

Lobster 59

The view from the bridge

Robin Ramsay

Have a guess

This was sent by Dan Atkinson, who wondered what was 'out of the question'?

From recently-declassified US discussions about the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974.

General Brown: I have one minor point that sort of parallels what we have been talking about. This Turkish opium issue.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's shut up a week on the poppy issue. We don't need to get that involved now.

Mr. Sisco: I have one small point. [1 line not declassified]

Secretary Kissinger: That's absolutely out of the question.

Mr. Sisco: I would think so, too. [1 line not declassified] ¹

Oh Canada!

Good old Canada! It didn't join the invasion of Iraq, did it? What an example to this country it set. Alas, it isn't true. While Canada may not have *formally* supported the invasion of Iraq, informally it did. In his 'Canada's secret war in Iraq' Richard Sanders quotes the then US Ambassador to Canada

'... ironically, Canadian naval vessels, aircraft and personnel.....will supply more support to this war in Iraq indirectly.....than most of those 46 countries that

¹ <www.state.gov/documents/organization/96606.pdf>

are fully supporting our efforts there.’²

In his essay Sanders lists that ‘indirect’ support.

Elite studies

The ripples from the great financial fuck-up will be with us for years. One of the striking themes has been the interest from some of the mainstream media in areas which previously they dismissed as cranky.

On April 24 2008 *The Economist* of all things, the absolute beating heart of the City and globalisation on this side of the Atlantic, ran a piece called ‘The global ruling class’. At one level this was just another ass-kissing piece about the big swinging dicks of the global-financial world. But with a spin. It included these sections.

‘It would be odd if the current integration of the world economy did not produce new global elites – business people and financiers who run global companies and global politicians who steer supra-national organisations such as the European Union (EU) and the International Monetary Fund.....

David Rothkopf, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,³ argues that these elites constitute nothing less than a new global “superclass”.

They have all the clubby characteristics of the old national ruling classes, but with the vital difference that they operate on the global stage, far from mere national electorates. They attend the same universities (Mr Rothkopf calculates that Harvard, Stanford and the University of Chicago are now the world’s top three

² <www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8110>

³ David Rothkopf has worked for Kissinger Associates and as the deputy under-secretary of commerce for international trade.

superclass producers). They are groomed in a handful of world-spanning institutions such as Goldman Sachs. They belong to the same clubs – the Council on Foreign Relations in New York is a particular favourite – and sit on each other’s boards of directors. Many of them shuttle between the public and private sectors. They meet at global events such as the World Economic Forum at Davos and the Trilateral Commission or – for the crème de la crème – the Bilderberg meetings or the Bohemian Grove seminars that take place every July in California.’

The financial analysts Bloomberg offered its columnist David Reilly’s comments on some of the detail of the great bank bailout in America in his ‘Secret Banking Cabal Emerges From AIG Shadows’.⁴

‘The idea of secret banking cabals that control the country and global economy are a given among conspiracy theorists who stockpile ammo, bottled water and peanut butter. After this week’s congressional hearing into the bailout of American International Group Inc., you have to wonder if those folks are crazy after all. Wednesday’s hearing described a secretive group deploying billions of dollars to favored banks, operating with little oversight by the public or elected officials.

We’re talking about the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, whose role as the most influential part of the federal-reserve system – apart from the matter of AIG’s bailout – deserves further congressional scrutiny.....

Later, when it became clear information would be disclosed, New York Fed legal group staffer, James Bergin, e-mailed colleagues saying: “I have to think this train is probably going to leave the station soon and we need to focus our efforts on explaining the story as best

4 <www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601039&sid=aaLuE.W8RAuU>

we can. There were too many people involved in the deals – too many counterparties, too many lawyers and advisors, too many people from AIG – to keep a determined Congress from the information.”

Reilly commented:

‘Think of the enormity of that statement. A staffer at a body with little public accountability and that exists to serve bankers is lamenting the inability to keep Congress in the dark.’

I’m not sure how enormous it seems: more like business as usual, I suspect.

Over at Huffington Post in January Janine Wedel wrote about her new book *Shadow Elite*; and, having described the interlocking networks at the top of the American and world political and financial world, concluded with this:

‘I’ve seen this kind of intertwining of roles and relationships before. They are exactly what you’d find in communist and post-communist societies. The blueprint the players used in Russia is now being followed by the interlocking handful of Wall Street/government policy deciders to wield increasing power and influence for their own benefit. In both cases, operators at the top challenge governments’ rules of accountability and businesses’ codes of competition, ultimately answering only to each other. In both cases, it’s hard to get more “efficient”, because inside information and power is confined to very few actors who trust each other. And, because only the players themselves have the information, they can brand it for everyone else’s consumption and stay largely out of the reach of government and public scrutiny, meaning you and me.

Today’s power brokers are still at the top of their game because they are said to “have the credentials”. No matter that they are the credentials of a shadowy

elite – and of failure.’⁵

The next day veteran writer/investigator Jack Blum also wrote about the *Shadow Elite* book:

‘Shadow Elite identifies players who perform overlapping, mutually influencing, and not fully revealed, roles across government, business, think tanks, and national borders in pursuit of their own policy agendas (“flexians,” she calls them, and “flex-nets” – such players who work together in a network) as an important key to understanding how influence is wielded and why policy decisions are made.

Profound changes in government and society have vastly increased the opportunities for agenda-bearing players wearing multiple hats (and often working in close-knit networks) to significantly influence public policy. Such activity is much less transparent to the public eye than when I first began my career. An amazing variety of corporate entities with strange and complex interrelationships today do much of the work of federal government, virtually substituting for it in some arenas. These entities and their sponsors are harder to identify, more insidious, and much more plentiful than the corporate fronts of yesteryear.’⁶

Retinger and Bilderberg

An account of the origins of the Bilderberg Group, written in

⁵ Janine R. Wedel, ‘For The Shadow Elite Failure Often Guarantees Future Rewards’ <www.huffingtonpost.com/janine-r-wedel/for-the-shadow-elite-fail_b_422939.html>

⁶ ‘Shadow Elite: Are They Responsible For The Subprime Mortgage Crisis?’ <www.huffingtonpost.com/jack-blum/shadow-elite-are-they-res_b_423884.html>

Wedel was back again on January 21, ‘Shadow Elite: Do You Know Whose Agenda You’re Being Sold?’

1956 by one of its founders, Joseph Retinger, is now on-line.⁷ It is the version we knew already: Retinger and his chums (probably MI6) were anxious to improve relations between Western Europe and America.

'In our view the improvement of relations between America and Europe ought not to be undertaken through any special publicity or propaganda, since it was of far greater consequence to us to have mutual understanding and goodwill among men occupying the highest positions in the life of each country than to try to influence the man in the street directly.'

Retinger describes the formation of the group, the thinking behind it, the early meetings and personnel.⁸ None of this is new but this is the horse's mouth, as it were.

JFK and withdrawal from Vietnam

It has become taken for granted by many JFK researchers that JFK planned to withdraw US armed forces from Vietnam. (This was one of the central themes in Oliver Stone's film *JFK*, for example.) On this thesis, JFK researcher, Robert Dorff, has pointed out that in an interview in April 1964 for the JFK library, Robert Kennedy was asked this: 'Did your brother have a plan to withdraw from Vietnam?' To which Robert replied, 'No.' Dorff wonders why researchers have ignored this.

Robert was trained as a lawyer and though the paper record shows that JFK was thinking of withdrawing, Robert's legal mind may have drawn the distinction between thinking of something and 'a plan'. Perhaps there was no literal plan. Or maybe it was just politics. The political perspective has no interest in the truth; indeed, barely ever considers it as a

⁷ <<http://home.teleport.com/~flyheart/bilderberg-group.htm>>

⁸ Also of interest will be a profile of Retinger by someone who knew him at the time: <<http://home.teleport.com/~flyheart/retinger.htm>>.

factor. The political perspective is interested in power; and by 1964 RFK (and the wider Kennedy clan) were already planning his presidential campaign. Anything he said, especially on the record, must be seen as a political statement, not an historical one. If he had thought it would have helped him, RFK would have asserted the opposite. But in 1964 the Vietnam war was widening and opposing it then was a political mistake.

Lee Harvey Oswald and the CIA

'The JFK Case; the Office that Spied on its Own Spies' by Bill Simpich⁹ is a very interesting and important article based on recent documents, which shows conclusively, from official paper, that LHO was working for the CIA. With some modest extensions, Simpich shows that LHO was part of operations which were trying (a) get defectors into the USSR and (b) detect 'moles' within the CIA. In other words, LHO was working for Angleton's counter intelligence end of the Agency. This explains why so much effort was made to cover-up the CIA's links with Oswald – for example the hanky-panky in Mexico City involving the Soviet embassy. It presumably also explains why Angleton was made the Agency's official liaison with the Warren Commission: he could make sure that none of his section's operations were exposed.

The military-industrial-intelligence-complex

For the most part the role of the military in the US society, and, in particular, its role – actual, historical and potential – against those who threaten its interests, is rarely mentioned by senior politicians. In November last year retired US Army Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, who had been Chief of Staff to

⁹ <www.opednews.com/articles/1/THE-JFK-CASE--THE-OFFICE-by-Bill-Simpich-100310-266.html>

Colin Powell when Powell was Secretary of State under the junior Bush, was interviewed on radio station KPFA in Berkeley. Wilkerson said that 'the consequences for one our presidents' who stood up to the military 'were not good'. He said that JFK 'stood up to a very, very aggressive military and we know what happened to John Kennedy.' Asked if he meant that the US military killed JFK, Wilkerson said 'there are consequences, whether they are direct consequences or indirect consequences, for standing up to corporate and military power in the United States of America.'

Wilkerson said:

'...the Warren Commission was a complete whitewash. No question in my mind about it...I've studied the ballistics...I've studied the area where Kennedy's assassin supposedly shot from...I've studied the grassy knoll...and there is absolutely no way the Warren Commission wasn't a whitewash.'¹⁰

Wilkerson is the most senior retired officer to raise his head above this particular parapet since the late L. Fletcher Prouty, also an (Air Force) colonel on retirement.¹¹ Despite his status, despite the centrality of his role as the liaison between the USAF and the CIA, Prouty is never referred to by American historians of the post-war period. He is not cited by Campbell Craig and Fredrik Logevall, for example, in their recent *America's Cold War* (reviewed in Books in this issue) even though, as the only military man of the Cold War period I can think of who has gone on the record about the activities of the American secret state, he supports the authors' thesis that the Cold War was largely sustained by the military-industrial-complex for its own ends (careers, jobs, money).

One of the few mainstream liberal-left commentators to

¹⁰ <http://journals.democraticunderground.com/deutsey/22>

¹¹ Prouty's most important book, *The Secret Team*, is on-line at <www.ratical.com/ratville/JFK/ST/ST.html> His Wiki entry contains his career details.

have cited Prouty's evidence on the Cold War is Russ Baker. In his 'What Obama is up against', Baker gives a pretty decent summary of some of the more obvious difficulties presidents have had with the permanent intelligence establishment since Kennedy's day.¹² Similar territory is covered by former CIA analyst Ray McGovern in his discussion of Obama's supine posture before the Agency and the experiences of some of his predecessors in the Oval Office. McGovern asks 'Are Presidents afraid of the CIA?' and concludes that the answer is essentially 'Yes, they are; and with good reason'.¹³

All of which has considerable relevance when the American left contemplates why President Obama has been such a disappointment. Here's Edward Herman:

'Couldn't Obama have changed course, betrayed the establishment instead of the public interest, and really altered the structure of national priorities? Couldn't he have used his powerful platform to make the case for real change, mobilizing the masses, and with their support moving us in a new direction? Of course there is no evidence that he really wanted to do this, but I don't believe he could have done it even if he had wanted to and was prepared to take heavy risks in the process. The institutional obstacles are too great. Not only the Republicans but a large fraction of the elected Democrats are in thrall to the financial and business community, MIC, and pro-Israel lobby, and they would have refused to go along with any severe cutbacks in the Pentagon budget, massive outlays for public works and subsidies-bailouts for ordinary citizens, or a single payer health care system. The business community would have gone on strike, with probably serious capital flight and layoffs. Cutbacks in military operations abroad would have resulted in hysteria in the media about Democratic

12 <www.truthout.org/11020910>

13 <www.consortiumnews.com/2009/122909b.html>

weakness and betrayal, possible disorder, and the possibility of a military coup to restore order. Even slow and careful moves along these lines would be furiously opposed and would likely precipitate a political crisis.’¹⁴

Harold Wilson’s resignation and the bugging of No. 10 Downing Street

Scott Newton has pointed out that the circumstances surrounding Harold Wilson’s resignation in 1976 were exhaustively detailed by Alan Watkins in his column, ‘Political Commentary’ in *The Independent* on 18 August 1996.¹⁵ Not only is there no mystery, there is not even the remotest hint of the beginning of mystery. Wilson began planning his resignation as soon as he took office for the second time in 1974. He was tired, a bit bored, and a bit afraid that his memory was going. His mother had suffered from what we now call Alzheimer’s and he knew what might be coming. The original perpetrators of the ‘Wilson resignation mystery’ were members of the anti-subversion lobby, and they used his surprise resignation as the basis of some disinformation about his (non-existent) links with the KGB.

Meanwhile the *Daily Mail* revealed the bit which the Cabinet Office, not MI5 (says the *Mail*) had insisted Christopher Andrew omit from his history of MI5:

‘MI5 used hidden electronic surveillance equipment to secretly monitor 10 Downing Street, the Cabinet and at least five Prime Ministers....for nearly 15 years, all Cabinet meetings, the offices of senior officials and all visitors to the Prime Minister – including foreign leaders

¹⁴ ‘Obama and the Steady Drift to the Right’, *Z Magazine*, March 2010

¹⁵ <www.independent.co.uk/dayinapage/1996/August/18/>

– were being bugged.’¹⁶

This is interesting enough: so much for Wilson’s ‘paranoia’ about No. 10 being bugged! But almost as interesting is the comment in the piece that Wilson’s successor, James Callaghan, the person who, we are told, had the bugging stopped (or, perhaps, thinks he did) made a statement to the House of Commons apparently denying that No. 10 had ever been bugged. To wit:

‘The Prime Minister is satisfied that at no time has the Security Service or any other British intelligence or security agency, either of its own accord or at someone else’s request, undertaken electronic surveillance in No 10 Downing Street.’

Where to start with this? It could be that he is simply lying; but this is unlikely. The British state and its senior political servants are generally too canny to actually lie to the House of Commons. There are other possibilities. The first is that, even though the *Mail* report specifically states that MI5 did the bugging, the surveillance was done by a non-British organisation. It has been taken for granted for many years by British spook-watchers that the NSA and GCHQ have a reciprocal arrangement in which the British spy on potentially embarrassing targets for the Americans and vice versa, enabling denials of the Callaghan ilk to be made without actually lying.¹⁷ Thus if MI5 asked for the bugging to be done it may not have actually done it.

The second possibility is that while Callaghan may have said that he is ‘satisfied’ that X did not take place, this is in fact *not* a denial that it did take place.

And thirdly, in Callaghan’s statement ‘electronic

¹⁶ Jason Lewis and Tom Harper, ‘Revealed: How MI5 bugged 10 Downing Street, the Cabinet and at least five Prime Ministers for 15 Years’ <www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1266837/Revealed-How-MI5-bugged-10-Downing-Street-Cabinet-Prime-Ministers-15-YEARS.html>

¹⁷ Though where the evidence for this covert reciprocal arrangement is I don’t know.

surveillance' means something other than bugging and the statement is not a lie.

Other questions which arise: how did the private company (one of James Goldsmith's, I seem to remember) brought in to sweep No. 10 for Wilson, miss the bugs (if there were bugs)? And how did Callaghan know the bugging was taking place when the previous prime minister didn't? Did he learn of it while home secretary and not tell Wilson? Was he told by the powers-that-be because they trusted him?

MI5, torture, the ISC and the charade of accountability

The House of Commons Intelligence and Security Committee (ISC) is the quintessential British political instrument, a notional accountability device for some of its secret servants. MPs, few with any knowledge of this field, are appointed to the committee by the prime minister. It sounds very grand in the official accounts:

'The Intelligence and Security Committee (ISC) was established by the Intelligence Services Act 1994 to examine the policy, administration and expenditure of the Security Service, Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), and the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ). The Committee has developed its oversight remit, with the Government's agreement, to include examination of intelligence-related elements of the Cabinet Office including: the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC); the Assessments Staff; and the Intelligence, Security and Resilience Group. The Committee also takes evidence from the Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS), part of the Ministry of Defence (MOD), which assists the Committee in respect of work within the Committee's

remit.’¹⁸

In practice they cannot do much, cannot compel testimony or the production of documents, and currently appear to have no investigative staff. What the ISC does do is write reports with material given to it by the various agencies. What the ISC really does is give the state a cover story: to any questions of accountability the answer is ‘We have it already – the ISC.’

ISC made the news earlier this year when MI5 was discovered to have not been telling it everything about its knowledge of the perpetrators of the 7/7 bombings.¹⁹ It was a piece of routine self-serving behaviour by MI5: it chose to admit not knowing much about the perps rather than admit that they knew quite a bit about them but hadn’t recognised them as an imminent threat. A great flurry of indignant comment was forthcoming from MI5, and on MI5’s behalf from the ISC’s chair, Kim Howells MP.

In a letter to the *Guardian*, John Morrison, who had been ISC’s investigator for five years, explained what was really what.

‘What many do not realise is that the ISC has no power to reach into the agencies and extract information. It receives carefully written submissions and takes oral evidence from ministers and senior agency staff. As the committee’s investigator, I had much greater access to junior staff, but no greater powers to obtain information than the committee itself. Nevertheless, on a number of occasions, I was able to uncover problems that the committee knew nothing about. However, since my contract was terminated in 2004, *the committee has had*

¹⁸ <www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/intelligence.aspx#reports>

¹⁹ See for example Richard Norton-Taylor, ‘MI5’s propaganda own-goal’, *The Guardian* 12 February 2010 <www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/feb/12/mi5-propaganda-own-goal> and Sam Marsden, ‘7/7 court told MI5 deceived MPs’, *The Independent* 27 April 2010 <www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/77-court-told-mi5-deceived-mps-1955727.html>

no dedicated investigative capability – this despite the recommendation in the 2008 governance of Britain white paper that the post should be revived....the ISC depends entirely on the truthfulness and good faith of those who testify to it. Agency heads are allowed to withhold certain information; if they were to withhold information they should have revealed, the ISC might never know. I do not believe that happens, but the second and more likely problem is that the senior staff who appear before the committee may not know what is going on at lower levels.’ (emphasis added)

Morrison concluded:

‘What we need is a beefed-up intelligence and security committee, with a tough and senior chairman, experienced and sceptical members, an effective investigative capability and the resources it needs to do the job properly. I see no signs that any of this will come about, but until it does, the credibility of the ISC will continue to wane.’²⁰

The row about MI5’s knowledge of the 7/7 bombers punctuated a much longer running row about MI5’s and ministers’ knowledge of and/or collusion with the American torture of British citizens or residents picked up in or near Afghanistan. The most interesting comment on this furore – which even provoked the head of MI5 to plead his organisation’s case to the media²¹ – came from former senior military intelligence officer Crispin Black.²²

²⁰ <www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/mar/01/control-of-secret-evidence>

²¹ See for example Gordon Rayner, ‘MI5 chief defends security services amid torture “cover-up” claims’, *Daily Telegraph*, 12 February 2010.

²² His Wiki entry tells us ‘...his last posting being a secondment to the Cabinet Office as an intelligence adviser to the Prime Minister, the Joint Intelligence Committee and COBRA (Cabinet Office Briefing Room A).’

'To pretend that the politicians were out of the loop on what was going on is implausible deniability if ever I have heard it. The idea that the British intelligence services were conducting the Bush-Blair "war on terror" without formal instructions about how to behave from their political masters is plain silly.

And even if our political leaders had wanted to do something different it would have been impossible. The British intelligence services are really wholly owned subsidiaries of their US counterparts – no more "independent" than our nuclear deterrent.

Once the White House decided to take a walk on the dark side we were along for the stroll as well.'²³

23 <www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/libertycentral/2010/feb/26/spooks-appeal-court-binyam-mohamed>

NATO's voice

Sunny Hundal, from the blog liberalconspiracy.org, reported there in December on a NATO briefing for British bloggers.²⁶ Among the subjects referred to by NATO, Hundal lists potential threats including energy security, cyber attacks, terrorism and protection for women in areas of war.

In the same neck of the woods, the very good site antifascist-calling.blogspot.com/ on 28 March 2010 reported on the details of a document, leaked from within NATO describing the strategies to be used to persuade different sections of European opinion to continue supporting the war in Afghanistan. (Good luck with that one!) Hundal's list of topics discussed by NATO spokespersons and this strategy paper are not that dissimilar.

²⁵ Clark describes this experience at <http://neilclark66.blogspot.com/2007/09/case-of-criminal-harassment.html>

²⁶ <http://liberalconspiracy.org/2009/12/08/nato-hosts-first-ever-briefing-for-bloggers/> At that address he lists the bloggers who were invited.

As NuLab sinks beneath the waves

Here is former governor of Hong Kong and Conservative minister, Chris Patten, surveying the 13 years of NuLab:

'So here we are. What has it all been about? A devolved administration in Edinburgh, half of one in Cardiff, a hard-won settlement in Belfast, no advance in Brussels, a splurge of public spending, a mountain of debt, Brown's very own "boom and bust", the stuttering beginnings of reform to our education system, the mother and father of all scandals in the mother of parliaments.' ²⁷

And what has Patten missed out? You could make an enormously long list, I suspect; but one important thing he omitted is *they were copying America*.²⁸ They copied American economic and social ideas. NuLab's major policies were learned by Brown and Blair on their trips to America in the early 1990s. It was from the Clinton administration that they learned the value of letting the money men loose; they followed America into the housing debt-fuelled boom and bust of the new millennium which exploded after Clinton had gone but which had been initiated by his administration;²⁹ and they copied the Clinton regime's belief that immigration was the route to economic growth.

This last point got lost in the furore surrounding the revelations by former NuLab policy wonk/speechwriter, Andrew Neather. In his column in *The Evening Standard* Neather wrote of the mass migration into the UK of the current

²⁷ Chris Patten, 'The End of the Party: The Rise and Fall of New Labour' in *The Observer*, Sunday 7 March 2010.

²⁸ 'When Gordon Brown at last became Prime Minister two years ago, his first important move was a visit to Washington D.C., where he declared to a joint Congress-Senate session that "no power on earth" would ever come between the USA and Britain. He made manifest a degree of prostration hitherto unknown in the quite long history of Anglo-American accords.' From Tom Nairn, 'The English Postman', <www.scottishleftreview.org/li/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=272&Itemid=1>

²⁹ Discussed in this issue: see 'The economic crisis'

millennium as a 'deliberate policy of ministers'. More interestingly he added that the earlier drafts he saw

'included a driving political purpose: *that mass immigration was the way that the Government was going to make the UK truly multiculturalthat the policy was intended* – even if this wasn't its main purpose – *to rub the Right's nose in diversity and render their arguments out of date.*'³⁰ (emphases added)

Without a hint of self-awareness, Neather enthused about the economic benefits the migrants of the last decade have brought to people like him in London – cheap help of various kinds – and maybe there was some of this in the wonks' vision of multicultural Britain. But the aim of making Britain 'truly multicultural' is not visible in the executive summary of the paper concerned;³¹ and while it might be true that this was the aim of some of those writing the policy papers, higher up the political food chain the main motivation was Gordon Brown's belief, learned on his trips to America during the first Clinton administration, that (a) there was no alternative to globalisation and (b) one way to generate economic growth (and taxes) in an open economy in which state direction of the economy was believed to be useless (or illegal), was by using the labour of immigrants (the leading edge of globalisation who would work for less than the indigenous population).

Globalisation theory says that the wages of the European and American worker should fall with competition from cheaper countries. In practice British governments haven't had the courage and/or the votes to drive domestic wages and benefits down enough for the theory and many of the lower paid jobs in the economy have been done by

³⁰ Andrew Neather, *The Evening Standard* 23 October 2009
<www.thisislondon.co.uk/standard/article-23760073-dont-listen-to-the-whingers---london-needs-immigrants.do>

³¹ Which was obtained via the FOI legislation after a long rearguard action by the government. It is available at the site of Migrationwatch, <<http://news.migrationwatch.org.uk>>

immigrants.

Increasing immigration is currently being promoted by Bill Clinton as the way out of recession for the American economy.³²

Blue Hairies

The most unintentionally amusing British story recently was that in *The Observer* by a member of the Metropolitan Police's Special Demonstration Squad describing how he 'infiltrated UK's violent activists'. The Met had ten of these undercover officers (called 'the hairies'; aah, the canteen culture!) within the London left, all – apparently – bent on discovering the various groups' demonstration plans. Infiltrating? All you have to do to 'penetrate' any group on the left is join and be willing to do the shit-work. The idea that you have to send people full time, under cover, with false IDs – the entire intelligence rigmarole – is just ludicrous.³³

32 See 'Bill Clinton: Expand immigration, reduce deficits' in *USA Today*, 28 April 2010. <<http://politifi.com/news/Bill-Clinton-expand-immigration-reduce-deficits-662294.html>>

33 Tony Thompson 'Undercover policeman reveals how he infiltrated UK's violent activists', *The Observer*, Sunday 14 March 2010