Will President Reagan be the target for another assassination attempt?

by Paul Goldstein

U.S. security and intelligence officials have told *EIR* that the removal of weapons from President Reagan's Secret Service detail by the British Home Office at London's Heathrow Airport was initiated by the same British intelligence unit responsible for monitoring the Palestinian terrorist group which nearly assassinated the Israeli ambassador to London, Shlomo Argov, on June 5, 1982.

That assassination attempt was carried out by the Abu Nidal Palestinian terrorist organization and provided the excuse for then-Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon to launch the invasion of Lebanon. According to U.S. intelligence sources, the British intelligence special section handling these terrorists knew of the assassination plans well in advance and prevented the arrest of the criminals prior to the hit attempt. In fact, these sources stated, only a small portion of the entire hit team was arrested afterwards, and most are presently operating freely.

Immediately following the assassination attempt against Argov, U.S. intelligence sent a special investigating team to London, but was blocked at the time from conducting an independent investigation into the Argov affair. A direct intervention by the British Foreign Office succeeded in blocking a separate but parallel investigation, nearly causing a full-blown diplomatic incident—especially when the Foreign Office threatened to expel the U.S. investigators from the United Kingdom if they persisted in the inquiry.

This is the same unit which was placed in charge of President Reagan's security for the duration of the London economic summit talks that took place during the week of June 4! At present, there is a quiet uproar within U.S. security and intelligence services over the London security-stripping incident. One security official told *EIR* that this incident will aggravate the already considerable tensions between the United States and Britain.

British 'tradition'?

The standard operating procedure for the Secret Service when preparing a presidential trip abroad is to establish direct security liaison with the host country. At these meetings, the countries' security officials combine resources and work out a fine-tuned, detailed plan for protecting the President. Everything is discussed, from where the counter-sniper teams will be deployed to who opens the door for the President. More importantly, the Secret Service and State Department security officials make careful arrangements as to what type of weapons will be carried, and notify the host country of not only the type of weapons, but also the serial numbers for each weapon.

Yet in Britain, for reasons of British Commonwealth custom and tradition, no foreign government security unit is permitted to carry weapons. Under this "traditional" arrangement, when President Reagan traveled to Ottawa, Canada in March 1981 for his first international summit conference, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police refused to allow the Secret Service to carry weapons at this event. When President Reagan spoke at the Canadian commons area in front of the Parliament, his Secret Service agents were not carrying weapons, even though there was a 7,000-person demonstration approximately 50 feet from where the President was speaking.

This incident which prompted the *EIR*'s anti-terror publication, *Investigative Leads,* to charge that "a dry-run profiling operation for setting up a hit against the President had just taken place in Ottawa, Canada." Within 10 days of the Canadian incident, presidential would-be assassin, John Hinckley, nearly succeeded in killing President Reagan on March 30, 1981.

With these facts in mind, how could the same operation be pulled against the Secret Service? One U.S. intelligence source indicated that the Secret Service had an informal arrangement whereby officially the British would say that the President's security could not carry weapons, but in truth the British would "wink" at the fact that the Secret Service was going to be carrying weapons in any case. As events turned out, when Secret Service agents got off the plane, they were whisked into a private room, frisked, and told to turn over their weapons which were then placed in escrow. These included uzi machine gun pistols, grenade launchers, .45 caliber hand guns, and an assortment of counter-sniper equipment. Only two bodyguards were permitted to carry .357 magnum revolvers with six bullets in the chamber and another six for reserve. Given the environment of terrorist threats

and the fact that this British special unit permitted an assassination attempt against the Israeli ambassador, why was this permitted?

To elaborate the background to such outrageous decisions involving the President's security, we turn to the incident in Krefeld, West Germany during the summer of 1983 when Vice-President George Bush was stoned by anarchist and terrorist networks during a visit to that country. Prior to his trip, *Investigative Leads* had conducted an investigation of potential disruption of the Vice President's tour and received information from intelligence sources that Bush could be in danger. This evaluation was given to the vice-president's office. But countering this assessment was the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which told White House officials that *Investigative Leads'* reports were exaggerated and that no extraordinary precautions for the Vice President's trip should be made. The U.S. embassy in Bonn reinforced the FBI's evaluation. Nonetheless, Bush ordered that an alternative route be taken. But the German terrorist networks associated with the Revolutionary Cells and other anarchists knew in advance the alternative route Bush was taking. Could this be another coincidence? Highly doubtful!

The failure of U.S. intelligence

The problem facing U.S. intelligence and security agencies is the failure to comprehend the political beast behind today's terrorist threat. *EIR* has insisted that the crucial problem for national security is the fact that former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was brought back into the government with the explicit intent to turn the Reagan administration into a satrap for the Eastern Establishment families of New York and Boston and their cousins in London. Kissinger's business partner in his "consulting" firm, Lord Peter Carrington, Margaret Thatcher's ex-Foreign Secretary who has recently become the Secretary General of NATO, still controls the British Foreign Office on behalf of those interests who are seeking a "New Yalta" accommodation with Moscow.

Concretely, this means breaking the back of U.S. foreign and military policy, especially eliminating the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which Moscow has called a *casus belli* for World War III. Since Reagan has allowed Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger to maintain the SDI program, albeit curtailed in budget, Reagan still represents, although unknowingly, an impediment to the "New Yalta" process.

Since Carrington and Kissinger are doing everything in their capacity to "decouple" Europe from the United States, and since Moscow is demanding Reagan's head on a silver platter before entering any negotiation, could not Messrs. Kissinger and Carrington have possibly arranged this caper?

Who benefits?

To answer the question, let's go back to the assassination attempt against the Israeli ambassador, Shlomo Argov. Everyone in the "spook world" knows that the Abu Nidal terrorist organization is not only penetrated by Israeli intelligence, but, according to recent *Jerusalem Post* articles, Abu Nidal's family, the Al-Bannas, are a prominent West Bank Palestinian family with longstanding ties into certain Israeli circles. These circles include former Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, Rafi Eytan, and the forces in Israel associated with the plot to blow up the Dome of the Rock on Jerusalem's Temple Mount. Henry Kissinger, Lord Harlech, and Lord Carrington have heavily invested in the West Bank real-estate scams which Sharon, et al. have used to drive the Palestinians out, and to create a massive counter-reaction in the Arab world, not only against Israel, but against those forces in the United States which support such efforts. Just when Sharon, who is financially and politically aligned with Kissinger's international forces, needed a bloody excuse for the 1982 Lebanese invasion, a hit was carried out against one of Israel's most respected ambassadors. The key question is: "Who benefits?"

Within this political-counterintelligence context, it is possible to understand why President Reagan is being set up for another assassination attempt. A variety of sources, including official circles, have told *EIR* that Khomeini's terrorists are planning a late-July hit attempt against the President.

According to these informed sources, two American-based Islamic fundamentalists, Imam Azzi from Maryland and Professor Ismail Fakrouqi of Temple University in Philadelphia, attended a meeting in Teheran of approximately 400-500 imams (priests) two weeks ago. At this meeting, Ayatollahs Montazeri and Mohagedeh reportedly set up a new wave of Islamic fundamentalist terror operations. Deployed by these imams was Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran Sadra who is in charge of Iranian operations against the United States and Western Europe. He went to Libya on May 14, meeting with Col. Muammar Qaddafi, Major Jalloud, and Libyan Foreign Minister al-Trikia. From there he went to London, where he was involved in a planning conference of Islamic fundamentalists slated for August. Following his London trip, Sadra returned to Teheran for the meeting of the mullahs described above. The groundwork for the hit plot against Reagan was planned, and it was determined that the President would be shot around the opening ceremony of the Los Angeles Olympics.

This August London Conference of Islamic fundamentalists is being arranged as an "after action" congress, these sources report.

Therefore, it is not at all accidental that London was the scene of the security-stripping operation against the President, especially since a certain faction of British intelligence, aligned with the Islamic fundamentalists and Moscow's KGB, wanted to profile the weaknesses in the President's security arrangements, thereby signaling a "go-ahead" for the hit.