
Commentary: Lyndon LaRouche

Why a summit against terrorism must fail

In an interview conducted with the radio program "EIR Talks" on March 13, Lyndon LaRouche was asked for his view of the "Summit of Peacemakers" jointly sponsored by the United States and Egypt then taking place in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, which brought together the Heads of State of 28 nations to discuss how to combat terrorism in the Mideast. Here is his reply:

There are two aspects to it. The fact that the President is going into the area to meet with other leaders to bolster the peace process, is, in itself, a very good idea. The problem is the idea that you can get an agreement against terrorism.

Now, this view of terrorism is utter nonsense. Obviously, there are things which, by their nature, are rightly called "terrorist acts." And there are people who perpetrate these acts, who can be rightly, for descriptive purposes, be described as terrorists. Obviously, it's necessary to defend populations against terrorists and terrorist acts. So far, so good.

But when someone tries to come up with the report, which is either a fool's credulousness, or a deliberate lie, to say there's a problem called international terrorism, then—and if you try to have a conference to resolve on measures to deal with international terrorism, then you're barking up the wrong tree, and you may actually create a disaster, as well as indulging in an act of clownish public incompetence.

The problem here is of a different nature. The development in the post-World War II period of nuclear weapons, even before the Soviet Union actually developed its first nuclear weapons at the end of the '40s, was based on—particularly after the firing of MacArthur by Truman, which ended all classical military policy in the United States and in other principal powers. We went into a period of what was called strategic conflict below the threshold of nuclear warfare. This was listed under so-called "limited warfare," and, also, "special warfare," later put under the rubric of "special operations."

This also involved the use of surrogate devices, that is, to use a small nation to conduct a war against a large nation, a limited war against a large nation. An example of that, was the United States trapped the Soviet Union into Afghani-

stan in a precalculated way; then ran a mercenary war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, using Pakistan-based drug-runners such as Hekmatyar as the vehicle; and used contributions from places like the Saudis, and also the recruitment of a large number of anti-communist Islamic people into what was called the mujahideen based in Pakistan, against the Soviet forces in Afghanistan.

Now, these people are now turned loose on the world as unemployed or largely unemployed mercenaries, still operating on the basis of the Golden Crescent and other drug-trafficking, to fund them.

For example, the terrorists in Algeria used by the Algerian government, and deployed, in part, into France recently for the terrorist operations which occurred in Paris, were mujahideen recruited from a Pakistan operation, deployed by the British from London into Paris, as well as in the operations in Algeria itself, where they were used as a foil, like a counter-Mau-Mau, against the Islamic opposition to the incumbent government.

Deployed from London

So the problem here is, in the Middle East: The terrorist operations against the peace process in the Middle East *are run from London*. They are run through the London-directed, two London-directed forces principally. One, is the section of Israeli politics and U.S. politics identified with the Anti-Defamation League, for example, as a political ally of this crowd, and Ariel Sharon in Israel; and Netanyahu. They are running terrorism for the purpose of trying to bring down the Peres government, to destroy the peace process.

Behind this, is London. The Hamas was created by London as a countergang, political countergang, against the PLO. And the Palestinian Authority has identified some of these things and their London connection. This group is supported by Sharon; and it was allowed to do things by Sharon's crowd in Israel, the government forces, for political purposes. But the control was, and is, from London.

For example, the military arm of Hamas is *not* based in the Middle East, it's based outside the Middle East. And what we're looking at *usually*, in what might be called Hamas military arm terrorism, will often be directed through the apparatus of the mujahideen, out of Pakistan; the same way that funny operation against Mubarak in Addis Ababa was run. It was run from Pakistan, by the same people that Lord Bethell and George Bush and so forth were using back in the 1980s. And to whom, I think, George is probably still connected in some way, if he can find his connection. But that's the nature of the thing.

So, the idea of having a summit to lend moral support and other support to the peace process in the Middle East, is a very good idea. But in the sense that somebody's trying to come up with a convention against international terrorism, this is a piece of dangerous idiocy, and should not be attempted or supported.