

conspiracy has induced a marked psychological deterioration among the top agents since Glassboro.

The mere presence of one Labor Party organizer at this week's terrorism conference was enough to set off public and private psychotic episodes by a number of the less-stable operatives, while others were observed intently pouring over every piece of USLP literature they could lay their hands on.

By the last day, the general psychological atmosphere resembled a men's room in a gay bar — a result of the fact that an attempted cover up of the Institute's nuclear terrorist operations had become a major unstated purpose of the conference. Under pressure of the USLP exposé, in fact, agent Nicholas Kittrie of the American University Law School was forced to concede the essential correctness of Labor Party charges that the CIA controls most terrorist groups, solely to cover up the actual role of the Institute itself! Kittrie, who sports red-tinted hair, ornate jewelry, and high-heeled cowboy boots, said he had "personal knowledge" that the Institute wasn't what the USLP said it was because he was "intimate" with many Institute members, including Institute Director Marcus Raskin.

#### **Gonadal Approach**

The political demoralization of conference participants was so rapid and so intense that for the bulk of the proceedings, it was difficult to tell whether politics or pornography was being discussed. One participant, Edward Glick, a Temple University counterinsurgent, got up to complain that he was suffering from male menopause, and to plead with the audience, "I hope you all still love me."

### Javits at Terror Conference

## "My Hands Are Dripping with Blood"

*NEW YORK, June 19 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts for the keynote address delivered here by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY) on June 9 to the "Conference on International Terrorism" sponsored by the Ralph Bunche Institute. Sen. Javits' remarks were entitled "International Terrorism: Challenges and Responses."*

I have been concerned and connected with terrorism for some time. . . The problem we face is a very subtle one. . . The reason for the critical danger now is that terrorists can get their hands on much more lethal weapons. The day is not far off when terrorists will get their hands on nuclear weapons which can be used as blackmail. . . .

The kind of punishment meted out today to terrorists is much too mild. Terrorism seems to pay off. It is very urgent that international action against terrorism be taken. Countries which harbor or otherwise aid terrorists must be the targets of international sanctions, such as cutting off all communication and transportation between them and the rest of the world. Very lethal measures are needed, especially against such irresponsible nations as Libya. . . .

The Third World nations believe that terrorism is an indispensable weapon in achieving national liberation. This is a cynical proposition, but many Third World countries feel it's all right to be cynical. But I'm confident that the Third World will compromise if terrorism reaches the point of using nuclear weapons, as I'm sure it will. This is inevitable. However, if it requires an air drop to get at terrorists taking refuge in Lybia, then there will be an air drop, and Libya will go down the drain.

If terrorism is on the rise, as I foresee, then independence

Bernard Johnpoll of the State University of New York at Albany suggested in his presentation that a "gonadal approach" to terrorism be taken. Johnpoll demonstrated his own gonadal approach under questioning by a Labor Party organizer. Brandishing a cigar, Johnpoll nearly leaped off the stage, screaming, "You have disrupted my classes in Albany, you disrupted Glassboro, you are ruining this conference. I want you locked up in a mental institution. I can't stand to hear any more about what you are saying. We are all polymorphous perverts here. Shut the hell up!" Johnpoll later admitted he'd played a major role in breaking the 1937 Flint sit-down strike on behalf of the UAW.

#### **World War III by Terrorism**

Through this gaggle of self-professed perverts Rockefeller is now moving to implement his conference marching orders for immediate war in the Mideast, "ethnic" terrorist subversion of Arab governments and the Soviet Union, and nuclear terrorist blackmail coupled with direct military attack against nations now leading the Third World fight for a new world economic order. Until the Institute for Policy Studies and its allied international agencies are thoroughly dismantled, the minute-to-minute danger that this scenario will trigger global thermonuclear war remains. In this chilling vein, American Security Council alcoholic Eugene Methvin reminded participants at the final conference seminar session that, "World War I was started by a terrorist assassin: World War II was started with a terrorist incident, and nothing makes me think the situation is any different today."

and liberty will be compromised. It's worth Spartan living to preserve morality in the world. This whole question comes down to very big issues of a material nature.

This conference should decide how to coerce Third World countries to agree to joint action against terrorism.

I realize every word I'm saying is dripping with blood.

### Exclusive Interview

## Nicholas Kittrie: A Nuclear War Plotter Predicts Rise in Terrorism

*NEW YORK, June 18 (NSIPS) — The following interview with Nicholas Kittrie, a professor of Comparative Law at American University in Washington, D.C. was released to NSIPS by a New York-based reporter. Kittrie was a participant in the Conference on International Terrorism here from June 9 — 11 sponsored by the Ralph Bunche Institute on the United Nations and the State University College at Oneonta. An "intimate" of Institute for Policy Studies head Marcus Raskin, Kittrie characterized the Conference on the second day as "shaping up really well... We're finally getting down to the real nitty-gritty" of terrorist activation and police state implementation.*

**Reporter:** How did you get involved in studying terrorism?  
**Kittrie:** I view terrorism as an incidental question to the broader area of political crime. I started in the field in the late 1960s, following my experience in the anti-war

resistance, which brought up the question in my mind that, if you are part of a state and you're convinced that the leadership is wrong, and injustices are being committed, what right do you have to resist? To what extent is it permissible to use extra-legal means to achieve your human rights. Terrorism escalates that question. I got a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to study the question of whether, if someone's motivation is altruistic, the law should be softened or ignored if he commits a crime. I did this study at the University of London.

**Reporter:** How would you define terrorism?

**Kittrie:** I'm drafting an article for the *British Yearbook on International Affairs* which demonstrates that in terms of deaths caused, terrorism really accounts for very few. The real horror of terrorism is that it denies the concept of innocence. Nobody is considered innocent in the eyes of a terrorist; thus nobody is safe from terrorist attack. It's the randomness that is so horrible. The denial of innocence threatens us in a psychological way. However, it is possible that within the next decade, terrorists could likely harm many more people. I definitely foresee a rise in terrorism over the next decade; I agree with Uri Ra'annan (professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University—Ed.) that the growth of alienation in the world breeds a need for ethnic identification, and that ethnic terrorism will grow rapidly. However, I don't share some people's feeling that terrorists will obtain a nuclear bomb, though I do anticipate that they will use more sophisticated technology.

**Reporter:** How about the causes of terrorism?

**Kittrie:** Well, aside from what I mentioned above, all the civilized nations in the world have endorsed human rights. We find ourselves in the position of proclaiming these things, and now we'll have to deliver. If we had a pluralistic society globally, then there would be generally less terrorism. Terrorism is a response to realities — to the deprivation of one's human rights. To the extent that the advanced sector — especially countries like Chile — decide to accord these basic rights, then there will be less need for terrorist violence to acquire them. The Soviets have given in to Western pressure on the question of Soviet Jews.

**Reporter:** Did you agree with the thrust of Senator Javits' (R-NY) comments (in the keynote address) that it might be necessary to invade a country that was harboring terrorists?

**Kittrie:** I think there are other approaches you can use. For instance, improved intelligence systems for monitoring terrorist groups. Interpol is coordinating an international monitoring and tracking system for terrorists. Or an effective means of sanctions. You have to be careful, because the terrorist is usually anxious to become a martyr. We need to develop an international legal approach to curbing specific terrorist acts... Well, maybe the U.S. would do what Javits suggested....

**Reporter:** Do you agree with some of the speakers at the Conference who have accused the Soviet Union and its allies, such as Libya, of controlling most terrorism?

**Kittrie:** No. All governments have been supporting these organizations... although I agree that Libya would support anybody.

**Reporter:** What do you think of the U.S. Labor Party's charge that the CIA runs all terrorist groups?

**Kittrie:** Well, I looked at the pamphlet ("The Institute for Policy Studies Exposed...") they are selling very closely. I would have paid the \$10 if I thought it was worth it, but I found it much too general and undocumented. Of course, it is probably and likely that the U.S. has supported terrorist

groups. I'm sure if we don't like a particular regime, that we would back a terrorist attack or assassination attempt against it. Take (Ugandan President) Idi Amin. He's a dictator (and more recently the target of an attempted assassination—Ed). Just imagine if on your tax return you were asked if you would allow some of your tax money to fund an attempt to overthrow Amin, don't you think that the majority of the American population would say yes? But, I think that what the U.S. Labor Party says about the Institute for Policy Studies is a little far-fetched. You know, that is something of a left-wing think-tank in Washington, and I am intimate with many of the people there, including Marcus Raskin. I can assure you they are not what the Labor Party says they are.

**Reporter:** Could you elaborate on your view as to why terrorism is on the rise?

**Kittrie:** I'm predicting a rise in terrorism on the basis that most countries in the world are not pluralistic. Also, there is a re-evaluation of nationalism going on. There has been much terrorism in the history of the U.S. It has only been through terrorism that minorities have gained their rights. It was only during the New Deal in the 1930s that the U.S. allowed a number of major groups to be absorbed into the power structure without major violence. Since the U.S. is the most pluralistic country in the world, there is much less likelihood that national terrorism will occur here, except perhaps for blacks and Puerto Ricans. We need to look at the potential of these marginal groups for terrorism. The Justice Department's Task Force on Civil Disorders and Terrorism is doing a study on terrorism, but, unfortunately, they've failed to identify potential terrorist-bearing groups in the U.S.

Let me make one more important point. In attempting to curb terrorism, we should be careful not to eliminate the safeguards for political offenders. You would not condemn a Jew if he tried to kill the Nazi who was putting him into a gas chamber. In deciding what is terrorism, we have to consider the nature of the regime, the particular target, and the proportionality of the terrorists' act to the abuses of the regime. In evaluating who is a terrorist, we have to assess it on a case-by-case basis. The League of Nation's contention that every government is holy was silly — is the whole world to perish to honor the sanctity of an abusive regime?

### Exclusive Interview

## "World War III Will Start with a Terrorist Attack": Editor of Readers Digest

*NEW YORK, June 19 (NSIPS) — The following interview with Readers Digest Senior Editor Eugene Methvin was conducted last week during a "Conference on International Terrorism" held here June 9—11 under the sponsorship of the Ralph Bunche Institute on the United Nations of the City University of New York. NSIPS obtained a copy of the interview from an investigative journalist who attended the conference.*

**Question:** Do you agree with the other participants at the conference that terrorism is on the rise?

**Methvin:** Definitely. I feel certain that terrorism is rapidly increasing and that nuclear terrorism is a real possibility... You know, don't you that both World War I and II