

Secretary Shultz and the Anglo-American spy scandal

by Criton Zoakos

Last month, American intelligence officials brought forward an Anglo-Soviet spy scandal, the so-called Prime affair, dubbed "the worst security crisis since Kim Philby," which in effect has placed a huge question mark on all the intelligence evaluations which Great Britain has supplied to the United States pertaining to the Soviet Union throughout the 1968 to 1977 period. As a result, relations between American and British intelligence services are now more strained than ever, with many American officials questioning the validity of the so-called "special relationship" between the two intelligence services.

This "special relationship" had once been described by Lord Halifax, when British ambassador to Washington, as one in which the British supply the "brains" and the Americans supply the "brawn" in the pursuit of global strategy. Not surprisingly, under this arrangement, most of post-Second World War foreign policy of the United States was designed in London and was appropriately imposed upon Washington. At the lower, intelligence-gathering level, the "special relationship" pivoted around a series of signed and unsigned agreements between the two countries according to which intelligence data are shared by the two countries' services. Thus, Britain's Government Communications Headquarters at Cheltenham supplies the U.S. National Security Agency with intelligence it obtains from its electronic monitoring of the Soviet bloc. The GCHQ, the NSA and similar organizations in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and NATO are linked by agreements to share the results of their electronic monitoring activities around the world. Cheltenham and its listening stations in Cyprus, Hong Kong, Ascension and elsewhere, is primarily focused on electronically gathering

all the military, political, diplomatic, economic, and other messages throughout the Soviet bloc which may be transmitted by radio, telex, teletype, microwave, and so forth. It then shares them with the United States.

Other special relationships

The Prime affair involves one Geoffrey Prime, a Cheltenham employee from 1968 to 1977 who through all these years was supplying Soviet intelligence with information about a special Cheltenham program which was supposed to monitor the conversations of the Soviet political leadership. The implication is that everything which British intelligence supplied to the United States regarding the thinking of the top Soviet leadership during 1968-77 (the Kissinger era), was only what the Soviet leaders, by prearrangement with Cheltenham personnel, wished to feed back to Washington.

Geoffrey Prime was exposed and caught in July, at the initiative of American intelligence officers, during the height of the Malvinas War. Between Prime's arrest and now, the British government has systematically refused to honor American requests for "damage assessment" reports. NSA officials have been sent to London to inquire, with no reported success. Relations between the commanding officer of GCHQ, Sir Brian Tovey, and his NSA counterpart, Lt.-Gen. Lincoln D. Faurer, are reportedly of "utmost formality" at this time.

Beneath this veneer of factual tidbits, lie the real facts of Britain's last great battle to break the strategic backbone of the United States, in order to herself emerge as the leading arbiter of what the British oligarchy refers to as the "British Commonwealth," and of the Western World, presumably

with the toleration of the Soviet Union. Secretary of State George Shultz is increasingly being caught in the web of consequences flowing out of the Prime affair in the following way:

George Shultz is committed to a policy of drastically reducing the United States defense budget this year, including any allocations which may be approved for the program to develop space-based relativistic beam anti-ballistic missile systems. Given President Brezhnev's Oct. 27 speech to the Soviet military leadership (see article, page 33), and given the Soviet military and industrial factions' consolidation of power this year, George Shultz will have great difficulty selling his defense budget-cutting policy unless he continues to present fraudulent intelligence regarding the state of affairs in the Soviet Union, of the type Cheltenham supplied Washington in the Kissinger era of 1968 to 1977.

Would Shultz be willing to commit such irreversible damage to the United States' strategic position?

Why not?

To understand what happened to American foreign policy, one must view the current Prime affair in the context of the H. A. R. "Kim" Philby affair. During the fall of 1977, the founder of this publication, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., successfully exposed the fact that the supposed British "defector to Moscow" Philby was still, in fact, in the loyal service of Her Majesty's Secret Intelligence Service. He currently serves in Moscow with the rank of KGB General. It was further exposed in the fall of 1979 that the Queen's art curator, Sir Anthony Blunt, was the mysterious "fourth man" in the quartet of Philby-Burgess-Maclean-Blunt.

The Milner group in Washington

Even with these verified facts, we are still dealing with the mere surface of British grand strategy. The story goes back to the Round Table of Cecil Rhodes, the imperial policy-making group of the British monarchy continuously from 1901 to this day. The Philby affair was spawned at the British embassy in Washington while Lord Halifax, a leading member of the Milner Kindergarten, was ambassador. Sir Isaiah Berlin, the recruiter of Henry Kissinger into the British Intelligence-KGB nexus, was also serving at the Washington embassy at the time, and is a leading surviving member of the original Round Table-Milner group.

Lord Halifax and his helpers at the Washington embassy were dedicated to carrying out what was then the central policy of the Round Table, now renamed the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or Chatham House. That policy was the institutionalization of the Cold War between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and the concomitant manipulation of both superpowers by Britain. All subsequent British ambassadors to Washington, from Halifax to Nicholas Henderson in 1982, were exclusively members of the old Milner Group—including Lord Harlech during the Kennedy period, who masterminded the Tavistock-Rapoport policy of leading the United States into the era of "post-industrial" environ-

mentalism, and Lord Cromer during the Nixon period, who masterminded the Watergating of the American President.

The power of these Milner Group ambassadors in Washington was augmented quite out of proportion to an ordinary embassy's capabilities because of the extraordinary assistance received from American members of the Round Table-Milner Group. For instance, very few know that the founder of the CIA, Allen W. Dulles, was a member in London of the Milner Group since 1935, and an intimate of Lord Alfred Milner himself. So was his brother, John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State. Other State Secretaries were also members of the Round Table, either of high rank, such as Cyrus Vance, or of low rank, such as Henry Kissinger.

When the Milner Group reconstituted itself as the Royal Institute of International Affairs on May 30, 1919, its chief funders were Americans, namely Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan, the Carnegie Corporation, and Jerome Greene of the Rockefeller Foundation. Most of the blueblood families of the United States, Harriman, Moore, Cabot, Peabody et al. viewed the group with great sympathy. Others, such as the Astors, played, and still do, a major role in leading the Royal Institute. Others were won over more gradually. The objectives of the group were formally stated in two books, one by the founder of the RIIA, Lionel Curtis, titled *Civitas Dei*, the other, by its chief intelligence officer, the historian Arnold J. Toynbee, called *A Study of History*. This program was, and is, cultural imperialist dominance of the British empiricist philosophical outlook throughout the globe. The proposed means for achieving this was, and is, a plan to destroy any republican form of sovereign government throughout the English-dominated world (colonies, dominions, possessions, United Kingdom and United States), so that all could be subordinated to the cultural and informal political control of the British Royal Family. Based on this homogenized political base, the (sodomy-oriented) British philosophical outlook would dominate world affairs.

This 1919 program continues today under the rubric of the Carrington Plan, after Lord Carrington, the recent Foreign Secretary of Mrs. Thatcher. This plan was partially described by Mr. Edward Heath in a speech he gave at Fulton, Missouri in March 1982, published at the time in this review. It has since been repeated frequently by Henry Kissinger on numerous occasions. Its gist is: The United States is no longer a superpower that can dominate world affairs. It now possesses less than 24 percent of world GNP, while in the 1950s it controlled over 50 percent. Its international and strategic commitments must be lowered accordingly. Instead of superpower policies, we should adopt a diplomacy of low, sophisticated profile, following Britain's lead. As a result of the Carrington Plan, U.S. positions in Latin America, the Middle East, the North Pacific, and the Far East have crumbled since the Malvinas war and the subsequent Lebanon war. France, West Germany, and Britain are quietly making security arrangements apart from the United States. Lord Carrington and the British royal household are engaged in what they

believe to be deals with the Soviet leadership, which would allow Britain to emerge as the arbiter of affairs in the West. The Soviets are encouraging what they believe to be “inter-imperialist rivalries,” slyly awaiting their ultimate benefits.

This is the real substance behind the exploding “British Spy Scandal,” not the purported feats of Mr. Geoffrey Prime. In this matter, the litmus test to be applied on matters of national security is defense policy: It is imperative for the survival of Western civilization and of the United States that America move rapidly to develop relativistic-beam ABM weapons to be deployed in outer space. Failing this, as Dr. Edward Teller argues, the United States has two options: either sign its surrender documents now, or go for general nuclear war. Secretary Shultz’s policy of opposing this defense orientation makes him either the duped victim of Anglo-Soviet misinformation, or a witting participant in the grotesque, obsessive geopolitical irrationalities of the Royal Institute.

Behind the scenes in the intelligence war

by Jeffrey Steinberg

As the story goes, two drunk Englishmen staggered home from the pub late one night. Being blind drunk, they missed their cottage doors and crawled instead through the front door of Her Majesty’s most secret spy station at Cheltenham. After sleeping through the night on the plush sofas in the office of the director, they awoke to discover their error. To cover this unfortunate “breach” and facilitate their departure, they carried out several boxes full of classified documents. Reportedly, the guards at the front door flagged down a lorry and helped place the boxes in a rear seat.

Such is the current reputation of Her Majesty’s most secret service.

Now, reputation has been amplified by a flesh-and-blood spy scandal that has already sent shockwaves across the Atlantic and back.

The scandal revolves around Geoffrey Arthur Prime, a Soviet spy arrested in July of this year. According to a New York Times article by Philip Taubman dated Oct. 24, Prime was a cryptographer and translator at the Cheltenham facility from 1968-1977, during which time he passed virtually everything he could get his hands on over to Soviet intelligence. According to the Taubman story, Prime’s information

allowed the Soviets to know every intercept point for British and American electronic espionage and to thereby maintain a constant flow of “disinformation” back into the West, concealing actual policy discussions, intelligence, etc. Cheltenham is the headquarters of the British equivalent of America’s National Security Agency, the top secret electronic espionage branch.

Reportedly, Judge William Clark, the director of the Reagan administration’s National Security Council staff and a top adviser to the President, is personally overseeing the investigation into the British government’s efforts to block further independent U.S. inquiry into the Prime matter. The personal involvement of Clark suggests that for the first time in decades, leading U.S. officials may have their eyes opened to the fact that British intelligence has repeatedly stabbed the U.S. in the back on any occasion that it has served Britain’s interests. The “special relationship” has been one of the cornerstones of Her Majesty’s doublecrossings.

It was the special relationship that was invoked with the cry of “Britain is our oldest ally” during last spring’s Malvinas War, when the U.S. violated the Monroe Doctrine to side with Britain and lost all respect as an ally in Ibero-America. It was the “special relationship” that, under self-described British agent Henry Kissinger, brought the U.S. into the absurd “China Card” which crumbled within a decade. It was the “special relationship” which has set the U.S. up for a disastrous rout out of the Middle East, where U.S. allies Egypt and Saudi Arabia are targeted for the Iran treatment by the British.

Tip of the iceberg

According to intelligence community watchers on both sides of the Atlantic, including the London *Daily Telegraph*’s top “mole”-catcher Chapman Pincher, the Prime affair is merely the first phase of a much bigger spy scandal that will rock the very foundations of the British intelligence establishment. According to others polled by this news service, Prime is believed to be part of a homosexual spy ring involving at least a half dozen others. The ring, according to these U.S. intelligence sources, has maintained a penetration of Cheltenham up to the assistant director level up through at least three months ago.

Curiously, the *only* prominent intelligence community celebrity who is trying to downplay the significance of the Prime affair is former CIA Counterintelligence Director James Jesus Angleton. Angleton, who built up a reputation as an undaunted and often “paranoid” hunter of Soviet double agents, insisted to an NSIPS reporter this week that the Prime affair is of no significance and certainly does not jeopardize the “special relationship.” The last time that Angleton was known to have adopted such a protective posture towards a British intelligence officer was in the late 1940s, when he covered over the suspicions about his personal friend Harold “Kim” Philby, now a General in the Soviet KGB and then the MI-6 Chief of Station in Washington.