

# Lord Carrington and the betrayal of Her Majesty's Secret Service

by Mark Burdman

Coincident with the decision by British Home Secretary Leon Brittan on Dec. 8 to release most of the secret papers pertaining to the case of British fascist Sir Oswald Mosley, it has become fashionable in certain London circles to start reminiscing about the fate meted out after World War II to Lord Haw Haw and John Amery, both hanged for having collaborated with the enemy.

It is being recalled in certain quarters of the British Secret Intelligence Services (SIS) and MI-5 that there exists a precedent in this century for defining a concept, in British terms of reference, of *treason*. The consensus politics and compromises intrinsic to the British "Establishment" have put the reins on use of the concept, but it is not to be excluded that in the not-too-distant future, some of the "old boys" of Her Majesty's Secret Service may decide that the behavior of Lord Peter Carrington falls under that category.

Now that Carrington has been officially designated Secretary-General of NATO, various factions within the Establishment, including members of the House of Lords strongly opposed to Carrington's actual policies, have decided to band together behind Carrington in the "higher interest" of Her Majesty's Government's control over the crisis-management mechanisms of the Western alliance. The idea was put crudely by the *Sunday Telegraph's* Gordon Brook-Shepherd on Dec. 11: Carrington's appointment meant that "les Anglo-Saxons" were again in control of the military and political branches of NATO for the first time since the 1950s.

But that does not dampen the extraordinary restiveness among elements of British intelligence. Military intelligence "old boys" are reportedly fuming over the role Carrington played in the "Falklands affair." "British intelligence was sending urgent dispatches about the military confrontation that was about to happen, and Carrington sat on everything," one source told *EIR*. "Then the intelligence service got blamed for so-called intelligence failures. There is a growing feeling that Carrington set the services up for a fall." Some insiders,

he said, are convinced that Carrington contrived the whole "Falklands affair" from the beginning, to throw British defense posture off balance in the context of his "balance of power" ("New Yalta") global wheelings and dealings with Moscow.

But consider the role Carrington is playing now in making the British Isles vulnerable to a pre-emptive strike from the East: If the full weight of this dawns on relevant nerve centers of the services, all hell will break loose.

## The Soviets' Western pre-emptive strike command

Carrington, like his co-thinkers in the Pugwash Conference circuit in Geneva, is committed to the maintenance of the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction ("deterrence") and to the prevention of the return to classical defense doctrine which would mandate crash development of beam weapons by the United States and the associated industrial-technological revolution that would go along with it.

The Soviets, from their side, have in reality never adopted the "deterrence" strategy, and in mid-December, at the Pugwash meeting in Geneva, they kicked the MAD chess game over, announcing in effect that they were launching a global confrontation whether the congregated epigones of the late Lord Bertrand Russell liked it or not. This threat so terrified the Pugwashers that they bowed and scraped before the Soviet generals present and mobilized their entire international network within hours to induce the Western alliance to make new concessions to Soviet blackmail.

The Pugwash stalking horse within NATO is Carrington himself. A British parliamentarian close to Carrington assured a confidant in London on the eve of the Pugwash meeting that Carrington would guarantee the sabotage of the American energy-beam development program and would keep NATO within the MAD regime.

Herein lies the rub: What the Soviets issued at Pugwash

was a pure and simple announcement that they were moving toward world war. According to University of Edinburgh Sovietologist John Erickson, who maintains conduits into the coterie around Soviet Chief of Staff Nikolai Ogarkov in Moscow, the Soviet war plans now include the creation of five "pre-emptive strike commands," including an operational "Western" strike command preparing military action against the territory of Great Britain itself. Corroborating information known to American, French, and Israeli intelligence, Erickson reported that the Soviets were engaged in unprecedented efforts to build an "invulnerable defensive system" based on application of lasers and particle beams to antibalistic-missile complexes, and that the Soviets were forging well ahead of the United States in these areas.

Why is Carrington silent on matters known to British military and intelligence circles, matters involving the continued existence of the United Kingdom itself? Why, for that matter, is Carrington so fanatically opposed to the doctrine of strategic defense for the West that would inclusively increase Great Britain's own chances for survival in the coming months?

According to Erickson, the Soviets have stepped up surveillance and reconnaissance provocations against Scotland and contiguous areas, with an ultimate view, in his evaluation, to act directly against underwater sensors in and around Scottish territory. During the week of Dec. 12, units of the Soviet Baltic fleet have begun to make menacing operations around British territory. As Erickson points out, Yorkshire is at the demarcation line between Soviet "northern" and Baltic military operations, and this is a point of intense Soviet pressure, in the context of an expanding matrix of Soviet provocations against Iceland, Spitzbergen/Norway, and other sensitive points, in preparation for pre-emptive Soviet military action in the period ahead.

Erickson's contentions were expanded on Dec. 12 in the *Daily Telegraph* of London, by former Navy Minister Speed, by Vice-Admiral and Vice Chief of Naval Staff Sir Peter Stanford, and by Admiral of the Fleet Sir Henry Leach, former First Sea Lord. Speed warned that the Soviets had shifted a "significant number of cruise missile submarines from their Northern Fleet to the Baltic to put them closer to targets in this country and Northern Europe," and had sent a submarine armed with four 250-mile-range cruise missiles through the English channel in October and the cruiser *Slava*, with 16 cruise missiles, sailing around northwest Scotland in November. Stanford and Leach warned of the inadequacy of Britain's capabilities to meet the threat.

The silence of Lord Carrington and his Foreign Office collaborators on these matters is deafening. Why?

Those interested in preventing the United Kingdom from being transformed into a radioactive heap would be obliged to desist thinking of Carrington as representing actual British interests, in the sense of 900 years during which the British Isles have never been conquered. Carrington is rather to be

regarded as of that Geneva-centered grouping, with branches in Venice and Genoa, which has predominantly controlled Britain only for the past 300 or so years, since the 1688 Glorious Revolution. It was Geneva which manipulated leading British factions into the folly that necessitated Benjamin Franklin's American Revolution, and it is the same quality of folly which is about to walk Britain and the Atlantic Alliance into the abyss.

The families for which Carrington speaks are, internally, completing the transformation of Britain into a Sodom and Gomorrah, a de-industrialized heap of drug users and homosexuals. They are savaging British defense capabilities, and they abhor the U.S. beam-weapons program insofar as that might help regenerate the United Kingdom's technological and industrial infrastructure as well.

### **The shock of Chirac**

Carrington does not assume his office as NATO Secretary-General until the spring of 1984. Before then, it is not to be excluded that a survival instinct of the same sort that gripped factions of the Cliveden set in early 1940 may re-emerge, and that Carrington's betrayal may become too much even for the Establishment to stomach.

Curious rumblings began to surface in the first days of December, immediately following the trip of French opposition leader Jacques Chirac to London.

On Dec. 1, during comments made at the prestigious Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chirac dropped a bombshell: He called for West Germany to be defended with beam-weapons systems as the most effective way of defeating neutralism and pacifism in the Federal Republic (see *EIR*, Dec. 20).

The proposal was front-page news in French newspapers, but never made the press in the U.K. On Dec. 2, London insiders who attended the RIIA event lied that Chirac had never made any such statement in London. One Thatcher intimate told *EIR*: "Nobody is thinking of beam weapons here." The latter fellow, one week later, had gone through a fascinating transformation. He still could not "remember" Chirac having spoken about beam weapons, but he declared: "Beams are in. The principles are accepted."

Developments in Paris, not only around the Gaullist Chirac, but also concerning President Mitterrand himself, had taken on an unexpected dimension. The London *Financial Times* Dec. 13 published a half-page op-ed about how Mitterrand now embodied the institutional forms of the Fifth Republic founded by de Gaulle, in terms of unflinching commitment to national defense. In British Pugwash circuits, the word was put out that the French could not be "trusted" and were acting like mavericks.

The truth that dawned on the Establishment, as much as they hated to admit it, is that the United States and France had embarked on complementary, if not cooperative, efforts for developing beam weapons. This, in a sense equal to the

Soviet threat itself, has begun to create a panic in Establishment circles that balance-of-power control over the West could fall out of British hands, unless an adaptation in policy were made. Under the most optimistic circumstances, this could mean that Britain will be compelled to enter into a American-French-British "directoire" policy arrangement to survive; the price could be the political head of Lord Peter Carrington.

### Treason in Britain: the Mosley case

In the United Kingdom, the question of treason, such as it is, reflects intense behind-the-scenes intrigues involving the royal family, the intelligence services, the banking world, and so on. The victims are chosen with a selectivity aimed at protecting the broad oligarchic principles of the British system.

Hence the gambits emerging around the release of the "Oswald Mosley papers." Based on interrogations of Mosley and other documents accumulated before and during the second World War, the papers contain an enormous wealth of material reportedly implicating a wide array of Establishment and royal family figures in backing not only the avowed fascist Mosley but European fascist movements more generally. That the British were massively involved in nurturing fascism in the 1930s, and that Establishment figures were involved in backing Hitler into the 1940s, is well known. But what is the motivation behind their sudden release now, when they were originally to have been kept secret until the middle part of the next century?

Notably, gossip is passing around London parlor circuits that Tory right-wing hardliners like parliamentarian Julian Amery will be hardest hit by the new revelations, especially as Amery's brother John had been hanged for collaborating with the Nazis. For all his idiosyncrasies, Julian Amery is today an outspoken advocate of strong Western defenses for meeting the Russian war threat. By the same token, why was John Amery selected as an example after the war? By the standards of Justice Robert Jackson's interpretation of the Nuremberg Codes and principles of treason in accordance with republican natural law, scores of Establishment figures should have met the same fate, but in Britain decisions are made for other reasons.

Among the most outspoken campaigners for the release of the Mosley papers has been the left-wing Labour Party Tribune Group faction, interfacing elements of Soviet intelligence and the U.S. Anti-Defamation League. Their motivations have all the outward cast of moral purity. In the words of parliamentarian Norman Atkinson, the aim is to show the "relations between the British fascist leader Mosley and the royal family." Ex-M.P. Stan Newens told the *Jerusalem Post* Dec. 9: "It is not Mosley who was being protected by the records being kept closed. A whole group of the British establishment was prepared to come to terms with Hitler, and after the war, they preferred that their past views should be forgotten. Today, people tend to forget that many people in

the Conservative Party and in the establishment were prepared to make a deal with Hitler. They were prepared to come to terms with him even as late as the early years of the war. There is a very important job to be done today in exposing this state of affairs. There is a great deal about Mosley and the Fascists which still has to be brought to light."

So far, so good. But, then this curiously worded conclusion: "There are lessons to be drawn today from these issues if we are to take an intelligent approach to current problems such as whether to support fascist governments as alternatives to communist regimes."

Of course, the insiders know better: It was "communist" Russia which backed, and in some cases helped to create, "fascist" movements as a way to destroy the West. Various British Establishment figures in the "Children of the Sun" grouping of the 1920s were godfathers of this "Nazi-Communist" assault against Western civilization.

Apparently, some people in the "Services" have begun to sniff a rotten egg. MI-5 historiographer Nigel West, in the Dec. 10 *Times* of London, draws attention to the fact that six files out of 140 in the Mosley papers are being withheld. He puts forward the hypothesis that "the most fascinating and explosive files of all relate to Moscow's intervention in the British Fifth Column." A certain "pro-Nazi" spy named Tyler Kent, West indicates, was most likely a Soviet spy run through Nazi networks.

"MI-5's postwar investigators learned that in fact Kent had been recruited by the Russians while on attachment to the American Embassy in Moscow," West writes. "The implication was that much of the pro-Nazi subversion . . . in the early months of the war had in fact been orchestrated from Moscow, not Berlin. It will be recalled that during this period, the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact of August 1939, which allied the Soviet Union to Nazi Germany, was in force and remained so until the invasion of Russia in June, 1941. . . . Far from covering up the alleged involvement of senior politicians with the Blackshirts, the files are more likely to contain information concerning that most sensitive of all subjects, Soviet penetration of the security service."

As important as it is to bring out the question of Soviet use of Nazi networks at this point in history, the issue is still broached within the maze of intelligence warfare. As of this writing, wild fights are taking place between British factions, in intelligence and inside the Freemasonry, apparently over control of drugs, terrorism, and so on.

But the reality is that Britain, and the NATO alliance, stand at the precipice of obliteration by the Soviet Union. British "survival" would dictate defining as treason those who are using their cherished "channels" into the East to lull the West into surrender and suicide. It is those influentials in the U.K. involved in the byzantine Soviet games indicated by Nigel West who need to be given their walking papers, and the British would do themselves and the world a favor if they began this process with Lord Peter Carrington.