. *Fact group number two:* If Air Force Intelligence's role is combined with that of the RAND Corporation, as is historically and operationally proper for this case, the British and Israeli influences conduited through those channels represent a major security problem for the United States. *Fact group number three:* the domestic intelligence operations role of the combined RAND-Air Force operations adds up to worse than what Congress and the courts have strongly deprecated for the cases of the CIA and FBI.

The Jones case is the best point of reference for getting directly to the dirty domestic operations under consideration. Before the CIA's Allen Dulles launched the psychedelic-cult project known as MK-ULTRA, the Air Force and RAND, aided by the Josiah Macy Foundation, were already well-established collaborators of Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead in the launching of the cult-building research projects. The connections of the offices of Governor Jerry Brown and of Dr. Joel Fort to the creation and deployment of the Jones Peoples Temple cult, plus Jones's earlier connections in the Indianapolis region, combine to fit the Jones cult as but one of many cults spawned in the same decades-long overall cult-building operation.

These cult-building projects were predominantly imports brought to the USA by British intelligence, and have been the outgrowth of the collaboration between Bertrand Russell and Aldous Huxley. The purpose behind these policies, as Russell and Huxley made perfectly clear often enough, was to bring on a "New Dark Age" worldwide, through fomenting wars and other means of chaos and confusion intended to bring most of the surviving portions of the human population to a condition of savagery.

One might well ask whether it was ever the intent of the Congress or the U.S. taxpayer that U.S. intelligence agencies should be engaged in such projects against the population of the U.S.? One might well ask whether it was ever the intent of Congress to bring U.S. foreign policy into complicity with the Russell-Huxley policy of inaugurating a "New Dark Age"?

Methods of investigation

The investigative and evaluations methods required for a competent inquiry are not generally understood even by experienced attorneys and judges. The difficulties of an ordinary criminal proceeding are great enough. The methods adequate for a criminal proceeding are wholly inadequate for intelligence work, or for investigation of the activities of intelligence agencies. Since we are determined not to cause the indictment of innocent, honest U.S. officers along with the guilty and evil ones, we must not only follow the kind of investigative method required. We must also note publicly the crucial special features of the method we are employing.

Any investigator knows that the most unreliable kind of evidence is "eyewitness testimony" as to matter of fact. Contrary to widespread belief, a sound case based on "circumstantial evidence" is the best servant of justice. Unfortunately, overzealous prosecutors tend to develop circumstantial evidence in a way which presents us with a very convincing lie: "circumstantial evidence" can lie, too.

For example, the problem of "begats." No investigation

can ignore the fact that the subject is a child of, sibling of, had a close business association with, and so forth. These are facts, but they prove nothing significant by themselves.

For example. In the year 1965 Meir Kahane entered into a business relationship with one Joseph Churba. Churba was a school acquaintance of Kahane's. The business effort was directed to selling domestic political-intelligence operations services to regular intelligence agencies of the U.S. government. Subsequently, Churba rose at a noticeable rate of promotions in Air Force Intelligence, while Kahane was off creating the Jewish Defense League. Now, Churba is politically associated with a former head of Air Force Intelligence, Major-General (ret.) George Keegan. Does this chain of associations link Keegan politically to Israeli terrorist Kahane?

According to information which Labor Party members received directly from General Keegan, we have the following additional facts to consider. Keegan was an American volunteer with the British Royal Air Force. During that service he became a friendly acquaintance (at least) of Ezer Weizman, the latter, in turn, a protege of British Middle East and drug intelligence operative, Orde Wingate. Keegan has maintained a close personal relationship with Ezer Weizman, the latter currently Israeli Defense Minister and a leading candidate to replace Prime Minister Menachem Begin. (The other most obvious contender is Moshe Dayan, who received his terrorist training under Orde Wingate.) Keegan reports his own son's residence in a Kibbutz, and Keegan expresses a bestial attitude toward Arab peoples.

Kahane has been and is an agent of Israeli intelligence. This fact establishes a significant degree of closure for the existence of a political connection between Keegan and Kahane, via Keegan's Israeli intelligence connections as well as via Churba. Whether Keegan has a direct relationship to Kahane otherwise is not established.

Keegan's affinities for British-created Zionist elements in the Israeli command are axiomatically in the category of "not nice" for a serving or retired U.S. military professional.

friendships, and no one should censure him for that as long as there is no act of disloyalty to his nation in the matter. In Keegan's case, one wonders whether his proposed strategic outlooks represent him speaking as an American, or as a person under undue influence of British and Israeli strategic perceptions. Is there any provable fault in Keegan's connections beyond that latter cautionary observation?

We are faced with two problems. First, the matter of strategic policy in particular issues: e.g., U.S. posture vis-a-vis, variously, the Arab nations and the Soviet Union in the Middle East. There is no doubt that Keegan's policies border currently on the lunatic, and that British and Israeli influences contribute to this specific lunacy. Is there something worse than that involved? Second, where does Keegan stand with respect to the "New Dark Ages" policies of Huxley, Russell, Bernard Lewis, Henry A. Kissinger, James R. Schlesinger et al.? Does Keegan as a former head of U.S. Air Force Intelligence, condone the sort of operations associated with MK-ULTRA, "Project 86," and so forth?

What methods do we require to develop competent proof one way or the other on these two points? Let us review the evidence.

The "New Dark Age" policy

In the aftermath of World War I, there was a growing dedication within the ranks of top British intelligence circles to the strategic doctrine of the "New Dark Age." This doctrine came in two somewhat distinct forms. One form was the version associated with the WW I chief of British foreign intelligence, Herbert George Wells (the novelist and "futurologist"). As in his "futurology" *Time Machine*, Wells argued for the going underground of a scientifically trained elite. After a period of wars, the elite would reemerge, armed with science, to take charge of the

French writer calls for

The following are excerpts of an article published in the New York Times *Dec. 12, 1978 by Andre Bercoff, a former cultural editor of the French liberal weekly magazine* L'Express. *Entitled "A Warning to 'Sleeping Princes' of France's Left and Right," the article outlines the Dark Ages strategy for France:*

Since the defeat of the Union of the Left in the French legislative elections last March, the positions of the majority and the opposition have seemed fixed for an eternity ... that will last until spring 1981, when the French will have to choose a new "king," or confirm their preference for the present incumbent ....

Here is the political portrait of France: on the surface, the satisfied purring of the politicians; beneath the surface, unemployment, inflation and the first signs of civil disobedience that, if we aren't careful, risk leading to a state of violence that could, sooner or later, call forth muscled "saviors" set on restoring order ....

Today, the (reforms — ed.) should all move in a single direction: the strengthening of civil society and direct democracy; the recovery of each citizen's control over his own life free of a state that has for too long been supercentralized, Jacobin, and all-powerful ....

Clearly, the first must be real decentralization ....

A second reform that is immediately possible is the creation of jobs in the area of social life .... What would it take to build in every city in France thousands of multidisciplinary workshops where young people could make music, learn to build their own motorbikes, plant vegetables, or become skilled in the techniques of solar energy?

surviving populations reduced to savagery. The other form was that associated with Bertrand Russell; Russell led the British intelligence faction dedicated to what we would term today the extreme "environmentalist" version of the same strategic policy.

The British oligarchical view behind both versions of the "New Dark Age" policy runs as follows.

British circles grouped around Milner, George Bernard Shaw, and the Webbs in British intelligence policy-making command, drew the conclusion that the progress of industrial technology over the 19th century had reached the point that the very existence of the aristocracy-centered oligarchical faction was threatened by even the continuation of existing technological levels. Therefore, they proposed to promote a prolonged period of wars, hunger and epidemics, through which to reduce the earth's population to a fraction of its existing number, and to reduce the survivors to such a degree of savagery that the habits of a technological-progress outlook were thoroughly eradicated from the survivors' minds.

The bias of H.G. Wells and his cothinkers was toward preserving science as the secret knowledge of a priesthood-like elite. In the Wells view, the problem had been that reflections of scientific knowledge had been permitted to leak out, through education and technology into the daily experience and knowledge of the general citizenry of the industrialized nations. If this were prevented, by aid of the priesthood gimmick, the new society the elite would build from the savages would work quite agreeably for a significant time.

By approximately the middle 1920s, Bertrand Russell came to a leading position among the faction of the oligarchy which wanted no scientific progress at all, with or without a Wells-type priestly elite. The gist of the argument from the circles associated with Russell was that one could not prevent science from "leaking out." Best dispense with scientific progress altogether.

Notable are the cases of Aldous and Julian Huxley and the case of George Orwell. All three had been proteges of H.G. Wells, and all three were recruited to the psychedelic black-magic ("hermeticist") cult of the Golden Dawn in 1929. The result was that they went over to the side of Bertrand Russell.

From the 1930s until his death, British intelligence's Aldous Huxley was the leading perpetrator of projects for building weird cults and for mass-drugging of the youth population in the USA. His *Brave New World* was the fictionalized ("futurologist") statement of the policy of his faction of British intelligence, the same faction as that of Bertrand Russell. Indeed, there was a close collaboration between Huxley and Russell against the people of the U.S. — with Chicago University's Robert Hutchins a close collaborator.

Over the 1938-1945 period, in addition to Hutchins, Huxley, Russell, Alinsky and so forth, key Russell co-conspirators against the U.S. of the future were Kurt Lewin (of MIT and then the University of Michigan), Russell's old collaborator, German-born Karl Korsch, radical-positivist Carnap, and others. In addition to the Hollywood and other West Coast centers of Huxley's activities, Hutchins's University of Chicago (including Alinsky), the Lewin-launched center at MIT, and the Russell operation at the University of Pennsylvania, served as project centers prominently included in the postwar subversion operations.

Our present first track on postwar operations begins (on the basis of present information) at MIT's RLE. Through members of the family of Macy's ownership and a seed grant from the Josiah Macy Foundation, Alex Bavelas headed up a Lewinite "task-oriented problem-solving group" investigation. This became the seed crystal, around which other elements were coordinated. The Air Force and RAND entered, taking over from Josiah Macy et al. We identify this as a suitable pathway of investigation because of the connection of the Josiah Macy Foundation to the activities of Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead during that period.

The cases of Marvin Minsky and Noam Chomsky are relevant. Minsky is associated with a computer research project termed "Artificial Intelligence." Chomsky is a

return to 'tribal' existence

To break down the lonely crowd and rediscover the conviviality of the tribe — this is a realistic Utopia.

Another basic measure would be the redistribution of working hours by the establishment of a la carte schedules ....

To foster the autonomy of citizens and lessen their dependence on the state, it will be important to encourage the development of associations that can play an essential innovative and civilizing role in addition to that exercised by any political party or union. Examples that currently exist include consumer associations and environmental groups ....

There must be broad latitude for free radio stations to develop and for experiments with cable television ....

How many brilliant students are sitting in managers' chairs without ever having lifted their eyes from their books? Isn't it time to teach these great intellectuals not to forget manual labor by obliging every lycee graduate, before entering the university, to spend two years of practical experience in a workshop, a farm or on a construction site?

These few suggestions do not come close to exhausting the subject. I certainly don't mean to say that everything is wrong in France, but why can't this country set an example once again, as it did in 1789, in 1871 during the Commune, in 1936, and in 1968?

... Otherwise, no one should be surprised to hear the increasingly loud report of bombs and weapons of self-defense, of violence out of control. The crisis is here. Salvation is now seen as "political protest." It will come down hard.

Henry A. Kissinger is a 'raving Communist Revolutionary' . . . of a sort.

former RAND Corporation associate who was trained in linguistics by the Bertrand Russell-founded project at the University of Pennsylvania. Chomsky, resituated at MIT, has cast himself in the political-intelligence operative mode of Karl Korsch, and has been closely associated with international intelligence projects set up under Bertrand Russell. The significance of the pairing of Chomsky and Minsky is that Chomsky's linguistics are a significant input to the brainwashing studies done at RAND Corporation and elsewhere with aid of the programming methods of Minsky. (A chimpanzee putatively benefiting from their work was named "Nim Chimsky.")

The connection between the work of Chomsky, Minsky, and others in and around MIT's RLE to the RAND Corporation and the Palo Alto complex is a significant part of the background for the case of Air Force Intelligence as a whole. It is also relevant that the rabid environmentalist James R. Schlesinger has several common denominators with Henry A. Kissinger, including Daniel Ellsberg. It was Ellsberg who brought Schlesinger into the RAND Corporation, and who collaborated with RAND Associate Chomsky in launching the public phase of Kissinger's "Pentagon Papers" project.

The operational connections of these points to the creation and deployment of the Jones People's Temple cult are adequately documented in earlier reports. To be emphasized is the connection of former Air Force officer Dr. Joel Fort to the building of the Jones cult in California, and the role of the RAND Corporation, as well as British and Israeli intelligence, in proliferating drug cults in the USA during the 1960s and 1970s.

The halting of scientific progress (e.g., "environmentalism"), the wrecking of the cognitive element in language usage ("linguistics"), and the development of synthetic drugs as instruments of mass mind-control of drugged political slaves (e.g., LSD-25), are all the three-point "New Dark Age" program specified by Bertrand Russell during the mid-1920s.

In sum, RAND Corporation and Air Force Intelligence have been complicit in a decades-long effort to destroy the United States, and to bring most of the world into a "New Dark Age."

That is a hard fact. Whoever says it is not fact is a liar. That objector is lying either by denying facts known to him, or lying in witting falsification of his ignorance. The proof is massive and conclusive.

What is not established is the full further evaluation of those facts. To what degreee did which specific Air Force Intelligence officials know the purpose of the operation in which they were complicit? To what degree were various Air Force Intelligence officials either directly or not directly involved? Which knew this sort of thing was going on? The complicity of the agency, Air Force Intelligence, is proven. The degree of complicity of each of various members of that agency is all that remains to be determined by further investigation.

To this, we add one further qualification.

In the Nuremberg proceedings, the use of medical and psychological practices for political purposes was extensively considered, especially in the cases of the "Nazi doctors." The victors, conducting the proceedings, adopted certain judicial rulings which have been entered into international law. The complicity of Air Force Intelligence and the Office of Naval Intelligence's Lewinite National Training Laboratories, in drugging and behavior-modification of elements of the U.S. population for malignant political purposes, constitutes a crime against humanity before international law.

For such cases, the international law standard of "either knew or should have known" was established. For instances of complicity with such projects, it is not necessary to prove that the accused was actually fully witting of the character and implications of the operation. It is sufficient to demonstrate that the individuals in question "should have known" in terms of a reasonable application of their knowledge and cumulative qualifications of experience.

This is not only a fair standard of judgment; it is required by the nature of the circumstances.

Whenever we are confronted by offenses committed as abuse of office, in which the nature of the offense prompts the perpetrators and accomplices to take some precautions to hide their complicity in such acts, we cannot expect to discover red-handed evidence of criminal *intent* by the most-responsible perpetrators. We must rely on the standard evidence of "should have known."

Those officials who were complicit in the Huxley-Russell-initiated drug-and-cultism projects clearly should have known the implications of the operational projects set into motion by MK-ULTRA and related pilots. They should have known that these projects originated with a foreign (British) intelligence entity, and that these evil undertakings were furthered in the United States during the 1960s by elements of the Israeli intelligence service.

If the clear intent of the responsible elements of British intelligence is taken into account, these projects in aid of "The New Dark Age" program were a form of warfare against the United States in the truest sense of the term warfare, covert warfare. Those U.S. officials complicit by the standard of *should have known* are clearly guilty of no less a crime than treasonous acts.

It may be that neither the United Kingdom nor Israel were declared enemies at that point. Nonetheless, MK-ULTRA-centered operational projects were acts of warfare against the United States, and it was treasonous of of-

ficials concerned not to report such acts of warfare to the Executive Branch, or, the Executive Branch declining to defend the nation, to the Congress.

Kissinger is a Communist

The reputation of Bertrand Russell as a "pacifist" is somewhat more than tainted by Russell's push for "preventive" nuclear warfare against the Soviet Union during the immediate aftermath of World War II. When this striking "inconsistency" is placed within the context of Russell's dedication to the "New Dark Age," from the mid-1920s onward, the artificed deception with which leading British circles disguise their policies begins to peel away.

Although there are, inevitably, many points of resistance to such a policy even within Britain itself, the policy of the "New Dark Age" is the persisting policy of that powerful section of British intelligence whose utopian outlook was fairly represented by the film "Clockwork Orange." This faction has been able to push British policy and influence in that direction with fair consistency over the intervening years since Russell embraced it.

It is true, in a certain convenient manner of speaking, to say that Aldous Huxley and Bertrand Russell were a "bunch of communists." It is fair, without the slightest exaggeration, to include Henry A. Kissinger as well as Daniel Ellsberg in that same category.

The best point of reference, pedagogically, for understanding this is the French Revolution. Who funded and armed the mob of sansculottes who stormed the Bastille? The Duke of Orleans, of course. Who was the leading patron of Maximilien Robespierre? The same Necker who had ruined the finances of France, the same Necker whose daughter, the Madame de Stael, had once been nearly affianced to Britain's Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger. Who trained and deployed Danton and Marat for the French Jacobin Terror? The British monarchy, of course — with aid from the Duke of Orleans and Necker.

Ah, but Orleans, Necker, the Madame de Stael, and the forces around Pitt were all raving profeudal aristocrats! Precisely! The Jacobin sansculottes' terror was an alliance between the anticapitalist feudal oligarchy of Europe and the anticapitalist slum population drawn in for welfare benefits from the French countryside.

It is in this sense that Kissinger, Ellsberg, Schlesinger, and many more are a "raving bunch of fanatical communists."

There are also professed communists (and social democrats too) who are raving feudalists — in the tradition of Danton and Marat. This is the case with the so-called "left wing" of the Socialist International, and also with such right-wing excommunists as Sidney Hook and Jay Lovestone.

There exists a dubious document termed "The Rakovsky Protocol," circulated from Spain during the early postwar period. This is purported to have been a

What are these reckless, deluded bastards trying to do to the United States?!

document secured from a Soviet security official's residence by Spanish forces deployed into Russia during World War II. It is represented as a stenogram of a prison conversation between a Soviet security official, mediating for Stalin, and Christian Rakovsky, convicted of treason during the Moscow Trials of the 1930s. We are in no position to certify that this document is valid or a forgery. We do not know whether or not Rakovsky ever said such things; we do know that the mentality attributed to Rakovsky in the document is the mentality of a certain type of professed communist, such as N. Bukharin and Karl Radek. It is for that reason — and one additional consideration — that we mention it in this context.

It helps, among other uses, to understand the dangers embedded in President Carter's proposed China policy.

There are two interesting features of the "Rakovsky Protocol." First, insofar as the included facts can be verified or refuted outside the Soviet Union, those facts are true. Second, insofar as the mentality of the Rakovsky of the document is projected upon members of the Parvus network, the representation of "Rakovsky's" mind is valid.

This verisimilitude extends more or less to the case of Trotsky himself. Prior to the summer of 1917, Trotsky was a gifted wretch, who was indeed a protege of circles linked to S.G. Warburg interests. Lenin understood this and handled Trotksy accordingly. At the same time, the events of 1917 and thereafter left a profound effect on Trotsky, including a certain guilt-ridden awe of Lenin's personality. After Trotsky's exile from the Soviet Union, he was subjected to alternating "Mutt and Jeff" treatment by British-coordinated circles. He never fully freed himself of the Warburg taint and its implications. However, prior to his death, he showed growing awareness of the evil represented by the British, especially with respect to British operations against outgoing Mexican President Lazaro Cardenas. Thus, there is a certain verisimilitude to the remarks on Trotsky given by the "Rakovsky" of the "Protocol."

The "Rakovsky" of the "Protocol" speaks of a kind of "Revolution." The usage of the term, the prisoner's efforts to explicate the meaning of the term, confuses and enrages the State Security official. It is the "Revolution" of Russell's "New Dark Age." It is "revolution" as understood and practiced by Dieterding's and Samuel's Alexander Helphand (Parvus) and by Karl Korsch after Parvus. It is a "Revolution" which is equally hateful of

Does anyone imagine that the tiny nation of Israel* independently *developed one of the most capable air combat arms in the world?

industrial-capitalist republicanism and a Soviet industrial-socialist model.

On the latter point, the attempt to include the post-1924 Trotsky in the forces allied to the "Rakovsky" of the "Protocol" breaks down. Yet, Trotsky's praise for the influence of Jeremy Bentham in his autobiography, *My Life*, is consistent with the pre-1917, Parvusite "permanent revolution" doctrines associated with Trotsky.

To compare this with the China problem requires one precautionary word of introduction. The reader must remember that an anti-Soviet posture has been institutionalized as a touchstone of Peking factional life and policy-making. No matter what the actual policy of a factional spokesman, he is obliged — for the present moment — to genuflect before that magical posturing. One cannot, therefore, adduce the underlying vectors of a faction's character from the mere fact that it loudly asserts an anti-Soviet posture.

The anti-industrial, pro-rural component of Peking's factions, the "Cultural Revolution" faction, is the sort of "raving communist" the cited "Protocol" represents Rakovsky to be. This is heavily underlined by the frequency of visits to Peking by Bavaria's Franz-Josef Strauss. Behind Strauss the ostensible backwoods demagogue there is a hard-core oligarchist operative on good terms with Otto von Hapsburg and Fritz Kraemer. Strauss's Peking outlook and his receptions there correlate with the British oligarchy's own connections to Peking. The British oligarchists and the "Cultural Revolution" faction in Peking are not only equally oligarchist in their character and outlook, but their attitudes toward one another are premised on a fully conscious recognition of this point.

There are in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union today some of the same strain of "communist revolutionary" the "Rakovsky" of the "Protocol" represents himself to be. This is key to the Philby-Maclean phenomenon, to the special biases of Imemo, and to debate within leading Soviet circles between supporters of the Hambros-defined pro-SDR policy and the pro-EMS policy. The Bucharest-Belgrade axis involves also the Parvus style of "revolutionary." The international "Eurocommunist" currents closely allied to the Socialist International are also of the same species.

Witness the case of Mr. Bernard Lewis. This British intelligence operative is nominally situated at Princeton and otherwise associated with Henry A. Kissinger at Georgetown University's CSIS. Lewis is a raving "revolutionary," the leading propagandist for a worldwide wave of destabilizations and persisting local wars. This epidemic Mr. Lewis (and Mr. Kissinger)
complish by fomenting "particularist-nationalist" insurrections, exploiting every conceivable shading of difference in religion, dialect, and political mythologies. There is no difference on this point among Bernard Lewis, "raving communist" Henry A. Kissinger, and the nominally Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party.

This is Kissinger's southern Africa policy. (Whoever denies that is a liar.) That is the Horn of Africa policy Kissinger ran in conjunction with London while he was Secretary of State. (Whoever denies that is a liar.)
was the London-Kissinger policy which governed the London-Kissinger cooperation with Israel in attempting to launch a tripartition of Lebanon, beginning April 1975. (Whoever denies that is a liar.)
for Iran, for Afghanistan, for "Baluchistan," for the entire subcontinent of Asia. That is the Kissinger-Einaudi policy for South America ("Second War of the Pacific"),
general destabilization of Central America, and Kissinger's Southeast Asia policy.

Kissinger is a raving "communist" revolutionary . . . of a special sort, the sort which Metternich and Bismarck employed through drafts on (principally) Rothschild banks.

Is Major-General (ret.)
communist" revolutionary of that sort?

There, for the benefit of those persons who term us "KGB agents" in the USA and "CIA agents" in Scandinavia — the same persons — we have confessed the innermost secrets of the matter. Yes, gentlemen, we confess: Henry A. Kissinger is a "raving communist" . . . of a sort. We cannot be certain of Major-General (ret.)
Keegan, but we have strong evidentiary basis for worrying.

Keegan and the New Dark Age

Keegan, in this respect like the incompetent Alexander Haig, is working to bring "raving communist" objectives into being. Since we know Keegan directly as well as from his record, for what he is qualified to be he does brilliantly, is an eminently competent military professional in that narrowed respect. Haig we know to be a raving incompetent with no known redeeming features. Thus, we extend our condolences to General Keegan for noting a certain undeniable connection between the policies of both.

Let us consider how Keegan is working to bring Bertrand Russell's New Dark Age into being. Two points are adequate demonstration. Primarily, his pro-Israel strategic policy brings the world right up to the brink of World War III. We do not blame him so much for the fact that he supports London's (and Kissinger's)
blame him because he has performed a significant part in disorienting U.S. military professionals and others who would have otherwise tended to warn against the lunacy of the Kissinger-Brzezinski policies. Secondly, Keegan

should be doing his patriotic duty by warning his brother serving and retired officers against the lunacy of the "limited nuclear war" doctrine. But for widespread swallowing of that latter incompetent refuse among so many military professionals, the U.S. would not be following the present course of risking World War III by strategic miscalculation.

In this we emphasize Keegan's failure to reflect his best side, his organically American side. To his earlier position as head of Air Force Intelligence, Keegan brought competence as a combat flying officer and the competence of a trained physicist. Our best estimate of his performance on those counts is that his abilities and achievements have been exemplary.

This virtuous side of Keegan makes the issue all the clearer. He is exemplary of those who would be among the best career military professionals in his field but for the subversive influence of British and British-controlled Zionist circles. In contrast to some wretch such as Haig, Keegan's Jekyll-Hyde performance on strategic issues efficiently illuminates the problem of subversion.

Take the second issue first. There will never be a limited nuclear war between the forces of the USA and Soviet Union. Only a lunatic military commander would ever tolerate violating the fundamental principles of warfare in such a suicidal fashion.

This lunacy, "limited nuclear warfare," is generically derived from the earlier doctrine, "brinkmanship." No commander will permit his strategic-defense capability to be nullified through inch-by-inch breaches without launching total thermonuclear war. The pressures of "brinkmanship" simply lower the threshholds represented by relative deterrence to the point that the next inch means instant thermonuclear war.

Neither of these two lunatic doctrines were developed out of competent military-strategic examinations of the implications of technological modifications of warfare. Both doctrines originated chiefly with the psychological-warfare branch of British intelligence, e.g., the London Tavistock Institute. It was at the latter institution that Henry A. Kissinger received advanced conditioning and indoctrination in the service of British intelligence, under the sponsorship of Chatham House. Both doctrines were the effort to solve the problem of Soviet nuclear-warfare capabilities outside the domain of warfare-capabilities, in the domain of psychology.

Worse, the entire British-designed doctrine within which these postures are situated is not based on classical military considerations of strategic interests of nations. Both are derived from British "geopolitical" cult-doctrine of Lord Milner et al., the same doctrines which led to fateful miscalculation in British catalyzing of two World Wars during this century to date.

From a military-professional standpoint, all of these British doctrines violate every lesson of modern warfare experience since the campaigns of Cesare Borgia and the writings of Nicolo Machiavelli. The fallacies embedded in these British doctrines were discredited in warfare in the American Revolution. They were discredited as the instrument created by Lazare Carnot demolished the Austrian and then the Prussian line. They were discredited by the leadership of General Winfield Scott, despite President Polk's virtual treason, in the war against the Duke of Wellington in Mexico. They were discredited by the experience of the U.S. Civil War. They were discredited in the so-called Boer War. They were discredited in two World Wars of this century, and in the Russian civil wars which followed the 1917 October Revolution.

The degeneration of our military leadership has been a process which has kept the British busy over decades. . . .

Yet, with all the proven military theory, there are star-studded nincompoops and muddle-headed naval flag officers around Washington who prefer the latest RAND computer print-out over the professional judgment one presumes them to have developed.

So, U.S. foreign policy and strategic posture shaped to fit the outlines of a potentially-fatal delusion, the U.S. veers toward the brink of radioactive Hell, while silly soldiers beat bravely against their medals, proposing to scare the Soviet strategic forces into submitting with no more than a half-swing of their own potentially war-winning strategic capabilities.

Every crucial feature of NATO strategic doctrine and British and U.S. policy respecting NATO capabilities profile is premised on this delusion. The "neutron bomb" and "cruise missile" gadgetry is premised essentially on assuming that the Soviet command is as deluded as the Pentagon has ostensibly become.

What are these reckless, deluded bastards trying to do to the United States?!

It is our firm conviction that Major-General George Keegan, among others, knows better. He, at least, comprehended the point that only effective, high-technology breakthroughs in active civil defense meant anything worth considering. How can he show such excellence on the matter on the one side and also behave as such a reckless, deluded fool whenever the British and Ezer Weizman send him a signal to trigger a virtual psychotic state in his outlook?

Perhaps "signal" understates the matter.

The key to Israel's military capability is its combined nuclear capability and its air force. Does anyone imagine that the tiny nation of Israel *independently* developed one of the most capable air combat arms in the world?

During the second phase of Israel's development, as a Ben Gurion-led British puppet-state, it was the British who controlled the development of Israel's military capabilities. This reached a climax in the deployment of

Israel against Egypt under the direction of the Anthony Eden government of Great Britain, in the 1956 Suez Crisis.

After a decent interval, and most emphatically at successive turning-points of 1967 and 1973, the U.S. assumed heavy obligations for developing the Israeli air arm. That arm is essentially a U.S.-built British surrogate military arm in the Middle East. General Keegan was closely associated with aspects of this project. Elements of the U.S. Air Force regard the Israeli military capability as chiefly their personal investment and toy. The British, who really control the situation, encourage U.S. officials in such consoling delusions.

This British success in deeply involving the Pentagon in Israel's military capabilities deepens the Pentagon's Trilby-like dependency on the British Svengali.

The following is a balanced view of the problem as a whole.

During and following World War II British intelligence influence over the U.S. military and intelligence establishment was concentrated with special force on the U.S. air arm. With many particular instances of officers, the British influence did not take to the extent the British would have preferred. The case of retired Chief of Staff George Brown might be cited in that connection. In many cases, the American heritage resisted the anglophile disease.

The worst manifestation of this with respect to the air arm was the old U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, the element spun off to create the corporate entity, RAND Corporation. The U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey was a clone taken out of the British Strategic Bombing Survey, which was, in turn, a highly indecent connection between the British Operations Research circus and the London Tavistock Clinic.

The published accounts of PMS Blackett and others during the 1950s laid open the most essential features of the Strategic Bombing Survey scandal.

The essential point to be emphasized is that it was the Tavistock Clinic crowd which predominated in the indecent connection — despite C.P. Snow's misleading emphasis in his account of the matter. The Strategic Bombing Survey was primarily a Frankenstein's monster-creation of the psychological warfare crowd around Rees, Trist, Dicks, Bion et al. It was therefore quite consistent that the sort of nonsense for which crazy Zbiggy Brzezinski usually receives credit nowadays was implanted in RAND Corporation from its corporate inception, with H.V. Dicks on premises to nurture the infant. This was the same Tavistock crowd which later put the final brainwashing touches on the British intelligence zombie known as Henry A. Kissinger.

During the post-1956 Suez Crisis period, General Maxwell Taylor joined the ranks of U.S. professionals brainwashed by the British, coming back with the lunatic doctrine which put the U.S. into the Vietnam War under Kennedy and Johnson. (Maxwell Taylor has evidently learned nothing from the Vietnam experience. He has been back at the same shtick recently.)

Under McGeorge Bundy and Henry Kissinger at NSC, and under idiot-savants such as McNamara at DOD, the competence of military professionals carried over from World War II was weeded out, and the incoming senior ranks were selectively culled to swing the overall bias more emphatically to the British side.

The degeneration of our military leadership has been a process which has kept the British busy over decades, not something fully established at the close of World War II. Yet, there has been a continuity of virtual or even outright treason within elements of the intelligence community over the past three decades. The Air Force Intelligence-RAND interface is one element of such loathesomeness. The Stephenson nests in U.S. Naval Intelligence and FBI counterespionage intelligence are others. The CIA, too, had its share — not surprising if one knows the Dulles brothers' pedigrees with sufficient refinement.

It is past time to clean the nests of British and Israeli agents out of our intelligence services. The risks are too great to postpone the housecleaning any longer.