

---

## II. 'Empire of the Mind'

---

# Tavistock's imperial brainwashing project

by L. Wolfe

Various types of belief can be implanted in many people, after brain function has been sufficiently disturbed by accidentally or deliberately induced fear, anger or excitement. Of the results caused by such disturbances, the most common one is temporarily impaired judgment and heightened suggestibility. Its various group manifestations are sometimes classed under the heading of "herd instinct," and appear most spectacularly in wartime, during severe epidemics, and in all similar periods of common danger, which increase anxiety and so individual and mass suggestibility.

—from Tavistock Institute psychiatrist Dr. William Sargant's 1957 book, *Battle for the Mind*

I think the subject that will be of most importance politically is mass psychology. . . . The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at: first, that influences of the home are obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. . . . It is for the future scientist to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for more than one generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen.

—Lord Bertrand Russell, in his 1951 book, *The Impact of Science Upon Society*

The late former foreign minister of Guyana, Dr. Fred Wills, once said that most of the diplomatic corps of the former colonies of Great Britain spent too much time trying to perfect their "Oxbridge" accents; the rest of the time, he stated, they spent searching "for a British rump to kiss." Trying to explain this behavior to his American friends, Wills said that colonialism still exists in its most powerful form, "as a state of mind of the subject peoples," even if the former

colonies have been given their nominal freedom.

Wills was commenting on the success of a long-term project of the British imperial elite, effectively keynoted in remarks by Winston Churchill to an audience of Anglophiles at Harvard University on Sept. 6, 1943. Churchill was then locked in battle with U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who had, on several occasions, made clear his intent to dismantle the British and all other empires at the conclusion of the war. While refusing to concede American authority to impose a "post-colonial solution" on the Empire, a consensus emerged in the imperial elite, among the families closest to the royal family, that the old imperial structures could not be continued. To maintain control, it was proposed to shift the battlefield, away from control of territory, to control of the minds, not merely of the colonial peoples, but of United States and the rest of the Western world.

In his remarks, which were broadcast internationally, Churchill proposed that his Anglophile allies within the United States join with their Mother England in a new enterprise. It is our two countries, he said with his typical pompousness, that control the destiny of the world; who control science and technology; who control culture. These are weapons far more potent than military power, Churchill declared. To control what men think "offers far better prizes than taking away other people's lands or provinces or grinding them down in exploitation. *The empires of the future will be the empires of the mind.*"

Churchill's "secret weapon" in this battle for the mind was an elite group of brainwashers and psychiatrists, then operating in the Army's Directorate of Psychological Warfare under the command of Brig. Gen. John Rawlings Rees.<sup>1</sup> These were the cadre of the Tavistock Clinic, based in London's suburbs; they had already built a network of co-thinkers in the United States in various university locations, including Harvard, and wartime operational bases within the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). In addition, Britain's psychological warriors had established a beachhead in Hollywood, in the emerging radio, television, and motion picture industries.

At the end of the war, the Tavistock network, which numbered several hundred individuals, reentered civilian life, but remained under the central command of British policy circles. They proceeded to spawn numbers of think-tanks, institutes, and other "nodes" (Tavistock's term for its various allied centers of activity) in every part of the globe, dominating every key aspect of social policy; today, the Tavistock core group numbers in the several score thousand. That core group, in turn, has trained close to 1 million cadre, by their own

---

1. The LaRouche movement did groundbreaking work on Rees and the Tavistock network in 1973-74, publishing the results of its investigations in the *Campaigner* (Winter 1973, Spring 1974 issues). Additional work has been published in *EIR* over the last 20 years.

estimates, who serve as teachers and advisers to nearly all business, military, political, and educational elites. In ways subtle, and some not so subtle, operating as a conspiracy intervening on individual human consciousness, they have attempted to not only shape what people think, but to establish the parameters and limits of thought itself.

### What is Tavistock?

The Tavistock Center, located in buildings in the London suburb for which it is named, is composed of the Tavistock Clinic and the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, which in turn has five component institutions. Over the last five decades, it has founded a network of “international nodes,” which function as mini-Tavistocks, and are involved in joint projects (see box). Its quarterly journal, *Human Relations*, published since 1947, serves as an effective briefing for the network on its more public work.

The Tavistock network owes its origins to the 1920 founding of the Tavistock Clinic, under the direct patronage of the royal family, through HRH, Duke George of Kent (1902-42). The Clinic soon earned the nickname “the Freud Hilton,” for its promotion of the pseudo-science of psychoanalysis; however, it quickly broadened its horizons to include various other psychological theories. Unifying all of its theoretical studies, was the oligarchical view of man as a beast, whose impulses and urges could be controlled and tamed, as one does with animals.<sup>2</sup>

Tavistock’s usefulness to its imperial masters can be gleaned from the work of its leader, John Rawling Rees. A virulent race patriot and believer in eugenical theories, Rees had studied “war neuroses” in France during World War I. His conclusion: Under controlled conditions, neurotic behavior could be induced, and, through these methods, individual behavior could be absolutely controlled. In later years, Tavistock operatives, such as Dr. Kurt Lewin, would elaborate on Rees’s “discovery” and develop methods for inducing controlled, irrational behavior by groups of people.

Tavistock, through Rees and others, proposed that its theories be put in service as a means of social control during times of peace. In his 1945 book, *The Shaping of Psychiatry by War*, Rees reported that the work of the Tavistock group during the war demonstrated conclusively that there was a “psychopathological tenth” of the population who were genetically dullards. These dullards, should their numbers not be controlled, would soon dominate civil society. It were therefore necessary to devise methods, using psychiatry, to control such people and prevent their increase in numbers, and to control their even larger populations in backward colonial

---

2. They also conducted extensive profiling of national ideologies, seeking weaknesses that could be manipulated by the British. Under Rees’s direction, some of these were compiled in a 1950 book, *World Tension*. Others remain classified to this day.

lands that threatened the civilized world. Of the remainder of the population, there were some people who, if their neuroses could be controlled, might be useful to the very small group of people whose genetic breeding and psychological training allegedly suited them for leadership. For Rees and Tavistock, the job of psychiatry was to conduct the “selection” process, by which society was divided and responsibility doled out among the dullards, the “useful” neurotics, and a genetically determined, superior 10% at the top.

Psychiatrists, Rees said, must be involved in all levels of society, prepared to intervene at any place—the home, the job, the schools—at any time. “If we propose to come out into the open,” wrote Rees, “and to attack the social and national problems of our day, then we must have shock troops, and these cannot be provided by psychiatry based wholly on institutions. We must have teams of well-selected, well-trained psychiatrists, who are free to move around and make contacts with the local situation in their particular area.”

Rees’s book was based on a series of lectures that he gave to his networks in the United States. Within two years of the book’s publication, Tavistock had expanded its operations in Britain and the Empire, and enlarged its beachhead in the United States. To the Tavistock Clinic was added the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, to train and deploy the teams of “mobile psychiatric shock troops.” In the United States, Lewin’s Research Center for Group Dynamics, the spin-off National Training Laboratories, and the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan were all established. Money poured into this effort from royal family-sponsored charitable trusts, as well as from the Rockefellers, the Mellons, and the Morgans, to name a few of the U.S. oligarchical families whose pockets opened to the Tavistock brainwashers.

### Restructuring the Empire

The British elites tabbed their Tavistock network to play a critical role in the postwar restructuring of their empire and its transition into the “Commonwealth.”

In 1947, as the Tavistock Institute was being created, Rees was moved into the United Nations apparatus, creating the World Federation of Mental Health, along with Montagu Norman, the leading banker of the British Crown and the man who had maneuvered Hitler and the Nazis into power. Rees helped create more than three dozen affiliated organizations around the globe, with each promoting his neo-Freudian racial selection theories, in targeting and selecting local elites for British patronage.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, he collaborated with Sir

---

3. In its voluminous output, Tavistock expresses its rejection and hatred of the Judeo-Christian view that man is created in the image of God, not in an anthropomorphic sense, but in that man, and man alone, is endowed by his Maker with human creativity. As with the cabalist Freud, Tavistock rejects the notion of human creativity, attempting to prove that it derives solely from sublimated erotic or neurotic impulses. For example, the Tavistock-trained

Julian Huxley, then heading the UN Economic, Social and Cultural Organization (Unesco), in devising programs to assist the selection of leadership cadre within the colonial sector, for special training. The UN bureaucracy itself was similarly infested with Tavistock-type group training programs to indoctrinate and control whatever cadre were sent through its mind mills. (Fred Wills described the UN bureaucracy as “the world’s longest, continuously run, brainwashing program” for developing sector leaders. Those who entered it, if they indeed ever came out, had lost all touch with reality.) At the same time, Unesco set up educational and cultural programs in the colonial sector, which quickly became mechanisms for Tavistock-designed brainwashing.

When these methods of control failed, as they often did, the British Crown turned to the same Tavistock psychological warriors to devise methods for creating controlled terrorist “movements.” Tavistock operatives assisted army units in the creation of what were called “gangs” and “countergangs” in the colonial sector. The technique was laboratory-tested by Brig. Gen. Frank Kitson in the 1950s in Kenya, where brainwashing and torture were used on prisoners in British POW camps to create phony, British intelligence-controlled units of the Mau Mau insurgency. Legitimate national liberation movements, fighting to win freedom from the British yoke, were penetrated and broken, their leaders killed, ostensibly by “rival” factions.

In 1970, Kitson was sent to Northern Ireland, where he—not the Irish Republican Army—launched an urban murder and bombing spree that triggered a quarter century of violence and psychological terror.

Following Rees’s departure from Tavistock, the man who ultimately took charge of the network was a Rees protégé, Eric Trist. Trist’s primary assignment was to expand Tavistock’s operations in the United States. But first, he launched a major Tavistock’s project: management training. In “Tavis-talk”: “Operational Research.” With the approval of the highest circles of the British elite, Tavistock’s brainwashers were contracted by the Empire’s corporate entities to “restructure” their management and workforces from within. One section of this was targeted at breaking the power of trade unions, by inducing them to become part of management teams (co-participation); but by far the largest component of these operations placed management itself through group-profiling and therapy-like sessions to force higher “productivity.” Among the corporations put through this brainwashing were Shell, Unilever, the British government-run coal industry, and several major financial institutions. Today, most major corporations have staff psychologists, or contracts with them, while corporate meetings are often run by a group leader, called a “facilitator,” hired for the task.

---

psychopath R.D. Laing claims that there is no distinction between the creative act and insanity, purporting to “prove” that the most creative individuals generally reside in mental institutions.

## Post-industrialism as neo-colonialism

Writing in a 1990 Tavistock anthology titled *The Social Engagement of Social Science*, Trist laid out Tavistock’s current mission statement: “All nodes express the philosophy of the social engagement of social science. The engagement is with meta-problems that are generic and field-determined rather than with issue-specific single problems.” Translated from Tavistockian psychobabble into English, Trist is stating that Tavistock does not merely study a large social problem, but intervenes (“social engagement”) to bring about a desired result. He continues: “The work is future oriented and concerned with the transition to the post-industrial social order and the paradigm shift which this entails.”<sup>4</sup>

Tavistock’s work in this area dates back to the 1950s when it conducted studies on the impact of “cybernetics” on the workforce of industrial countries, and on the emergence of the “service-oriented economy.” In the 1960s, Tavistock operatives conducted studies on the effects of the Kennedy space program on Americans, and found that they were contributing to inhibiting the post-industrial shift; British-controlled policy interests moved to shut down the space program.

During the 1960s, Tavistock produced a series of reports and papers, spelling out how to effect the “post-industrial shift.” The seminal work was done by Trist himself, who was at the time based in the United States, and his protégé, Fred Emery, working out of Tavistock and Australia. Their work is summarized in a 1973 volume, *Towards a Social Ecology—Contextual Appreciation of the Future in the Present*.

The “problem” confronted by Trist and Emery, on behalf of their imperial masters, was as follows. For the last 100 years, the world had been governed by the “industrial paradigm,” in which people saw that application of new technologies has produced a better life for increasing numbers, over successive generations. Now, however, we have the emergence from backwardness of the former colonial world; the emerging nations, if they are assimilated into this industrial paradigm, will desire the same route to progress and a better life. Industrial progress, thus, explicitly threatens the power of the British oligarchy, creating the basis for the establishment of nation-states that oppose continued oligarchical rule.

---

4. The Tavistock brainwashers use the term “paradigm” to describe a set of beliefs and institutional structures that govern a given social or historical period. It is arbitrarily applied and not precise in the delineation of such periods. Thus, the “post-industrial paradigm” overlaps the “New Age paradigm” and both co-exist at the boundary of the old “industrial paradigm.” When discussing the “shift” from one paradigm to another, Tavistock’s writings tend toward Hegelian metaphysics. Left out deliberately, is the role that Tavistock and its sponsors play in bringing about these attempted “shifts,” including the test-tube creation of mass popular movements. For example, Tavistock played a crucial role in fomenting and designing the rock-drug-sex counterculture of the 1960s. Similarly, their methods were used in the recruitment of members of the “New Left” from that period. These elements were crucial to their so-called New Age and post-industrial paradigms.

## Tavistock Center's 'international nodes'

The Tavistock Center, which is comprised of the Tavistock Clinic and the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, has five sub-units in London, the Human Resources Center, the Center for Applied Social Research, the School of Family Psychiatry and Community Health, the Institute for Marital Studies, and the Institute for Operational Research. The following list of the center's "international nodes" is drawn from Eric Trist and Hugh Murray, eds., *The Social Engagement of Social Science: A Tavistock Anthology* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990). The names given are "initiating individuals." The commentary is *EIR*'s.

### United Kingdom

Scottish Institute of Human Relations: Jock Sutherland; created in the 1960s by Sutherland, a former director of the Tavistock Clinic.

Center for Family and Environmental Research: Robert and Rhona Rapoport; Robert Rapoport had been involved in the Tavistock study that led to the dismantling of the U.S. space program.

Department of Continuing Management Education, Loughborough University: Garth Higgin; promotes sensitivity training among management elites.

Foundation for Adaptation in Changing Environments: Tony Ambrose, Harold Bridger; promotes the "post-industrial" paradigm shift; it is now based in Geneva because of its close affiliation with the UN's World Health Organization.

Organization for Promoting Understanding in Society (OPUS): Eric Miller; established by Sir Charles Goodeve, the dean of British "Operational Research" and a Tavistock board member.

### Europe

Work Research Institute, Oslo, Norway: Einar Thorsrud, Eric Trist, Fred Emery; works worldwide, including through UN programs, on control of technology and socio-ecological brainwashing.

School of Business Administration, Erasmus Univer-

sity, the Netherlands: Hans van Beinum; funded by the Dutch monarchy to push malthusianism.

Institute for Transitional Dynamics, Lucerne, Switzerland: Harold Bridger; specializes in "organizational transitions."

### Australia

Center for Continuing Education, Australian National University: Fred and Marilyn Emery; responsible for much of Tavistock's work in Asia.

### Canada

Action Learning Group, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, Toronto: Eric Trist; coordinates much of Tavistock's work in the developing sector, as well as serving as the Canadian Tavistock.

Quality of Working Life Center, Ontario: Hans van Beinum; specializes in employee-worker relations.

### India

BM Institute, Ahmedabad: Jock Sutherland; Kamalini Sarabhai; a center for child and family psychiatry.

National Labor Institute and Punjab Institute for Public Administration: Nitish De, Fred Emery; pushes the control of technology and ecological concerns; maintains strong ties with the Australian node.

### United States

Wright Institute, Berkeley, California: Eric Trist; Nevitt Sanford; Sanford was one of the principal authors of Tavistock's "Authoritarian Personality" project; the institute functions as "the U.S. Tavistock, West), training psychiatrists.

A.K. Rice Institute: Margaret Rioch, A.K. Rice; specializes in the application of group dynamics brainwashing to community situations; based in Washington, D.C., it has dozens of U.S. chapters.

Center for the Quality of Working Life, UCLA: Louis Davis, Eric Trist; coordinating point for profiling the U.S. population, and mass brainwashing to promote the post-industrial paradigm shift.

Department of Social Systems Sciences, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania: Eric Trist, Russell Ackoff; the "U.S. Tavistock, East," and for years, Trist's main base of operations.

Trist and Emery came up with the following answer: If a post-industrial paradigm is imposed on the advanced sector, then it will also define the limits of growth for the "developing sector." Since such nations as those in Africa are several decades from being assimilated into the post-industrial paradise,

there will be a mixed system of post-industrial advanced countries and semi-industrial and mineral-extractive lands in the "developing sector," they indicate. This imbalance defines the basis for continued exploitation and control of these areas by the British-dominated world oligarchy.

The question is then posed: How to get society to make what are called in the Tavistock circles “Reesian,” or “critical” choices, in which all of the possible choices are “bad” and lead to a degraded condition? Tavistock had clinically proven that an individual will make such choices when placed under extreme stress, and, most importantly, will fail to see the rejection of the parameters of the choice itself as an option. Emery and Trist reported that if society were put through extreme stress—what they termed *social turbulence*—the appropriate degenerated and psychotic mental states could be induced in the mass of western population to make a “choice” for a post-industrial future.

The Tavistock brainwashers spoke of a period of successive social, economic, political, and cultural shocks beginning in the 1960s, that would create a vortex-like push of mental states to successively more degenerate levels of defensive adaptation. All of these *maladaptive* responses, as they call them, are present in the society at the same time, interacting with each other, to produce neurotic behaviors on a grand scale. To a world put through terror and stress, a post-industrial future looks bright, they offer. The role of the Tavistock shock troops, say Trist and Emery, is to “assist the weary” and to bring them over the threshold into the new post-industrial age.

### Drug-rock-sex counterculture

Thus, it should come as no surprise, that the British Empire, working largely through Tavistock, was the driving force behind launching the drug-rock-sex counterculture. Tavistock “shock troops,” such as Dr. William Sargant and Dr. Ewin Cameron, were brought in to lead the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency’s 1950s and 1960s secret experiments with psychotropic drugs and mind control, known as MK-Ultra.

Tavistock fellow-traveler Aldous Huxley, the guru of the 1960s New Age movement, was living in Hollywood, working in the motion picture industry, and cranking out such works as *Brave New World*, which, decades before the first doses of LSD-25 hit the streets, already advocated societal drugging as the ultimate form of social control.

Huxley was even more explicit about his and Tavistock’s agenda, in a 1961 lecture at the California Medical School in San Francisco, sponsored by the U.S. State Department’s Voice of America. Huxley told the crowd of doctors, psychiatrists, and government bureaucrats: “There will be in the next generation or so a pharmacological method of making people love their servitude and producing dictatorship without tears, so to speak. Producing a kind of painless concentration camp for entire societies so that people will in fact have their liberties taken away from them but will rather enjoy it, because they will be distracted from any desire to rebel—by propaganda, or brainwashing, or brainwashing enhanced by pharmacological methods. And this seems to be the final revolution.”

Tavistock oversaw the mass drugging of America’s col-

lege students in the late-1960s, helped launch “gangs and countergangs” which the zombified youth joined. Meanwhile, Tavistock’s in-place network of institutes and clinics, such as Esalen in California, put hundreds of thousands of youths and others through brainwashing “sensitivity sessions,” as Tavistock-created and -trained gurus such as Timothy Leary, helped lead the drug-infested masses into “the New Age.” In 1967, Tavistock even sponsored a summer-long brainwashing session in London, dubbed “Conference on the Dialectics of Liberation.” American radicals Angela Davis and Stokely Carmichael were among the participant-victims in this session. A generation, once slated to lead the United States and the world into an era of unprecedented progress and prosperity, was thus transformed into a collection of doped-up zombies, “change agents,” and shock-troops for Tavistock’s Brave New World.

### The new order: stateless world fascism

In 1991, Tavistock devoted significant space in its journal *Human Relations* to the publication of results of a multi-year project on world governance and social change, that had been initiated by Trist in the 1980s and involved participants from many Tavistock nodes and its international network.

The results of the study must be viewed as a policy recommendation to the imperial elite whom Tavistock serves. Its results can be summarized as follows. The collapse of the Soviet Union as a superpower created new possibilities for world governance and for the full entrance of the world into the post-industrial era. The greatest impediment to that change was the continued existence of the nation-state. As long as the Soviet Union existed, the continuance of the nation-based world system, in some form, was necessary to maintain a balance of power. It were now finally possible to look beyond that form, to a new system of world relations. That system, as described in the introductory paper for the series by David Cooperrider and William Pasmore, the study coordinators from Case Western Reserve University, is based on “the current *transnationalization of world affairs* whereby international relations of the nation-state system have been superseded or supplanted by *non-territorial* relations among private individuals, groups, and organizations.”

What is described, and proposed, is the reformation of the United Nations along lines already well in progress, to turn over all operations and key relations to an international network of hundreds of thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other groups, of varying size, shape, and form. As the study reveals, virtually every one of these groups either traces its origin to the Tavistock network’s operatives, or is influenced by such operatives. Nearly all such key groups have funding connections to either the British oligarchy and its American spores; in many cases, they have direct connections to the House of Lords, and its members (see p. 29).

The nation-state, says Tavistock, made the industrial age possible. Remove it, and the industrial age will die, replaced

by what is called the “axial age,” to be defined by “informal relations,” with the main medium of communication between peoples and groups, being through computer interface. Such interface, now more commonly known as the “Internet,” can link these disparate groups, which Tavistock calls “global social change organizations,” and vastly enhance their activities and ease of deployment.

There will be resistance to such ideas, say the rapporteurs, coming from the entrenched bureaucracies of the industrial age and the transitional period. For example, the huge multinational corporations which had helped usher in this “globalization” process, must eventually give way to new forms of organization, based on more informal structures; the corporate form, they say, is a relic of the industrial age. Government must become based more on smaller planning groups, in local communities, tied together by telecommunications. Even the UN, with its cumbersome bureaucracy, must serve more as a forum for such local groups, and less as a service to national governments. As for questions of sovereignty, they are soon to become even more meaningless, since the telecommunications Internet can pass through any defense, any border.

The transition to this new world will not be easy or without suffering, Tavistock indicates. It expects an economic cataclysm, as the old system crashes down. But, not to worry: The Reesian shock troops will be there to ease the pain and help us into this Brave New World of universal fascism.

The typical member of one of these NGOs described in these reports is a zealot, not so unlike a member of a cult or Nazi Party official. But, one also notices a sickly smile across their faces, even as they are in heated argument. That smile, it has been noted, is the same seen on the victims of Tavistock’s brainwashers in their various mind-destroying “experiments.” The “Tavistock Grin,” as it became known, is the true face of the new world order.

## The invisible empire of NGOs

by Joseph Brewda

One of the weapons that the British Empire has deployed against the nation-state in recent years is the “NGOs,” the non-governmental organizations. Under the cover of defending “human rights” and the “environment,” or organizing “humanitarian relief,” NGOs are routinely used to target states for discreditation, subversion, civil war, democratic coups, and revolution. The Commonwealth Foundation of Britain, which coined the term in the 1960s, defines NGOs as “voluntary, independent, not-for-profit organizations,” seeking to “improve the circumstances and prospects of disadvantaged

people” and “to act on concerns and issues which are detrimental to society as a whole.” The foundation was created in 1966 to help manage the nominal transition from the Empire to the Commonwealth.

According to the foundation, the NGOs are a new phenomenon; however, the network is quite ancient, and spans everything from the privately owned foundations of Britain’s ruling families, to their single-issue conduits, with which the term is usually associated. This network, which elevates and topples politicians, manipulates public opinion, spawns new religious movements, plots revolutions, and assassinates heads of state, is in many respects as powerful as government bodies whose power flows from the Crown. There are now over 500,000 NGOs in Britain alone, according to the foundation, with an annual turnover of \$30 billion. Of these, a hard core of several hundred, run by the ruling families, guides the whole herd.

### House of Lords wage war and insurrection

The House of Lords, which is a meeting ground used by the families to announce previously agreed-upon policies and to define targets, has a special role in coordinating this army. Media propaganda campaigns and clandestine operations, are often decided here, and then assigned to subordinate agencies in government and to NGOs.

Some of the more important of these NGOs are led by members of the House of Lords directly. Lord Judd (Frank Judd), the former foreign secretary, for example, runs Oxfam (Oxford Famine), the arms-running famine relief agency. Similarly, the recently deceased Lord Ennals (David Ennals), also a former foreign secretary, ran Amnesty International, the terrorist support network and propaganda arm, as a family proprietary. Baroness Chalker of Wallasey (Lynda Chalker), the Minister of Overseas Development Administration (the new name for the old Colonial Office), meanwhile, directs all foreign grant-making by the British government, including to the NGOs.

The activities of Viscount Cranborne, Lord Avebury, and Baroness Cox of Queensbury, typify the way in which the families use NGOs to run international terrorism, and related measures, to destroy nation-states.

### NGO puppet-masters

**Viscount Cranborne** (Robert Cecil): Lord Privy Seal (chief of the Queen’s Privy Council) and Leader of the House of Lords. Viscount Cranborne operates at the highest rank of the British nobility; his family, the Cecils, is one of Britain’s oldest and most powerful oligarchical families. His great-grandfather, the Third Marquess of Salisbury, was the prime minister at the turn of the century, who played a key role in setting up World War I; his grandfather, was a World War II Colonial Secretary.

Viscount Cranborne was a primary organizer and overseer of the first phase of the Afghanistan war (1979-88), dur-