

to act to restore Lebanese sovereignty: "Since 1976 [first Syrian intervention in Lebanon mandated by the Arab League], the Syrians have tried to fool the entire world on their real intentions . . . they have tried in particular to make the free world believe that the war in Lebanon is a war between Christians and Muslims, that their presence was to secure peace and protect the Christians of Lebanon. . . . In 1987, to push through the implementation of their plan, the Syrians deployed elite troops, their special forces, in the Lebanese capital, claiming yet again that their aim was to restore order, to free the American and Western hostages from the hands of the fundamentalists, to end international terrorism originating in Lebanon, and to put a stop to the narcotics contraband. . . . But in reality for more than ten years now the Syrian Army has been acting as an occupation army. The hostages are used as a means of blackmail. International terrorism is still exported from Lebanon under their patronage: Abu Nidal, Ahmed Jibril, and the Hezbollah; the narcotics traffic is sponsored by the Syrians. Poppy is cultivated in the Bekaa valley under Syrian control, heroin is synthesized in laboratories in areas under their control and is exported through various illegal ports which they dominate. . . . It is very important that the free world become conscious of these truths which have long been camouflaged by disinformation published in the media. . . . It is disgusting that world public opinion is mobilized in a universal outcry against the hunt of baby seals and whale hunting, yet accepts the hunt of the Lebanese people by the Syrian Army. . . . I present the Lebanese problem to world public opinion and the world's conscience so that the truth can be said . . . and so that world opinion act to end the occupation of Lebanese soil by Syrian troops."

Though the United States, France, and the Vatican have all recently reaffirmed their support for Lebanese sovereignty, a March 20 statement by newly confirmed Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger reveals quite another policy: "If Syrian troops withdrew from Lebanon the situation would be worse, not better." Eagleburger's statement undoubtedly reflects not only the State Department's years-long policy toward Syria, but more specifically, the policies set down by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in 1975. In his memoirs, Kissinger reflects the Syrian tilt of U.S. policy at that time when describing President Assad as a "political genius" and the Meternich of the Mideast. At the outbreak of the civil war then-U.S. Ambassador to Beirut Brown suggested to the Christians that Christian presence in the Islamic Arab world was a historical aberration. In one of the most unbelievable contemporary gestures of U.S. diplomacy, Washington then suggested that 500,000 Green Cards would be given to Lebanese Christians willing to leave their homeland of many centuries for Canada, the United States, and other parts of the world.

The outbreak of war in Lebanon in late March will test whether, as Colonel Kallas demands, the international community acts to save Lebanese sovereignty.

## Soviet-Iran terror pact casts its net

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On March 29, the Saudi imam of Brussels, Belgium, Abdullah Al Ahdal, and his Tunisian deputy, Imam Salim Bahri, were both assassinated at their mosque in Brussels. The killings were immediately linked by Belgian police officials to a recent interview given by Bahri, in which he took a "moderate" stand in opposition to Ayatollah Khomeini's death sentence against *The Satanic Verses* author Salman Rushdie. This marks the first publicly reported instance of an assassination linked to the Khomeini call for Rushdie's execution.

Behind this incident, as well as a number of other terrorist acts—including four bombings in the United States since mid-February—stands an alliance between an ever more radicalized Khomeini-centered Islamic fundamentalist movement and Soviet bloc intelligence services. The alliance is a revival of the Communist-Islamic fundamentalist pact which emerged at the Baku Conference on the "revolutionary peoples of the East" in 1921.

That alliance was publicly celebrated during Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's trip to Teheran in February, in which he embraced the Islamic revolution at exactly the point that Western governments across the board were denouncing Khomeini for his call to arms against Rushdie. Due to the rampant "Gorbymania" among Western politicians and news media, there has been an appalling silence to date on the fact of the newly hardened Soviet-Iranian terror pact. In fact, evidence of the alliance, and the identification of at least one key player in it, is known to Western intelligence services, whose silence seems to indicate a deep level of commitment to the superpower New Yalta balance-of-power game—even at the cost of a new wave of Soviet-sponsored terrorism.

### The key role of Mohtashemi

Arab sources have identified Iran's Interior Minister Ali Akbar Mohtashemi as a pivotal figure in the terror upsurge that began on Dec. 21, 1988, with the bombing of Pan American Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 people. A long-time crony of Khomeini, Mohtashemi is known to be the member of Iran's inner council with the deepest ties to Soviet intelligence. From 1980-83, Mohtashemi was Iran's ambassador in Damascus, during which time he arranged for the training of Pasdaran (Revolutionary Guards) terrorists in

East bloc-run camps in Syria and in the Bekaa Valley of Lebanon. Following Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon, Mohtashemi oversaw the founding of Hezbollah and Jihad, the two groups responsible for the majority of kidnappings in Lebanon over the past seven years.

Throughout this period, Mohtashemi served as the liaison between the Iranian regime and such leading Syrian and Soviet-backed terrorists as Dr. George Habash and Nawaf Hawatmeh. After escaping an attempt on his own life in 1983, Mohtashemi returned to Teheran where he was named interior minister two years later.

According to reports in both American and British newspapers, the bombing of Pan Am 103 was contracted by Mohtashemi in retaliation for the accidental American shooting down of an Iranian civilian airliner over the Persian Gulf last July 3. In February, the captain of the *U.S.S. Vincennes*, the U.S. naval vessel that was responsible for that incident, was the target of a pipe bomb attack in San Diego. Captain Will Rogers's wife narrowly escaped when a pipe bomb blew up her van as she was driving near the U.S. naval base.

Reportedly, in the past year, increased Western security attention to Iranian activists and known Pasdaran operatives has undermined Iran's ability to deploy its own international terror army. Mohtashemi subcontracted Soviet-Syrian asset Ahmed Jibril's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-GC) to carry out the Pan Am bombing, for a reported \$10 million payment.

Mohtashemi's itinerary during the mid-February period of Khomeini's death sentence against Rushdie, according to Arab sources, suggests that he was the architect of Khomeini's action. On Feb. 9-10, Mohtashemi was in Pakistan negotiating an "anti-drug" pact with the new Bhutto government. Two days later, anti-American riots broke out in Karachi in protest over the Rushdie book. On Feb. 14, Mohtashemi reportedly personally briefed Khomeini on the anti-Muslim passages of the Rushdie book, prompting the death sentence against Rushdie—six months after the book had been released.

A variety of intelligence sources have told *EIR* that Mohtashemi's faction inside Iran is notorious for being penetrated by KGB agents. They say that he has been in a factional brawl with nominally "pro-Western pragmatists" in the Khomeini government, who had been negotiating with British and American intermediaries at the time the Rushdie affair broke, over freeing the remaining hostages in exchange for Western economic aid.

With the recent resignation of Ayatollah Montazeri, one of the principal so-called moderates around Khomeini, Iran is at least temporarily on a radicalized path—with a new-found intimate relationship to the Gorbachov gang in Moscow. All told, it makes for a dangerous new climate, ripe for international terrorism. This is especially the case if Western blinders to the increasingly sophisticated Soviet playing of the terror-at-a-distance continue to remain in place.

## Defend Iceland from green terrorism

by Poul Rasmussen

The international green terror organization, Greenpeace, has declared war on the nation of Iceland, a member country of the Atlantic Alliance. In recent months, Greenpeace has been responsible for an international campaign to boycott all Icelandic fish exports, with the open aim of destroying the entire economy of the nation.

So far, Greenpeace has succeeded in threatening and pressuring restaurants and supermarkets in the United States and Germany into stopping purchases of Icelandic fish. If this campaign is allowed to continue, it will actually break the back of Iceland's economy. The export of fish products represents 76% of Icelandic exports, and a full 45% of the GNP.

### NATO's northern flank at risk

The official reason for the Greenpeace campaign against Iceland is a total hoax. In a typically manipulative campaign, Greenpeace is ostensibly protesting against the Icelanders hunting of whales. There is no reason for that, since Iceland is carefully following all international regulations on whale hunting. When the International Whaling Commission in 1982, under pressure from environmentalist groups, decided to declare a four-year moratorium on all whale hunting from 1986 to 1990, Iceland accepted their decision. The whaling commission granted Iceland a yearly catch of 80 fin, 40 sei, and 80 minke whales for scientific purposes. This is what Iceland catches, nothing more.

The real reason for the Greenpeace campaign has nothing to do with whales. Given the open anti-NATO attitude of Greenpeace, it is hardly an accident that the Greenpeace campaign coincides with the Soviet propaganda proposals for a "denuclearization of the seas," which is aimed at kicking NATO out of the North Atlantic.

Situated strategically in the so-called GIUK Gap (the waters between Greenland, Iceland, and the United Kingdom), Iceland plays an important role in the defense of Western Europe. In case of war, U.S. reinforcement of Europe is only possible if the GIUK Gap can remain closed to Soviet naval activity. In recent years, Soviet naval activities in the waters around Iceland have increased significantly, and Iceland has responded by demonstrably increasing its participation in NATO activities. Now, they are hit by economic warfare.