

The view from the bridge

Robin Ramsay

Thanks to Nick Must for editing/proof-reading help.

Bernie or bust

If you were wondering why so many of Bernie Sanders' supporters are hostile to Hilary Clinton (of course the MSM haven't explained it), you could look at the long report showing how the Clinton campaign stole the nomination from Sanders. Yes, *stole*.

'Available evidence from Arizona, New York, and California suggests more than 500,000 registrations were tampered with or improperly handled....hundreds of thousands of voters were denied the right to vote or were forced to vote provisionally. A quarter million or more provisional or affidavit Democratic ballots were not counted. Available evidence also suggests that the vast majority of suppressed voters would have voted or tried to vote for Senator Bernie Sanders.'¹

The IMF's *mea culpa*

Among the casualties of the financial crash of 2007/8 has been the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which got most of it wrong and made things worse. The IMF had an internal post-mortem and the following paragraphs are from the executive summary.² The italicised bits are my comments.

¹ <<https://www.facebook.com/notes/election-justice-usa/democracy-lost-a-report-on-the-fatally-flawed-2016-democratic-primaries/923891901070837>>

² The report's executive summary is at <<http://www.ieo-imf.org/ieo/files/completedevaluations/EAC%20-%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>>.

'The IMF's surveillance of the euro area financial regulatory architecture was generally of high quality, but staff, along with most other experts, missed the build-up of banking system risks in some countries.'

'In May 2010, the IMF Executive Board approved a decision to provide exceptional access financing to Greece without seeking preemptive debt restructuring, even though its sovereign debt was not deemed sustainable with a high probability.'

In other words: we lent them money even though we knew they probably couldn't pay it back.

'The IMF's policy on exceptional access to Fund resources, which mandates early Board involvement, was followed only in a perfunctory manner. The 2002 framework for exceptional access was modified to allow exceptional access financing to go forward, but the modification process departed from the IMF's usual deliberative process whereby decisions of such import receive careful review. Early and active Board involvement might or might not have led to a different decision, but it would have enhanced the legitimacy of any decision.'

In other words: a dumb decision was taken behind the back of the Board.

'....because the European Commission negotiated on behalf of the Eurogroup, the troika arrangement potentially subjected IMF staff's technical judgements to political pressure from an early stage.'

'....The IMF-supported programs in Greece and Portugal incorporated overly optimistic growth projections. More realistic projections would have made clear the likely impact of fiscal consolidation on growth and debt dynamics, and allowed the authorities to prepare accordingly or persuaded European partners to consider additional—and more concessional—financing while preserving the IMF's credibility as an independent, technocratic institution.'

In other words: more accurate projections would have led to less onerous loan conditions, but we were leaned on.

In the *Telegraph* Jeremy Warner commented:

'Over the last ten years, the [IMF] has been pretty much wrong about everything of substance. It failed to see the financial crisis coming, and it failed to anticipate the eurozone debt crisis, having essentially become a cheerleader for integrationist ambitions of monetary union.

It then proceeded to become part of one of the biggest economic policy blunders of the modern age, overriding its own rules and conventions to save the euro and bailout the bankers.'

True enough. But does Warner believe that the IMF could ever have *not* bailed out the bankers and helped to save the euro?³ Not in the world I live in.

Kincora and Wallace

In early July the Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (HIAI) into allegations of child abuse in Northern Ireland reached the stinky core: Kincora.⁴ The conversations with witnesses, some anonymous, are on-line. There is a lot of this and much of it is impenetrable to me, not least because I haven't read the preceding inquiries – however inadequate – to which the conversations often refer. Colin Wallace has refused to give evidence to the inquiry because, unlike the mainland UK equivalent, the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse, it does not have the power to compel testimony; and thus, suspects Wallace, it will be just another layer of cover-up.

It has been many years since the government accepted the veracity of many of Wallace's claims; indeed, none of his claims have ever been shown to be false. It should also not be

³ <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2016/10/04/the-imf-must-stop-playing-political-games-and-get-back-to-its-ro/>>

⁴ See <<https://www.hiainquiry.org/sites/hiainquiry/files/media-files/M15-D220-Trans-Rev-RO.pdf>>.

forgotten that Wallace's conviction for manslaughter was overturned. In spite of all this, one of the Inquiry's lawyers, Joseph Aiken, smeared Wallace as a liar and disinformant who had not been believed by other, previous inquiries.⁵ Wallace's reply to this can be read at the excellent Tom Griffin site.⁶

Bilderberg

A major collection of Bilderberg internal documents, hundreds of pages of minutes and agendas, going back to the 1950s, is now on-line.⁷ The collection is prefaced by this:

'The following documents were obtained from a variety of sources who contributed copies of documents related to the Bilderberg Group from academic institutions. Documents contributed to the collection are sometimes photocopied and in other cases photographed page by page during visits to academic institutions, diplomatic libraries and legal archives including the Presidential Library of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Harvard Law Library, the National Archive and the archive of former State Department official and member of the Bilderberg Steering Committee Robert Murphy held at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.'

I'm not going to read all this: Bilderberg is no longer a mystery; nor is there any evidence that it is, or ever was, the central committee of global capitalism as is believed by some.

9/11

There was a very striking piece on *Politico* about the attempts by the CIA to warn the Bush administration about the threat posed by Al Qaeda in the months and weeks before 9/11.⁸

5 <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-36725599>>

6 <http://www.tomgriffin.org/the_green_ribbon/2016/08/colin-wallace-on-the-hia-inquiry.html>

7 <<https://publicintelligence.net/bilderberg-archive/>>

8 <<http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/11/cia-directors-documentary-911-bush-213353#ixzz4MspT64jU>>

CIA personnel have made similar comments before but these are the most explicit to date.

'The drama of failed warnings began when [then CIA Director] Tenet and [then chief CIA of counterterrorism Cofer] Black pitched a plan, in the spring of 2001, called "the Blue Sky paper" to Bush's new national security team. It called for a covert CIA and military campaign to end the Al Qaeda threat—"getting into the Afghan sanctuary, launching a paramilitary operation, creating a bridge with Uzbekistan." "And the word back," says Tenet, "was 'we're not quite ready to consider this. We don't want the clock to start ticking.' " (Translation: they did not want a paper trail to show that they'd been warned.)'

'Tenet vividly recalls the White House meeting with Rice and her team. (George W. Bush was on a trip to Boston.) "Rich [Blee] started by saying, "There will be significant terrorist attacks against the United States in the coming weeks or months. The attacks will be spectacular. They may be multiple. Al Qaeda's intention is the destruction of the United States." [Condi Rice said:] "What do you think we need to do?" Black responded by slamming his fist on the table, and saying, "We need to go on a wartime footing now!"

"What happened?" I ask Cofer Black. "Yeah. What *did* happen?" he replies. "To me it remains incomprehensible still. I mean, how is it that you could warn senior people so many times and nothing actually happened? It's kind of like *The Twilight Zone*."

The key sentence here is this:

'(Translation: they did not want a paper trail to show that they'd been warned.)'

This has the true, bell-like ring of the political perspective: fuck national security, how's it going to look?

The *politically* important material – the Saudi connection and the Bush regime's refusal to act on the warnings – has

been obscured and contaminated for 15 years by conspiracy theories, many of which were obvious nonsense.⁹ I wonder if some smart alics in the White House, or its allies in the US intelligence community, didn't help to create or propagate them.

Jonathan Marshall

When *Lobster* began in 1983 there were only two similar publications: *Intelligence and Parapolitics* out of Paris and Jonathan Marshall's *Parapolitics USA*.¹⁰ Marshall went on to co-write a number of books with Peter Dale Scott as well as having a career as a mainstream journalist. Currently he is writing regularly for The Consortium, Robert Parry's exemplary and pioneering reader-funded website.¹¹ Recommended.

Close but no cigar

As opening paragraphs go, the one which begins the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee report on the UK's role in the overthrow of the Gaddafi regime in Libya is a belter (the emphasis is mine):

`In March 2011, the United Kingdom and France, with the

9 For example: the claims that no plane hit the Pentagon; that there were no planes at all, they were holograms; that the buildings were destroyed by nukes in the basements; that the buildings were destroyed by beam weapons.

The 9/11 research community has to make a shift analogous to that made by the JFK researchers when they separated the shooting from the cover-up. There is a mystery about the buildings' collapse; there may be a mystery about the failure of the US administration to take the warnings seriously; but there is no mystery about Al Qaeda's role in hi-jacking the planes.

10 The first, 1981 issue of which can be read at <<https://www.scribd.com/doc/63837535/Parapolitics-USA-no-1>>. The complete list can be seen at <<https://www.scribd.com/user/79032933/Jonathan-Marshall>>.

A very useful tool for those without a Scribd account is <<https://scribdownload.com/>>.

11 Marshall's recent articles can be found at <<https://consortiumnews.com/tag/jonathan-marshall/>>.

support of the United States, led the international community to support an intervention in Libya to protect civilians from attacks by forces loyal to Muammar Gaddafi. This policy was not informed by accurate intelligence. In particular, the Government failed to identify that the threat to civilians was overstated and that the rebels included a significant Islamist element. By the summer of 2011, the limited intervention to protect civilians had drifted into *an opportunist policy of regime change*. That policy was not underpinned by a strategy to support and shape post-Gaddafi Libya. The result was political and economic collapse, inter-militia and inter-tribal warfare, humanitarian and migrant crises, widespread human rights violations, the spread of Gaddafi regime weapons across the region and the growth of ISIL in North Africa. Through his decision making in the National Security Council, former Prime Minister David Cameron was ultimately responsible for the failure to develop a coherent Libya strategy.¹²

'An opportunist policy of regime change'?

The committee did, however, wonder about the 'intelligence' it was all based on.

'Intelligence on the extent to which extremist militant Islamist elements were involved in the anti-Gaddafi rebellion was inadequate. Former Chief of the Defence Staff Lord Richards of Herstmonceux confirmed that intelligence on the composition of the rebel militias was not "as good as one would wish." He observed that "We found it quite difficult to get the sort of information you would expect us to get."⁶¹ We asked Lord Richards whether he knew that Abdelhakim Belhadj and other members of the al-Qaeda affiliated Libyan Islamic Fighting Group were participating in the rebellion in March 2011. He replied that that "was a grey area".⁶² He added that "a quorum of respectable Libyans were

12 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmfaaff/119/119.pdf?utm_source=119&utm_medium=module&utm_campaign=modulereports>

assuring the Foreign Office" that militant Islamist militias would not benefit from the rebellion.⁶³ He acknowledged that "with the benefit of hindsight, that was wishful thinking at best."⁶⁴

Lord Richards' quoted comment on the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group – 'a grey area' – is unintelligible. The full response is no better.

Lord Richards: I think it was a grey area. I am not trying to defend us, because I have agreed with you that it was a weakness. What I hope I have tried to get across is that the imperative of the need for speed to prevent Benghazi falling meant that we were committed to conflict in an imperfect world.¹³

Richards simply dodges the question and no-one on the committee asks him what he means. And no wonder he evaded it: for it was the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) that MI6 (SIS) had been dickering with since the 1990s and which was the subject of some of the most disgusting *real politik* in which the British state has been recently engaged.¹⁴

The committee's report is the most recent version of the received story: it was a humanitarian exercise, based on a false alarm about threatened atrocities,¹⁵ which drifted into

13 <<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/foreign-affairs-committee/libya-examination-of-intervention-and-collapse-and-the-uks-future-policy-options/oral/27184.html>>

14 The group was first hired to assassinate Gaddafi, then some of its members were allowed to live in the UK. With Blair's *rapprochement* with Gaddafi, the line changed and those members were identified to Libyan intelligence. See <<http://markcurtis.info/2016/08/30/overthrowing-qaddafi-in-libya-britains-islamist-boots-on-the-ground/>>.

On the LIFG role in the Gaddafi assassination plot see <<http://anniemachon.ch/spies-lies-and-whistleblowers-the-gaddafi-plot-chapters>>.

15 In his comments to the Commons committee Lord Richards said 'If we were going to stop Benghazi falling – the decision was taken that we should, and that it would be a stain on our conscience forever if we allowed another Srebrenica; I remember a lot of talk about Srebrenica...' <<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/foreign-affairs-committee/libya-examination-of-intervention-and-collapse-and-the-uks-future-policy-options/oral/27184.html>>

regime change for which no-one was prepared and which, as in Iraq, ended in chaos. It may be true. It may have had nothing to do with Libyan oil, the Gaddafi proposal to create an Africa-wide, gold-backed currency independent of the dollar, or the fact that Libya was one of the countries which the neo-cons running the Bush government's foreign policy were determined to clobber.¹⁶ But I'm going to need more than a Commons' committee report to believe that.

Yes, we could have, but we didn't

You can watch Obama's last speech to the Washington press corps' annual dinner on YouTube.¹⁷ He's a great speaker: funny, self-deprecating, charming and sharp when appropriate. He's not that far from being a good stand-up comedian. But he's also nominally at the head of a regime which now has thousands of drones patrolling the skies over 'threats' (mostly imaginary) to the American world order¹⁸ and is engaged in sabre-rattling displays in the Baltic, Poland and the South China Sea.

In *Lobster* 62 I noted research which showed that Obama's presidential campaign was funded by Wall Street.¹⁹ Using the recent Wikileaks dump of Clinton e-mails, a recent article in the *New Republic* shows that most of the senior positions in the Obama administration were filled by people chosen by Michael Froman, an executive at the American bank Citigroup.²⁰

¹⁶ We know this from no less a source than US General Wesley Clark, former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO. See <<http://www.globalresearch.ca/we-re-going-to-take-out-7-countries-in-5-years-iraq-syria-lebanon-libya-somalia-sudan-iran/5166>>.

¹⁷ <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hA5ezR0Kh80>>

¹⁸ 'There are currently [i.e. 2014] 7,362 Ravens, 990 WASPs, 1,137 Pumas and 306 T-Hawks – all small UAS. By contrast there are only 246 Predators and Gray Eagles, 126 Reapers, 491 Shadows and 33 Global Hawks – to cite a few from the larger categories.'

<<http://www.dodbuzz.com/2014/01/02/pentagon-plans-for-cuts-to-drone-budgets/>>

¹⁹ See subhead 'Bought and paid for' at <<http://www.lobster-magazine.co.uk/free/lobster62/lob62-view-bridge.pdf>>.

²⁰ <<https://newrepublic.com/article/137798/important-wikileaks-revelation-isnt-hillary-clinton>>

Current Nobel laureate for literature, Bob Dylan, has a line in one of his early songs: 'Money doesn't talk, it swears.' Wrong, Bob: money doesn't even need to raise its voice. It just sends a memo.

How the chips fall

Lobster magazine emerged from a subsection of the left – what we might call the paranoid left – which was looking at the American and British secret states in the wake of JFK, Vietnam, Watergate, the Pentagon Papers, the Wilson plots and changes in policing and the rise of the 'strong state'. Yet, looking back at the last 40 years or so, it is quite clear that the most important event in this country since the 1960s had nothing to do with any of that: it was the capture of a handful of journalists by the apostles of monetarism. It was this which opened the door to the revival of the 'free market' notions which became dominant in the 1980s.

I have arrived back at this after an e-mail from an American economist. He was sent my review of the Elliott and Atkinson book which is in this issue. In that I mention in a footnote that while an undergraduate in the early 1970s, doing economics as a subsidiary element in my degree, our economics lecturer gave us monetarism – then called the quantity theory of money – to critique because it was such simple nonsense that even second year non-specialists could demolish it. My American economics professor commented on his experience:

'In grad school (1965-70) Friedman was seen as a lunatic.'

Friedman is Milton Friedman, the public face of monetarism in the 1970s, who became prominent in the UK after 1976, the year he won the Nobel Prize for Economics. His belief in the centrality of controlling the economy's money supply was adopted by the Tory right around Thatcher, who had rejected Keynesian notions of the state managing the economy.

Previous to this, in 1972 when they were faced with rising unemployment, Edward Heath's government had pulled

all the levers at the state's disposal to increase demand in the economy. Unfortunately the British bankers had already persuaded the government to change the rules governing bank lending²¹ and, freed from the constraints of the state, they were creating a big credit bubble. Allied to the Heath government's attempts to expand the economy, this did help to boost economic growth and job creation but it also generated inflation. Heath might just have got away with this had his home-grown inflation not coincided with the so-called 'Arab oil price hike' of 1973. Together they gave us inflation at 25% in 1975; and inflation at 25% is a very serious thing.

The Tory politicians round Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher drew the wrong conclusions from the Heath years: politically – and perhaps psychologically – they were unable to see that the inflation of 1972-5 was in large part the consequence of reduced regulation of the banks and their excessive lending (as well as the Heath government's over-enthusiastic attempt to generate economic growth).²² Ignoring the 1945-71 period, they concluded instead that the inflation showed how state management of the economy (loosely, Keynesianism) was a mistake and the state's economic role should be confined to controlling the expansion of the money supply by the use of interest rates.²³

The theory went thus: rising interest rates would reduce the demand for credit so enabling the 'control' of the money supply; and so prevent inflation. It was the old racket: banks would be allowed to lend as much as they wanted, to but

21 It seems pretty clear that the politicians were conned by the bankers. I have written about this episode in more detail in 'Well, how did we get here?' in *Lobster* 60.

22 Ironically, while some of this was generated by concern at rising unemployment, it was also Heath's belief that the UK economy should be going at full tilt when it entered the EEC and faced competition from other EEC members.

23 This took place in an environment in which capital – largely America corporations – was mounting a sustained campaign against the idea of state management of the economy and for a return to the 'free market'. This is described in Sydney Blumenthal, *The Rise of the Counter Establishment* (New York: Times Books, 1986) and Richard Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable* (London: Fontana, 1995). Friedman gets a chapter in Blumenthal.

when inflation began to rise they would be 'punished' for lending too much by being 'forced' to raise interest rates. It was a return to the world before the Great Depression and Keynes.

By the late 1970s Milton Friedman's views on the money supply – monetarism – and its centrality in government economic policy had become adopted by the Thatcher faction of the Conservative Party, apparently by Labour Prime Minister Callaghan²⁴ and by sections of the higher media commentariat. In 1980 Friedman presented a series of hour long films with the umbrella title 'Free to Chose' and I remember BBC2 broadcasting one of the episodes.²⁵ A panel of British politicians – of whom I remember only Denis Healey – were in the studio to discuss the film after it was shown and they practically fell over themselves to rubbish Friedman. And no wonder: Friedman used Japan – Japan! – a very long way from being a free market economy, as the exemplar for his homespun homilies. I was aware that Friedman's ideas were in the air but had neither read nor seen him; and, like the politicians in the BBC studio, I was astonished: why was this idiot being taken seriously?

At this distance the interesting historical question is: how and why did the editors of newspapers and TV programmes come to believe this disastrous rubbish? Who read what and who believed whom?²⁶

24 This is disputed. Callaghan appeared to embrace monetarism in his 1976 speech to the Labour Party conference. His son-in-law, Peter Jay, then writing for *The Times*, who wrote that section of the speech, later denied that either he or Callaghan had embraced monetarism. Given the disastrous consequences of that embrace, Jay would deny that, wouldn't he? But Jay was using the columns of the *Times* to advocate monetarism. See William Keegan at

<<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2006/dec/17/politics.economicpolicy>> for the Callaghan

25 The series of ten episodes is on YouTube at <<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCVADSkup9W1RzUSuba-Czng/videos>>.

26 No doubt Friedman's 1976 Nobel Prize helped his credibility but that was awarded for technical work in economics, not for his simple-minded views on macroeconomics. See <http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/1976/friedman-facts.html>.

The LBJ-dunnit thesis

The late Billie Sol Estes is at the heart of the LBJ's-people-dunnit theory of the Kennedy assassination. That most of the Kennedy assassination researchers do not take this theory seriously is due, in large part, to their not taking Estes seriously, because he was a convicted fraudster. Precisely what his fraud was has been difficult to grasp until recently. But Amy Reading has researched it in detail and has published an intelligible account.²⁷

Via Robert Caro's literary agent, I sent a third e-mail to him wondering why he had omitted Billie Sol Estes from his most recent volume on LBJ. For the third time I got no response.

Thanks to SC for pointing me towards the 1999 autobiography of Eddie Fisher, the American crooner of the 1950s and early 60s. Basically an account of all the women he fucked – most famously Elizabeth Taylor, whom he married, who appears on the front cover with him above the book's title *Been There, Done That* – there isn't much of parapolitical interest: fragments about Sam Giancana, more on JFK as pussy-hound, and we can add Fisher to the list of Judith Exner's lovers. But on page 257 there is this. Fisher flew back to Washington from Dallas the day after the assassination with Jackie Kennedy's press secretary, Pam Turnure, his then lover.

'Pam told me, Jackie Kennedy said to her, "Lyndon Johnson did it." Words I'll never forget.'

There is nothing else about the assassination.

It is hard to convey to those not interested in the story just how striking this is. With the exception of the 1967

²⁷ See <<http://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2013-05-16/how-a-texas-paper-brought-down-billie-sol-estes>>. Reading is the author of *The Mark Inside: A Perfect Swindle, a Cunning Revenge and a Small History of the Big Con* (Vintage).

play Macbird²⁸ and an obscure book by Joachim Joesten,²⁹ LBJ, the most obvious suspect of them all, disappeared from the story for 30 years.

Since Jackie Kennedy couldn't have *known* that Johnson was responsible – unless Johnson had let her know that he had done it; which was not beyond him – she assumed it; she 'knew' it. Other Washington insiders, who knew that the Kennedys were trying to get Johnson off the ticket for the '64 election by encouraging the media and Congress to pursue his corruption, probably also made the same assumption when JFK was shot in LBJ's backyard. And so the word would have spread beyond the Kennedy inner circle pretty quickly. It is possible that the whole of official Washington politics knew in 1963 that LBJ was responsible, making the Warren Commission even more of a farce than it currently appears.

Finally, if Jackie Kennedy believed LBJ's people were behind it, Robert Kennedy must have been privy to the same 'information' and his desolation after the shooting may have been the consequence of his part in the political attack on Johnson which triggered it.³⁰

Plus ça change

The new Cold War is now firmly established: once again

28 The author of which said ten years ago she did not intend to suggest that LBJ was behind the assassination. See <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/04/AR2006090400993.html>>

29 Probably but not provably putting out the Soviet line at the time. The KGB had been informed in 1966 that Johnson did it. See <<http://www.indiana.edu/~oah/nl/98feb/jfk.html>>. Joesten's book is still available. See <<https://www.amazon.com/Dark-Side-Lyndon-Baines-Johnson-ebook/dp/B00BXIU53A#nav-subnav>>.

30 It has been widely reported since 2011 that Jackie Kennedy had accused Lyndon Johnson of the assassination in tapes she made with the late Arthur Schlesinger; but this was not mentioned in the extracts from the tapes which were released. See for example <<http://www.irishcentral.com/news/jackie-kennedy-blamed-lyndon-b-johnson-for-jfk-murder-127220093-237788131.html>> and <<https://redice.tv/news/jackie-kennedy-believed-lbj-had-her-husband-killed-new-tape-shows>>.

Russia is the 'threat' and has to be 'contained'. The Pentagon and its sales wing in the arms corporations (or is it the arms corporations and their political wing, the Pentagon?) are happy. Never mind that we are not too far from a shooting war in the Baltic....



The illustration above – not very clear, reduced for reproduction: check the original³¹ – shows the deployment of US/NATO forces around the Russian border. And more are coming: the Canadians are being asked to deploy troops in Poland.³² Hopefully Prime Minister Trudeau will ignore this ridiculous request.

Stanley Kubrick's *Dr Strangelove* appeared in 1964. I don't remember when it arrived in Edinburgh where I lived, perhaps a few months later. I do remember that as a member of Youth CND, I joined in leafleting the cinema at which it was being shown. This is the leaflet we handed out.³³

31 <<http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-06-14/nato-begins-encirclement-russia>>

32 <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-baltics-troops-russia-1.3635139>>

33 I found it at <<http://archives.lse.ac.uk/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=CND%2f2008%2f7%2f2%2f2%2f51>>



Copyright of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
www.cnduk.org

Plus ça change indeed, right down to both leaflets referring to 'Russia'.

The EU referendum

I voted for 'leave' at the referendum. There is something deeply depressing and/or comic about large chunks of the British left and trade union movement voting to remain in a political union, whose central principle is the free movement of capital, when *the free of movement capital is the problem*. So how do we explain this? In part this is the result of contamination of the position by the right. I was thinking of how to write about this when a correspondent sent me an e-mail reminding me of my essay in *Lobster 33* on this subject, which I had forgotten about. When I looked at it I realised a section of it could be reprinted without changes. So here are the opening pages of my essay 'Contamination, the Labour Party, nationalism and the Blairites'. Twenty years later it is still apposite.

In footnote 6 in his essay on the Bilderberg group in *Lobster* 32, Mike Peters noted that the US Left had lost interest in the study of the power elite because the subject had become 'contaminated' by the interest in it taken by the US Right.³⁴ I had never thought of it as that, but 'contamination' is exactly right. Peters' naming of this issue was very useful, for ideological or political 'contamination' is at the heart of several of the areas in which *Lobster* has been interested in during the last five years, and is one of the central issues of British politics.

Contamination works thus. (This may be self-evident but I think it worth spelling out.) Given the dominant bipolar concept of politics we have in this country – right, left and centre – most people on the centre-left end of the spectrum are concerned not to be associated with certain ideas or people on the right. This process obviously works in reverse, people on the right do not wish to be seen to be associated with people or ideas on the left. But my knowledge of the right is limited and so I refer throughout to this mostly from the left point of view.

To be associated with an idea from, or people belonging to, the ideological opposite is to be *contaminated*. People, ideas, concepts and movements on the left can all be contaminated by association with the right. The right is

³⁴ That footnote said: 'It is ironic that while the initial research which discovered the existence of the Bilderberg network and explored its ramifications within the power structure of Atlantic capitalism came entirely from Marxist and left-inclined scholars in the USA, the whole subject has now been virtually taken over by the US far right as the centre piece of its own bizarre world-view. These writers of the far right (Anthony Sutton, Lyndon La Rouche, Spotlight and the Liberty Lobby etc.) have added virtually nothing to our understanding or knowledge of the phenomenon, and accordingly, are not referenced in the bibliography below. They have, however, *contaminated* the topic with their confusion. Since around the mid-1980s, the American Left has dropped the whole issue like a hot potato. For a singular exception see Brandt 1993, which is essentially a response to Berlet, 1992.' (emphasis added)

Note 6 of Mike Peters, 'The Bilderberg Group and the project of European unification' in *Lobster* 32.

anathema.³⁵

This rests on a number of assumptions. The left believes (or takes for granted, very often) the following.

1. Anything the right believes is wrong and anything it supports is suspect at best, and must be opposed.

2. The political ideas of the right are expressions not of beliefs about the world but of material interests: and if they profess otherwise they are trying to con people (and possibly themselves). The right has interests not ideas.

3. Many on the right are really much further right than they admit in public. Behind the conservative is the proto-fascist. (The fascist menace.) In the mirror image, behind the social democrat is the revolutionary left. (The communist menace.)³⁶

As well as being a reflexive response, 'contamination' or anathematisation is a tactic used by the left (and right) to attack opponents; and, within their internal politics, to exclude or undermine actual or potential opposition in the struggle for power and control of the political agenda. Allied to party or group loyalty and the pressure for unity generated by them, the threat of contamination is a very powerful weapon. On the left, for example, it is a serious thing to be guilty of, or suspected of, sexism or racism.³⁷

Nationalism in the UK

The most potent contamination concept in British mainstream politics today is nationalism, which is currently one of the chief weapons being used by the pro-European Union centre of British politics, against the anti-European Union politicians. Tony Benn commented recently that, in the debate about the

³⁵ Writing this it occurred to me that contamination might also be called anathematization, being made or becoming anathema.

⁶ Labour MP writes for *Morning Star*, therefore Labour MP is a communist sympathiser; therefore the Labour Party is communist. Geoffrey Stewart-Smith's big pamphlet in the mid 1970s, *The Hidden Face of the Labour Party*, was a classic of this kind.

³⁷ Obviously I am describing a version of political correctness. The British Right lampoons the Left for being PC while concealing the fact they operate their own kind of PC code, albeit less openly and less rigidly.

European Union,

'Anyone who doubts the wisdom of accepting an unelected central bank is called [by TV journalists] a *nationalist* or a trouble-maker, or is assumed to be launching a crude leadership bid.'³⁸ (emphasis added)

Opposing the European Union (EU), a section of the British Labour Left is in danger of contamination by a section of the Tory Right, which also opposes the EU. Labour Left opponents of the EU thus have to try to ensure that they are not contaminated by such an association, that they are not perceived as nationalists – 'little Englanders' – with its xenophobic and racist overtones. Here is Bill Morris, General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers, preparing to oppose a single European currency:

'I do not approach this issue from a nationalist position. The flag-waving, tub-thumping tabloid chauvinism of the Tory right is alien to the traditions of the trade union movement.'³⁹

Here is 'left-wing Eurosceptic' Walter Cairns welcoming the election defeat of Michael Portillo:

'Had he won, his chances of obtaining the leadership of the Tory party on an anti-European ticket would have been extremely high. This would have meant that the Eurosceptic cause would have been even more solidly entrenched into the far-right camp - thus *smearing by association* those who have severe reservations about the EU for reasons other than blind xenophobia.'⁴⁰ (emphasis added)

And here is Diane Abbott MP, from the Labour Left, in the *Observer* (Business) on 18 August 1996, underneath a piece by John Redwood, from the Tory Right, both of them opposing European Monetary Union:

'The debate on economic and monetary union has been

³⁸ *The Guardian* 18 March 1997

³⁹ *The Guardian* 9 September 1996

⁴⁰ *The Guardian* (letters) 3 May 1997 It is sadly typical that Cairns thinks – or professes to think – that right-wing hostility to the European Union is simply motivated by xenophobia.

hi-jacked by the Tory Party right wing. But there is also a socialist case against it. And it has nothing to do with the *backward-looking nationalism of the Tory little Englanders*. On the contrary, for true internationalists.....' (emphases added)

The claim that the right has 'hi-jacked' the issue is nonsense. There has always been a section of the Tory Right which, like a section of the Labour Left, has opposed the EEC and the European Union. Rather uncomfortably they lined up together in the 1975 referendum campaign on EEC membership; just as some of their political antecedents had opposed the Marshall Aid plan almost thirty years previously.⁴¹ The Labour Left has to go through these ritual manoeuvres on this issue in particular, because their opponents in the Labour Party, in the pro-European Union wing, as well as in the predominantly pro-EU media, attempt to contaminate them with nationalism – and thus the right. Here is Prime Minister Tony Blair doing it, in his talk to Rupert Murdoch's News Corp Leadership Conference, in Australia:

'...the Labour government I hope to lead will be outward-looking, internationalist and committed to free and open trade, not *an outdated and misguided narrow nationalism*.' (emphasis added)⁴²

Nationalism contaminates on the British Left because of its association with racism, fascism and anti-semitism. But that is not really accurate. For in Wales and Scotland and Ireland ⁴³ it is possible – and intellectually respectable – to be a nationalist and not really risk contamination with the far right. The Scottish National Party, for example, has always been

⁴¹ While the right (Tory) and left (Labour) anti-EEC politicians were uncomfortable, people like Ted Heath and Roy Jenkins discovered that they had more in common with each other than they did with the anti-EEC people of their own party. There are hints that in the wake of the referendum the pro-EEC factions of the left of the Tory Party and right of the Labour Party – symbolised by Heath and Jenkins – explored the possibility of 'breaking the mould' of British parliamentary politics then.

⁴² *The Times* 17 July 1995

⁴³ Northern Ireland, divided as it is, contains two identities. Or maybe three if you count the Ulster Protestant and British as distinct.

internally divided between the right and left. A 'left nationalist' is intelligible in Scotland and Wales but barely so in England. It would be more accurate to write that nationalism contaminates on the *English* Left because of nationalism's association with the *English* far right (and thus with racism, fascism, and anti-semitism.) In Scotland, Wales and even Northern Ireland, the National Front, the British National Party *et al* have singularly failed to make even the tiny inroads they have in England in part, at least, because in the non-English parts of the United Kingdom nationalism is regarded as *legitimate* and is embraced by mainstream political parties.

Nationalism contaminates because the Labour Left – and the whole of the British Left – sees itself as internationalist. Nationalism is regarded as one of the sources of all evil in the world: *vide* World War 2, *vide* Yugoslavia, *vide* the history of the world. But the British Left's hostility to nationalism is flexible. When the British Left helped in the struggle to free the British colonies it was working with nationalists. The Left supports Irish nationalism and supported Vietnamese and South African nationalism. These nationalists did not contaminate the British Left, for nationalism is perceived as legitimate when it is opposing a colonial oppressor, when it can be called national self-determination. Here is the basis of the legitimacy of Welsh, Scots – and Irish – nationalism: their oppressor is England.

In fact this doesn't quite work, for the oppression of the Scots and Welsh in recent memory is not comparable to that of the Kenyans, say, or the black South Africans. But there is enough of it left, a vestigial memory, to make Scots and Welsh nationalism seem.....acceptable. At any rate, the British Left does not assume that *qua* nationalists, the Scots and Welsh Nationalists are racists and fascists; and never has, as far as I am aware.⁴⁴ But it is my experience that this Welsh and Scots nationalism is not even anti-*English*. Scots and Welsh Nationalists don't see the people in the North (or Midlands, or East or West) of England as their oppressor. Their oppressor is in London and the Home Counties – the English

⁴⁴ The discussion of these issues I enjoyed most was Tom Nairn's *The Left Against Europe?* (Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1973).

establishment, which at its core is the City of London, and what might be best described as the overseas lobby in Britain – the financial, political, administrative and cultural remnants of the British Empire.

Where this essay is going may now be apparent. For the financial interests of that overseas lobby in London and the Home Counties against which the Welsh and Scots Nats are struggling, have all too frequently taken precedence over the interests of industrial, non-metropolitan *England*, as well as Scotland and Wales – most recently and most nakedly, in the 1980s.....

Right thinking

There's something called 'A European Framework National Statute for the Promotion of Tolerance'⁴⁵ which is moving through the EU, thence to national governments for implementation (or not). Below is an extract. The kicker is in the last four lines.

'Section 7. Penal Sanctions

- (a) The following acts will be regarded as criminal offences punishable as aggravated crimes:
 - (i) Hate crimes as defined in Section 1(c).
 - (ii) Incitement to violence against a group as defined in Section 1(a).
 - (iii) Group libel as defined in Section 1(b).
 - (iv) Overt approval of a totalitarian ideology, xenophobia or anti-Semitism.
 - (v) Public approval or denial of the Holocaust.
 - (vi) Public approval or denial of any other act of genocide the existence of which has been determined by an international criminal court or tribunal.

Explanatory note:

This Sub-Section defines acts punishable as aggravated crimes. Sub-paragraph (vi) does not affect public (or private) discussions and differences of opinion

45 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/libe/dv/11_revframework_statute_/11_revframework_statute_en.pdf>

as to whether other acts – not covered by decisions of international courts or tribunals - also amount, or fail to amount, to genocide.

(b) Juveniles convicted of committing crimes listed in paragraph (a) will be required to undergo a rehabilitation programme designed to instill in them a culture of tolerance.'

What did the government of Vietnam call such programmes in the late 1970s? Ah yes, reeducation camps.

Mobile phones and cancer

My exposure to some of the literature on electro-magnetic radiation was started by the late Harlan Girard whom I met in 1989. I've not studied any science since I left school but even I could see that there was a lot of really bad news in the suitcase full of scientific articles he was lugging round the British media.

Consequently I resisted getting a mobile phone. When my partner decided she wanted to get on-line we were in the process of installing a second land-line to avoid wi-fi and its associated signal until a techie showed me that our house was already in the wi-fi fields of four of our neighbours (now its a dozen, at least). Living in a city this stuff cannot be avoided. I have even started occasionally using a mobile phone.

I have been commenting on this subject for a long time, certainly since *Lobster* 31 in 1996. Until recently the evidence was substantial but not conclusive. Now we have something which the tech companies may not be able to spin away.

'A link between cellphones and cancer has been found in a major U.S. study, officials said late Thursday. The peer-reviewed \$25 million study was conducted over multiple years and found two types of tumors in male rats exposed to the same kind of radio frequencies emitted by the devices. The tumors were found in brain and heart cells. "Even a very small increase in the incidence

of disease resulting from exposure to [radio-frequency radiation] could have broad implications for public health," the report said, especially "given the widespread global usage of mobile communications among users of all ages."⁴⁶

That this story has taken 20 years to get going is down to two things. Most important is the fact that funding for research has had mostly come from the technology companies which are unwilling to pay for bad news.⁴⁷ Second, these technology companies have been spending their considerable funds 'war-gaming' any research which impeded their highly profitable growth.⁴⁸ All we need now is some serious research on the health effects of living near mobile phone masts, which, like wi-fi signals, are impossible to avoid in cities and increasingly difficult to avoid in rural areas.

Roughly speaking, we are where the anti-smoking lobby was in the mid-1950s with the idea that tobacco caused cancer.⁴⁹

Bliar, MI5?

Thanks to SC for pointing out that the extract from former MI5 officer Annie Machon's book, *Spies Lies and Whistleblowers*,

46 This quotation is from <<http://www.thedailybeast.com/cheats/2016/05/27/major-study-links-cellphones-to-cancer.html>>.

For more details see <<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/major-cell-phone-radiation-study-reignites-cancer-questions/>>.

47 Some examples are at <<https://www.rfsafe.com/motorola-war-games-scientists-indicating-health-risk-from-cell-phone-radiation/>> and <<http://thewalrus.ca/cellphone-games/?ref=2008.09-health-cellphone-brain-tumour-melinda-wenner&page=>>.

48 See <<https://www.rfsafe.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/cell-phone-radiation-war-gaming-memo.pdf>> which reproduces the notorious 1994 memo from an executive of Motorola which talks of having 'war-gamed' the unwanted results of one of their researchers. Or the interview with Dr. Devra Davis at <www.alternet.org/personal-health/radiation-concerns-aboutcellphones?page=0%2C0> and the article she wrote at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/devra-davis-phd/cell-phones-brain-cancer_b_3232534.html>.

49 Christopher Ketcham wrote about this in 2010 in his essay at <http://www.theinvestigativefund.org/investigations/envirohealth/1212/is_your_cell_phone_hazardous_to_your_health/>.

which was redacted by MI5 prior to publication, has been published in *Counter Spy* by Simon Tomlin.⁵⁰ In that section Machon reports that a source in MI5 she calls Swallow Tail told her and her then partner David Shayler that Tony Blair was recruited by MI5 to report on the left within the Labour Party, around the time he was selected to stand for the parliamentary seat at Beaconsfield in 1982. This is not terribly surprising is it? A young politician on the make, in a party he despises, is offered a potentially career-boosting hand by the state? Of course he would say 'Yes'. But this still isn't quite hard evidence.

Doing Dettol

It has been hard to miss stories in the last few months about the epidemic of opiate addiction in America. One of the causes of this is the creation of people who are addicted to legal painkillers, something that what is now known as Big Pharma has been encouraging, marketing opiod (opiate-immitating) painkillers in the same way that they might market any other product.⁵¹ One of the most popular is OxyContin – Oxy – sometimes known as hillbilly heroin. The 'Oxy' trade was one of the recurring themes in the US TV crime series *Justified* which was shown in the UK over the last five years.⁵² *Justified* showed 'prescription mills' being set-up with corrupt doctors issuing prescriptions for Oxy on demand. Which is what has happened in real life, encouraged by Big Pharma.

Reading these stories I noticed a familiar name, buprenorphine, now being touted in the States as a way of getting people off opiod addiction.⁵³

I was told about bupenorphine – marketed in the UK as temgesic – in the early 1980s by a man in Hull who had been a

50 On-line at <<https://books.google.co.uk/>>. Enter author and title there. The relevant sections begins at p. 144.

51 See <<http://www.alternet.org/personal-health/what-big-pharma-does-not-want-you-know-about-opioid-epidemic>>.

52 See <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1489428/>>.

53 See for example <<http://touch.latimes.com/#section/-1/article/p2p-87313669/>>.

junky. It was being manufactured in Hull by Reckitt and Colman, whose scientists had developed it. At the time it was being written about as 'non-addictive morphine'.⁵⁴ One of the night cleaners at the Reckitt's factory began stealing it, selling the pills for 50p each, and Hull drug-users began crushing, dissolving and injecting it. It was, said my junky acquaintance, 'better than any £5 bag of smack' he'd ever bought. Because the pills had the Reckitt and Colman logo of the shield on them, Hull's temgesic users joked that they were 'Doing Dettol'.⁵⁵

But the man stealing the pills got busted, the supply dried up, some dozens? hundreds? of people found that they were addicted and turned to the only available alternative: street heroin. Thus, said my acquaintance, was Hull's first proper junky community created. And the same thing is happening in the US as people find their supplies of legal, Big Pharma opioids drying-up.

At the centre of this story is the chemists' perception that addictiveness is the property of particular elements in a product and all they have to do is identify the element and remove it. Thus 'non-addictive morphine'. As if.....

My enemy's enemy is...?

And then there's the relationship between the British state, its secret arms and academia. Consider the case of The Rendition Project. Run by a couple of British academics, this

⁵⁴ From the Wikipedia entry on buprenorphine:

'In 1969, researchers at Reckitt & Colman (now Reckitt Benckiser) had spent 10 years attempting to synthesize an opioid compound "with structures substantially more complex than morphine [that] could retain the desirable actions whilst shedding the undesirable side effects (addiction)." Reckitt found success when researchers synthesized RX6029 which had showed *success in reducing dependence in test animals*. RX6029 was named buprenorphine and began trials on humans in 1971.[34][35] By 1978 buprenorphine was first launched in the UK as an injection to treat severe pain, with a sublingual formulation released in 1982.' (emphasis added)

⁵⁵ One of Reckitt and Colman's best known products with the shield prominent on the label.

describes itself thus:

'Working closely with a number of other organisations, in particular the legal action charity Reprieve and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, this project aims to bring academic expertise to bear in order to research the CIA's rendition, detention and interrogation (RDI) programme.'⁵⁶

This is potentially embarrassing for the CIA *and* the British state whose intelligence services collaborated with the Agency. Who is funding the Rendition Project? At the bottom of the Project's home page is this:

'The Rendition Project has been funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)....'

So: the British state, through the ESRC, is funding research into something it would rather we didn't know about. Go figure.

The other Mr Atkinson

Occasional contributor to these columns, Dan Atkinson, is writing some witty and informative stuff on the Brexit debate. Try his take on the current relationship between the British trade unions and the EU,⁵⁷ or his account of the economic rationale for leaving the EU,⁵⁸ in which he memorably describes economic nationalism as 'a cause without any rebels'. His new book, with Larry Elliott, *Europe Isn't Working*, is reviewed in this issue of *Lobster*.

The *Guardian* mystery

Roderick Russell, a victim of private sector persecution, has written for or been written about in these columns several

56 <<http://www.therenditionproject.org.uk/>>

57 <<https://thelionandunicorn.wordpress.com/2016/05/08/everybodyin-trade-unions-and-the-eu-referendum/>>

58 <<https://thelionandunicorn.wordpress.com/2016/02/12/reasons-to-be-leaving-part-1-trade/>>

times.⁵⁹ He got in touch after reading my comments in *Lobster* 71 about the *Guardian* and its support for American foreign policy. He wrote:

'While I am not certain that in dealings with the secret services one will ever get more than circumstantial evidence, I do think there is enough of that to make a very strong case that the security/intelligence agencies see the *Guardian* as one of their assets.'

Some of that circumstantial evidence is on pp. 39/40 of a report he wrote, 'Russell: Zersetzen', documenting the harassment of him and his family.⁶⁰

Wonga Britain

In the background of the current economic debate is the question: 'When in government, did Labour borrow too much?' Academic economists sympathetic to Labour say, 'No',⁶¹ while the Conservative Party, seeking a rationale for their austerity policies, say, 'Yes'. In my view the answer is 'Yes, they did': afraid to put up taxes, they borrowed to fund current expenditure, just as millions of Brits do (and the Conservatives have continued this policy). But even if the answer is 'No', they borrowed lots of it stupidly. In a study of the debts generated by the PFI (private finance initiative) schemes under Labour, Jonathan Owen reported:

'The system has yielded assets valued at £56.5bn. But Britain will pay more than five times that amount under the terms of the PFIs used to create them, and in some cases be left with nothing to show for it, because the PFI agreed to is effectively a leasing agreement. Some £88bn has already been spent, and even if the projected cost between now and 2049/50 does not change, the

⁵⁹ See for example *Lobsters* 57, 65 and 70.

⁶⁰ <<https://zersetzen.wikispaces.com/file/view/Russell%20Zersetzen%20%284%29.pdf/513210120/Russell%20Zersetzen%20%284%29.pdf>>

⁶¹ For example Simon Wren-Lewis and Anne Pettifor, both members of Labour's economics advisory board. See <<https://notesbrokensociety.wordpress.com/2016/04/08/notes-on-the-new-economics-john-mcdonnells-tour-comes-to-bristol/>>.

total PFI bill will be *in excess of £310bn*. This is more than four times the budget deficit used to justify austerity cuts to government budgets and local services.’⁶² (emphasis added)

Like many of the government IT projects embarked on with the big computer companies and abandoned after spending billions,⁶³ these are essentially frauds by the companies concerned, taking advantage of economically illiterate politicians and civil servants.

Labour and anti-semitism

As John Newsinger notes in his ‘Livingstone, Zionism and the Nazis’ in *Lobster* 71, we are going to get a lot more of this nonsense as NuLab remnants and the Israeli lobby use it to attack Corbyn and the Party’s left. On this subject there have been a number of recent analyses, one by occasional contributor to these columns, Michael Carlson.⁶⁴ A useful complement to these is an account of the *Guardian’s* role in this at sodiumhaze.⁶⁵

Thus far I have not seen any Labour spokespeople who have grasped the central fact about such smear campaigns: the only way to resist them is to name the subtext. Everybody around Corbyn – and most of the journalists making this piffle ‘a story’ – know the sources of this one and the reasons for it; and not to name and identify it is inviting it to continue.

⁶² <<http://www.independent.co.uk/money/loans-credit/crippling-pfi-deals-leave-britain-222bn-in-debt-10170214.html>>

⁶³ A detailed account of the failed NHS IT project is at <<https://caltonjock.com/2015/01/20/it-projects-the-last-labour-government-the-failures-the-cost-of-writes-off-to-the-taxpayer-we-must-not-get-stung-again/>>. David Craig’s *Plundering the Public Sector* (Constable, 2006) provides a general account of NuLab’s incompetence and intellectual prostration before the shibboleths of the public/bad, private/good thinking.

⁶⁴ Carlson is at <<http://irresistibletargets.blogspot.co.uk/2016/05/anti-semitism-and-election-politics.html>>. The others are <<http://www.alternet.org/grayzone-project/inside-manufactured-anti-semitism-scandals-designed-weaken-uk-labour-leader-jeremy>> and <<http://www.redpepper.org.uk/antisemitism-and-the-left/>>.

⁶⁵ <<http://www.sodiumhaze.org/2016/05/16/how-the-guardian-bullies-morality-so-they-can-bully-you/>>

Ah, innocent days

In a recent posting of more data from the Snowden documents, Glen Greenwald's *The Intercept* included this extract from an NSA document.

'A Perspective on the NSA/USUN Partnership

SUMMARY

The intelligence SID [Signals Intelligence Directorate] gave to the U.S. United Nations team (USUN) during the wind-up to the Iraq War 'played a critical role' in the adoption of U.N. Security Council resolutions. The work with that customer was a resounding success.'

Which means the NSA were intercepting phone calls. Which means the diplomats concerned hadn't grasped that all electronic communications that aren't seriously encrypted are, in effect, public.⁶⁶

Mind control and TIs

It has been a while since I last wrote anything about this field. I haven't had much material is one reason. Perhaps people stopped including *Lobster* in their e-mail CC lists as my occasional references to the subject dried up. Perhaps the way I treated the subject displeased people. But also I stopped writing about it because the subject is frustrating. The situation remains as it was in 1989 when I first met the late Harlan Girard, my first putative TI (targeted individual): there is evidence that some of this is technically feasible and, given the history of US government-sponsored experiments on unwitting subjects, it is conceivable that this is happening. But moving beyond those two propositions is not possible. Only one of the apparent victims of these technologies that I have seen – albeit a tiny sample of the whole – has produced any

66 <<https://theintercept.com/2016/05/16/the-most-intriguing-spy-stories-from-166-internal-nsa-reports/>>

evidence.⁶⁷

Recently, within the space of three days, I received three missives, one relayed by Garrick Alder. This is a link a site where TIs report their experiences and their (failed) attempts to get official action.⁶⁸ On there is a letter from one Dr. John Hall:

'Over the last decade we have seen a sharp rise in the number of people coming forward with complaints of non-consensual experimentation with electromagnetic weapons designed to target both electronic hardware and the human central nervous system. While this was typically disregarded as mental illness in the past, the total global population voicing these identical complaints has exponentially grown to numbers that can no longer be attributed to delusional disorder, schizophrenia or any other described mental illness.'⁶⁹

So, they can't all be deluded? Alas – and this is where the difficulties lie – yes, they can. With the spread of the Internet and thus the spread of stories about TIs and mind control technology, people looking for answers to problems may be reading the same narratives and this may explain why we get, as Dr Hall notes, 'identical complaints'.⁷⁰

For example, many of those seeking an explanation for their experiences cite a 1996 document by John St Clair Akwei, who it is claimed, worked for the NSA.⁷¹ But his 'evidence' has been largely assembled from other people in the field. For example, the most striking list of all the alleged effects of these neural techniques is taken from Eleanor White ('Raven'),

67 I am referring to the Swede, Robert Naeslund, who had a device implanted in his skull. Photographs of this are at <http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp_sociopol_mindcon29.htm>.

68 <<http://www.freedomsos.com/>>

69 <<http://www.freedomsos.com/blog/archives/02-2016>>

70 About fifteen years I met a group of four putative 'TIs' and asked how many of them were being microwaved, 'beamed at', while I was talking to them. Three of them said they were. All of them seemed 'sane' and 'normal'.

71 See, for example, <http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/scalar_tech/esp_scalartech12.htm>.

a familiar name to anyone who has tried to research mind control. Akwei is not contactable and no-one has been able to confirm that he worked at NSA.⁷²

The second communication I received was an e-mail from Elizabeth Coady:

'I am a former newspaper reporter and television producer who sued Oprah Winfrey to challenge the confidentiality agreement she had employees sign (in my case midemployment). Ms. Winfrey is a talented but troubled person who suffers from narcissism. I caused her what is known as 'narcissistic injury' – you can investigate how a powerful narcissist responds to such injuries. Ms. Winfrey endorsed Obama and is credited by political scientists with winning him the election. It is my informed belief that this campaign against me is a quid pro quo agreement between Obama and Ms. Winfrey.'

Ms Coady claims to be 'a nonconsensual DARPA experiment subject who has myriad implants including a biotelemetry wire, biomems, microchip and what must be a neuro chip and or wire.' The building in which she lives is also involved.

'The president and his minions took years to lay this revenge plan in place. The conspiracy was so extensive that a former NSA director named Bill Black actually

⁷² Another name which appears regularly is a man who calls himself Dr Robert Duncan, who says of himself:

'Call me The Saint. I am the all American – prep school, Harvard College graduating with honors in computer science and a minor in premedical studies, and advanced degrees from Harvard and Dartmouth in business and science. My famous ancestors are President Lincoln, King Duncan of Scotland, and Governor William Bradford, the first governor of Massachusetts.

My research interests have been neural networks, virtual reality, and EEG controlled robotics. Before graduate school I worked for the Department of Defense, Navy, NATO, and various intelligence agencies computer science projects. I have done business consulting and computer consulting for the largest companies in the world. I have been a professor, inventor, artist, and writer. I am one of the last Renaissance men.'

But he's a fraud, as is obvious from these comments. For more details see <<http://exposinginfragard.blogspot.co.uk/2012/07/dissecting-claims-of-robert-duncan.html>>.

bought a unit in my building (from perpetrator Mary Wisniewski who helped implement campaign). I believe Mr. Black bought the unit under the pseudonym Martin Dooley.'

All this because of offence taken by Oprah Winfrey!

Coady has posted a X-ray on the Net⁷³ which she claims shows a device in her body; but I cannot interpret X-rays.

The third recent correspondent sent me a registered parcel containing two letters about an elaborate – if barely intelligible – plot to kill her because she uncovered 'a network of cameras in my flat and the people behind it, who run a voyeur/porn/rape + snuff movie website/network/ business want to kill me before I tell anyone'. Included with the letters were a smashed-up iPhone, a cigarette, some sexual lubricant (in a sachet labelled 'Swiss Navy') and four small capsules containing I know not what. But no explanation of what their significance is (and no return address).

And so it goes....

Cottrell and Banks

The collaboration between *Lobster* contributor Dr. Roger Cottrell and former British mercenary, John Banks, has resulted initially in a book *BlowBack: Narco Terrorism, Deep Politics and The Plot To Bomb The 2010 World Cup*.⁷⁴ However NB that in an author's note Cottrell writes, 'this is a work of creative non-fiction founded in fact....'

73 <<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/FullSizeRender.jpg.pdf>>

74 <http://www.amazon.com/BlowBack-Narco-Terrorism-Politics-CupORLD/dp/1533236488?ie=UTF8&qid=1463565034&ref_=tmm_pap_swatch_0&sr=1-1>