

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.