

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

began with a terrorist act. World War I was triggered by a terrorist assassin, World War II was triggered by terrorist activities.... People forget that Hitler's Beer-Hall putsch involved hostage-taking, and that two years before World War II broke out, two Japanese Prime Ministers were assassinated by right-wingers in the Japanese Army. There's every reason to think that World War III will start in a similar way.

Q: Do you think that an incident of nuclear terrorism could occur in the Mideast?

M: I don't think that it's very likely at this point. But the situation in the Mideast is very dangerous. You've got the superpowers facing off one another over Lebanon. Anything could happen.

Q: Who do you think controls most of the terrorists?

M: Well, there's abundant evidence to show that certain groups in the U.S. such as the Weatherunderground, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, etc. are run by the DGI (Cuban Intelligence). The DGI in turn is run by the KGB. I'll tell you what a good story would be....why don't you look into the links between the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee and the DGI. Jennifer Dohrn is in New York now and she's doing alot of organizing with the Organizing Committee. It would really be worth looking into.

Q: What do you think the US should do, then about this 'Cuban control' of terrorism?

M: Blockade and invade Cuba, if necessary! There is such a thing as the Monroe Doctrine you know. We ought to enforce it! This has nothing to do with the JFK assassination. If we're not strong enough to defend the Caribbean against the Russians, then we're dead and we don't know it. Cuba is a penal colony of 9 million people. They have a right to be free. It's implicit in the Monroe Doctrine to prevent the Russians from maintaining a Gulag Archipelago (prison camp) in our back yard. Another thing — why isn't the US media reporting about the horrible abuses that are taking place in Cuba, instead of yapping about Chile all the time. I'm sure glad

Kissinger is raising hell in Chile, but that won't be enough.

Q: Well what do you think the Soviet Union will do if the US invades Cuba?

M: The Russians? Ah-h-h, they'll just yell as loud as we did when they invaded Czechoslovakia.

Q: Let me ask you what you think about the charges that the U.S. Labor Party spokesman has been making during the conference to the effect that it's Kissinger and the Institute for Policy Studies which control terrorism?

M: It's paranoid megalomania. I'll tell you about these people. They're just like the Moonies. They're programmed to say certain things. They all look and talk alike. I first encountered them at the Watergate hearings in July 1973, and then they popped up at the World Population Conference in Bucharest which I was covering for Readers Digest. I've got a file inches thick I'll show you. Maybe you can do some legwork for me, too, like finding out anything you can about their guru, Lyn Marcus. Any personal data on their members — where they were recruited, by whom, things like that. Their finances, although I don't think they'll tell you much. How many members they have. No they're not KGB, or anybody else for that matter, as far as I know.

Q: Are they terrorists?

M: That's the damndest thing. I've looked into every nook and cranny to find out about the Labor Party, and I've never found any incident of violence. They just seem to be dead-set against violence. I can't figure it out.

Q: Well, what do you think specifically about the Labor Party's charges that the People's Bicentennial Commission is going to disrupt the July 4 Philadelphia celebration?

M: Well, I don't know. I don't believe Jeremy Rifkin (head of the People's Bicentennial—ED.) is a terrorist — maybe he helps create an atmosphere in which terrorism can develop, but he's not a terrorist himself. Rifkin's kicked up quite a fuss about the SISC investigation (Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's investigation into the People's Bicentennial Committee—Ed.) — Senator Eastland (chairman of the committee) makes a damned good target, of course.