

NEW SOLIDARITY INTERNATIONAL PRESS SERVICE



The International Terrorism Report

Atlanticists Set For New Terrorist Drive, Agree On Tactics

By Michele Steinberg

July 25 (NSIPS) — The July 21 assassination of newly appointed British Minister Christopher Ewart-Biggs when his car drove over a land mine in Dublin, Ireland, has been described by one informed political observer as a replay of the internal factional battle within Atlanticist political circles which led to the murder of Athens CIA station chief Richard Welsh last December. Another U.S. terrorism expert on the Irish Republican Army commented in a July 23 interview, "You know, historically British officials have been known to slay other British officials just prior to a political move...tighten security or whatever."

The Ewart-Biggs murder is the latest move in the ongoing Atlanticist-directed terrorist offensive which gained international momentum following the spectacular Israeli violation of national sovereignty at Entebbe Airport, July 3. But while unanimously agreed on employing the Rand Corporation defined "surrogate warfare" terrorist scenario, top Atlanticist circles are split over a traditionalist "no-concessions" approach and a utopian "flexible response" counter-terror deployment. With strong Soviet and pro-development Third World moves to shift the international strategic situation away from Wall Street-demanded genocide in the Mid-East and Africa, the major battleground for this internecine Atlanticist fight for control of counter-terror policies is the U.S. State Department.

Terror Set To Go

Over the last week, leading Rockefeller think-tanks, like the Rand Corporation, have blasted the no-concessions policy implemented by then-President Nixon following the 1972 Black September massacre at the Munich Olympics. The fight was opened up in the pages of the New York Times, July 18, in an article conduited through the Fabian Progressive magazine blasting the impotence of present State Department policy on Terrorism. One top intelligence official stated that the material in the article was classified — leaked by someone opposing the present policy.

At the same time, top Atlanticist press mouthpieces revved up a Goebbels-style war propaganda barrage of terrorist scenarios intended to build up maximum expectation for further bloody

terrorist murders by Interpol-Institute for Policy Studies terrorist gangs.

One day following the Ewart-Biggs assassination, the New York Times featured a warning entitled "Terrorist Techniques Improve: So Do Effects To Block Them." Naming as the major threat the Baader-Meinhof gang, the Japanese Red Army and the "Carlos" network, all documented as Institute-controlled creations, the Times lied that there is massive international terrorist cooperation provided through Libya, Syria, South Yemen, and the PLO and it is slated to escalate. Again, the Times warned, one of the major problems is that Western countries **lack the will** to move against political terrorists.

The same day, the West German daily Die Welt published an exclusive interview with "Pierre," now in Montreal, and allegedly the most wanted FLQ terrorist in Canada. Emphasizing that his band of terrorists could strike at any moment, the illusive Pierre told Die Welt, "We **think** it would be psychologically stupid to strike at this time."

Within hours of this Atlanticist signal, every paper in the U.S. heralded an Interpol-headed Royal Canadian Mounted Police manhunt in Montreal for the "secretary general" of the never-before heard of Arab Liberation Front, who had "slipped into Montreal with an Iraqi diplomatic passport." The tip of this massive mobilization came from the London Daily Telegraph via an unnamed "Middle East source." With last week's bloody terrorist predictions, the Montreal Olympics remains a likely target for an international terrorist incident. But, as "Pierre" noted, the whole question is psychological.

One...Two...Many Entebbes

Top military and intelligence sources pushing the "flexible response" doctrine reached this week warned that the traditionalists must be swept from their positions of control if these utopian criminals are to glean any results from the deployment of their own terrorists. "The policy is too rigid, doesn't work," one source complained, "Terrorism is psychological warfare aimed not at the victims, but the population watching the terrorism. We lost those diplomats in Syria before we could make a move."

The factional odds and contradictions in setting off numerous Sarajevo terrorist incidents that could blossom into war has produced major fissures in the intended Atlanticist total psywar effort. On July 22, there was widespread hysteria in top NATO and Social Democratic Party circles in West Germany when a Munich daily paper blew the story that the U.S., West Germany and Israel were running guns to the fascist Lebanese Falange to continue the Palestinian genocide. On July 23, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer published a scathing editorial condemnation of the Entebbe raid as a parallel to Hitler and Mussolini ignoring limited national sovereignty. The same day, major U.S. press — Time Magazine, the Associated Press, and the Boston Globe — attended a U.S. Labor Party press conference in Boston, Mass., which exposed how and why the Institute for Policy Studies creates Symbionese Liberation Army-type domestic terrorist gangs.

Brian Jenkins, author of the Rand Corporation "surrogate warfare" doctrine explained: "Entebbe removed the aura of vulnerability that terrorists have over governments and populations." "If the operation seems to be competent, that is what becomes most important. Flexibility means to be creative and innovative with as many as two dozen options available... (then) we might be able to do what the Israelis are able to do."

This continual process, cited by Jenkins, is precisely the issue in the international Atlanticist feud, centered for now at the State Department. Time and flexibility, these Kissinger madmen think, are key to manipulating the observer population into ecstasy over counter-terror military operations.

NSIPS Exclusive Interviews

Terrorism "Expert" Bell: Anything, Anyone Can Be A Terrorist Target

July 24 (NSIPS) — What follows are excerpts from a July 16 interview on international terrorism with J. Bowyer Bell, director of the Institute for War and Peace at Columbia University. Bell was a featured speaker at the early April Glassboro, N.J. conference on International Terrorism, which has been exposed by NSIPS as having planned the so-called terrorist offensive of the last several months, including the aborted July 4th scenario. The conference also was a forum for the release of various scenarios on "nuclear terrorism" which have since appeared in the Western press. Bell's comments were made available by an independent journalist.

Q: How do you conceive of the international terrorist conspiracy?

Bell: The closest thing you are going to get to the international conspiracy is described in today's Times. (That day's Times, contained a major psywar article on "Libyan terrorism." — ed.) Libya provides the passports, diplomatic cover, etc., for these groups.

Q: What about the Soviets?

Bell: I was just going to mention that. I know this will disappoint the John Birch Society, but the Soviet Union is very conservative on the question of terrorism. After all, they're as vulnerable as anyone else. As an example, they are not supporting Ethiopia's Eritrean rebels. Here, the Libyans and others are supporting, training and funding that movement while the Soviets are seeking to strengthen their ties to the official Ethiopian government.

Q: Don't the Soviets have an impact on Arab terrorism through their ties with the Arab bloc?

Bell: There is no such thing as an Arab bloc. That is a contradiction in terms.

Q: West German Federal Justice Minister Hans-Jochem Vogel

held a press conference this week where he predicted "spectacular murders" as the next escalation in terrorist activities. What do you call a "spectacular murder"?

Bell: I have never met a terrorist. They are all patriots, freedom fighters, revolutionaries who believe in a transnational imperialist system. Since a terrorist action is so strategically weak, they hit where they can at a range of targets: airplanes, hotels. They can't take on their enemy, so maybe New York or London will be the target. That would be a "spectacular murder."

Q: Would terrorists go after innocent populations like that?

Bell: There is really no such thing as an innocent population when you say terrorism. In World War II we bombed cities, workers and their families in West Germany, because it was more effective than bombing defense plants. The machine-gunning of 200 civilians at an airport by terrorists is a dirty, nasty affair, but no more dirty than many more people being killed in one day in a war in Beirut.

Q: The West German government has enacted special laws against what they consider to be "disruptive forces." Do you think that this is an exaggerated response to the terrorist threat.

Bell: Exaggerated? I am saying that countries are approaching terrorism with glee and joy as the opportunity to extend their powers. Don't you think every government you have ever seen will take any opportunity to extend its powers?

RAND's Jenkins: "We Need No Rules To Get Those Bastards"

July 24 (NSIPS) — The following interview with the RAND Corporation's terrorist "specialist" Brian Jenkins was obtained through a pre-arranged set of questions asked by another journalist. Jenkins, who is regarded as one the leading experts in his field, regularly works on classified intelligence documents for the State Department concerning questions about U.S. policy on terrorism. In one of his most recent interviews with "progressive" magazine, published in last week's New York Times magazine section, was actually a "leaked" classified State Department document (Progressive magazine is an original Fabian publication based in Madison, Wisc. and is directly tied into terrorist networks of the Institute for Policy Studies). Jenkins told the reporter who submitted the questions for this news service that he had nothing to do with the leak, and could not comment upon the content of the report because of its classified nature. Clearly, the "leaker" of the document could be none other than Secretary of State Henry Kissinger or others immediately around Kissinger whose "Cabinet" Committee to Combat Terrorism" is in charge of "staying on top of" all terrorist incidents. Jenkins, is one of the many "Kissinger Young Turk" types who seek to take over the direction of US policy and turn the RAND computer method of psychological warfare into the means to start a war with the Soviet Union.

Question: ... in reference to the NY Times article, would you care to comment on whether there is a factional debate between the Ford Administration's present policy and what critics of that policy would prefer.

Brian Jenkins: First, let me say that I cannot comment on the content of the material in the article because that material is presently classified.

Question: Well, then who leaked the document?

BJ: I will say that there is quite a heated debate within the State Department and it was probably leaked by critics of the present policy.

Question: It seems that the present situation with terrorism has prompted many governments to move to handling terrorism on

a military level. Would you say that West Germany and Israel are in the forefront of that activity.

BJ: Before answering the question, let me add that I am putting out a new revised edition of this problem in "Trends and Potentialities of International Terrorism," where I have previously outlined and predicted that direct military action — both covert and overt — would become the wave of future responses to terrorism. The Israeli's have the 39th Brigade (Israeli Army Commando unit — ed.) as their key unit which had previously been used in a 1968 Beirut response and retaliation to a hijacking. However, in terms of West Germany, no single country is actually in the forefront of combatting terrorism. France, under Interior Minister Poniatoski, has responded when terrorism hit France at the Orly Airport (Paris, referring to previous incident — ed.). No one country will suffice (in combatting terrorism). It will take a continual process of making the necessary changes required... no one incident in itself will do because after every major terrorist action there is a great deal of strong sounding words but never any real significant change.

Question: What is the U.S. policy concerning the developments of these military commando units?

BJ: Well, that's getting into the area that is classified. After all, we have Special Forces units (U.S. Army) of which I am proud to say I was a member and spent 3 years in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic... I've paid my dues... However, let's summarize what the actual effectiveness of the Mayaguez action is (the retaking of a U.S. ship captured by the Cambodians in 1975 — ed.). To be frank, it was almost comical. A total failure... the wrong ship was landed upon... We bombed Cambodia for no real reason... It was rather bad. The same for the commando operation into North Vietnam (during the Vietnam war — ed.) — an action supposedly carried out to free U.S. POWs. So far as the U.S. record is concerned, we've failed.

Question: Where would you say the failure of policy is located? In the present policy stance alone and-or with the resistance from military "traditionalists" who reject these commando concepts of warfare?

BJ: Again, that question gets us into that sensitive area. Let me say that in those operations that I outlined, there was a total lack of precision in tactics which resulted not only in a total failure of the operation militarily, but more importantly their psychological failure. The psychological effect (of these operations — ed.) was disastrous. Any special commando operation must prove to be militarily and psychologically effective. Otherwise the world looks at you in a rather bad light.

Question: Would you then say if the U.S. had more options opened in terms of a flexible policy (in responding to terrorists — ed.) than is publicly stated, then the non-negotiating approach might provide for a better performance? In other words, do you consider the psychological after effects of such a strategy to be most important?

BJ: Exactly. It's not only a question of having an operation pay off, but equally important pay back for future actions. Look at the Israeli raid on Entebbe. Right now, it is beyond the U.S.'s response capability. Entebbe removed the aura of vulnerability that terrorists have over governments and populations. If the operation seems to be competent, that is what becomes most important. Flexibility means to be creative and innovative with as many as two dozen options available. Look, if I told you that you can't do something every two minutes, pretty soon all you think about is what you can't do, not what overall possibility there is for any actions. We must have this flexibility for creative and innovative responses. This way, we don't have to tell anyone in advance what our policy is, just that it is open and flexible. In Sudan in 1973, our two diplomats were essentially killed before any action could be taken. (Jenkins is referring to the capture and subsequent execution of two U.S. envoys by

terrorists who attacked the U.S. embassy — ed.) This I know is treading on sensitive areas, but let's face it if we had a flexible approach then, we might be able to do what the Israelis are able to do. I might add, however, that you can't do anything the same way twice.

Question: Nothing will work twice? Why is that?

BJ: Here's an historical example that provides us with a clear understanding — ransom kidnapping. It is a highly unpopular act. The family always pays... However the conviction rate is tremendously high, the sentences are heavy, the jury response is harsh... it pisses off the public. Just look at the kidnapping of the 26 school children (in California this week — ed.) There was tremendous outrage, everyone cooperated. People had citizen band radios. It was just tremendous.

Question: What about the Patty Hearst case?

BJ: It was good, until she turned sides!

BJ: Anyway, what is important is the aftermath. That is where the real deterrent to terrorism lies. In the aftermath, how the population responds is key. We have got to have no rules to get these bastards.

State Dept. Terrorism Coordinator: "PLO Will Turn To Terror If Wiped Out In Lebanon"

July 24 (NSIPS) — New Solidarity International Press Service has obtained the following excerpts from a July 16 interview with Robert P. Meyers, the U.S. State Department's Assistant Coordinator for Combatting Terrorism. Meyers is replacing Robert A. Feary as head of the Cabinet Committee to Combat Terrorism.

Q: What are the possibilities for securing international sanctions against nations who harbor terrorists?

Meyers: What we see now is a consternation in many countries who were not previously affected by terrorist acts. The phenomenon that has been tolerated by many of these countries is now coming back to haunt them. Austria, which has winked at terrorists in the past, and West Germany are now tightening up their security. Venezuela and Colombia are sponsoring a joint resolution at the UN General Assembly to enact sanctions against countries who support terrorists and the West Germans are organizing for the passage of an anti-terrorist convention in the UN which will probably be introduced this fall. There is increased interest in such moves. With a few more incidents of the recent nature people will be up in arms.

Q: What do you think of Weinraub's article on Libyan support of terrorists in today's New York Times?

Meyers: Bernie did a good job. We agree with his rendition of the Entebbe hijacking. We know all about Wadih Haddad's group (identified as having coordinated the Uganda hijack by various press sources — ed.). It was a splinter group of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) that carried out the raid.

Q: Can we expect more incidents like the Uganda hijacking?

Meyers: I wouldn't rule out Haddad pulling something like that off again. If things go badly for the Palestinians in Lebanon, for instance, more of this kind of terror can be expected. Up until now, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and other Palestinians have been making progress with the official channels of government, getting recognition from the UN, etc. But once they feel that these kinds of activities are no longer going to allow them to get the attention they want, then they could turn to terrorism again. Lebanon is said to be the place where this turn could happen if the left and the PLO are wiped out.

Q: Can some sort of international police organization be put

together to carry out rescue operations like the Israeli raid on Entebbe?

Meyers: This is a long way off. It is hard enough for Israel to do what it did let alone trying to set up such police operations on a supranational scale. Abortion is not the ideal method for birth control, but when it's necessary you should use it. The Israeli Raid was not an effective control of terrorism, but it had to be done.

Javits' Aide:

"Unfortunately We Can't Just Move Militarily Against Those Who Harbor Terrorists."

Washington, D.C., July 24 (NSIPS)—Excerpted below is an interview made available to NSIPS with Peter Lakeland, foreign affairs advisor to Sen. Jacob Javits (D-N.Y.). Lakeland wrote the keynote address delivered by the Senator at last month's conference on international terrorism at the Ralph Bunche Institute in New York during which Javits called for the invasion and bombing of Third World nations "suspected of harboring terrorists."

Q: How do you see the international terrorist situation shaping up after the Entebbe (Uganda) raid?

Lakeland: Well, obviously we have to anticipate more terrorist acts, although I believe that the Israeli raid will have much more of a deterrent effect than a provocative effect. It will make terrorists—and countries which aid terrorists—think twice. If there is no place to land a skyjacked plane, well...

Q: Sen. Javits mentioned the possibility that terrorists might resort to using atomic weapons. Do you think that that is likely?

Lakeland: Atomic terrorism is a real possibility—we have to consider it as an option.

Q: You have only mentioned skyjacking so far—in terms of being deterred by the Entebbe raid. How about other forms of terrorism, such as the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) planting bombs in an Israeli city?

Lakeland: Those are quasi-acts of warfare and are much easier to handle...they're analogous to war.

Q: Do you think that we are any closer to reaching an international accord against terrorism?

Lakeland: Do you? No, I don't think we are...But if you get two or three successful operations like the Israeli raid, then this could have a definite salutary effect.... Terrorism is 90 per cent a PLO problem. What's going on in Lebanon now — grisly though it is — will resolve the PLO problem. It will either make them stronger, or it will destroy them — they are currently being destroyed. It will also split the Arab world, isolating radical countries who are pro-terrorist. No doubt about it, though, we'll be living with terrorism for some time.

Q: What did you think of (New York Times correspondent) Bernard Gwertzman's article saying that the real backers and suppliers of terrorists are the East Bloc?

Lakeland: Bernie? His article was good. It's definitely true that terrorists' arms come from the East Bloc into Libya. Libya is what you could call a depot.

Q: Well, if we're not close to some form of international agreement, what do you suggest be done to stop terrorism?

Lakeland: Unfortunately, we're no longer living in the 19th century — we can't just move into a country like Libya militarily and punish them for harboring terrorists...That guy Qaddafi (Libyan leader) is a real nut...Who knows how long he'll live?

Chowchilla: Another RAND "SLA" Scenario?

July 24 — Information provided by the national news media this week strongly indicates that the kidnapping of 26 Chowchilla, Ca. school children was, like all other recent acts of terrorism, directed by top Rockefeller terrorist controllers to create an environment for the imposition of police-state "sanctions" against terrorists.

A Rand Corporation report by "surrogate warfare" expert Brian Jenkins directly points to this conclusion. Recently leaked to and printed in the New York Times, Jenkins' document discusses the importance of a "flexible response" policy toward terrorists, and emphasizes the importance of the aftermath of a terrorist incident as crucial to controlling terrorism. Jenkins reemphasized this in an interview this week: "In the U.S. ransom kidnapping has become an unprofitable form of terrorism because of popular outrage and a high arrest and conviction rate with stiff sentences. Take the case of the 26 school children, there was full cooperation with the police."

Although all details of how the kidnapping was planned and coordinated are not yet available, the activity of the national press and Attorney General Edward Levi provide crucial "indirect" evidence that the Chowchilla kidnapping was orchestrated using the Rand scenario discussed by Jenkins.

The three suspects, Fred Newhall Woods and his companions Richard and James Schoenfeld — the children of wealthy residents of Portola Valley outside of San Francisco can only be

a small element in the entire kidnapping. Although early stories in the press indicated a larger number of people directly involved in the kidnapping these were soon obscured by tightly controlled "human interest" stories run daily on the front page of every major newspaper in the country. Initial rumors that the kidnapers had been connected to a San Francisco area drug cult were blacked out leaving the suspects vague individuals with no histories past high school. Leading coming from initial reports of a female caller to the Livermore Police Department and the Mayor of Chowchilla threatening "the children are safe but there will be others" shortly after the children escaped were also not pursued.

From the standpoint of the Rand scenario, the press coverage makes complete sense. From the beginning, coverage has focussed on Jenkins' "popular response:" anguished parents forming vigilante search teams and extended prayer vigils.

Simultaneous with the press blackout of new leads in the kidnapping was the abrupt withdrawal of FBI investigators by Attorney General Edward Levi provoking Madera County Sheriff Ed Bates to send a scathing telegram to Levi accusing him of sabotaging the investigation by pulling out his resources. Levi has now recommitted the FBI investigation team of 50 agents. This schizophrenic activity on Levi's part is the same pattern seen in the SLA—Patty Hearst kidnapping and suggests similar Justice Dept. coverup of the actual controllers of the kidnapers.