

EIR Special Report

Legitimizing terror: who wins, who loses

by Paul Goldstein

One of the most important strategic issues facing the United States remains the question of international terrorism. It is this question that President Ronald Reagan directly addressed during his inaugural presentation, as well as in his statement at a White House reception given for the hostages, where he said the United States would meet the challenge of terrorism with "swift and effective retribution."

As of this writing, the Reagan administration has not decided whether to go ahead with the Carter administration's unconstitutional deal with the controllers of Iran's mad mullahs. Within Reagan's own administration there is an effort to ram through the Carter-Khomeini deal. Secretary of State Alexander Haig is leading the charge to secure the approval.

The actual price of the Carter-Khomeini settlement raises one of the most fundamental issues in the post-World War II period. This issue, upon which the Reagan administration and Congress must ultimately decide, involves a threat to national sovereignty more dangerous than any comparable agreement in the history of the United States.

In effect, if the settlement is approved by the Reagan administration and Congress, then the very intent of President Reagan's statements on combating terrorism will be undermined, and Americans will suffer further Carter-like years of policy disasters. It will serve as a signal to the controllers of international terror that the United States is ill-prepared for the fight ahead.

The strategic damage to the national interest of the United States would be incalculable. Organizations deployed by the Socialist International and their Soviet intelligence (KGB) counterparts, along with the Jesuit "Theology of Liberation" ideologues and the pseudoconservatives of the Heritage Foundation are geared for a new, explosive round of terrorism resulting in far greater human damage and political consequences than even the pattern of terror over the past year. What advantage do these forces gain from



deploying terrorism? First, terrorism is an extension of political combat—a form of surrogate warfare deployed as a covert capability. If, as a result of a terrorist deployment, the very issue of the legitimacy of the terrorist group—be it the Red Brigades or Iranian students—becomes one of the points of contention, and if a national government must be brought down to the level of negotiating with terrorists, then the very question of a nation's sovereignty comes to a crucial crossroad.

Who benefits?

Underlying the political deployment of international terror is the creation of a "one-world utopia" in which environmentalist enforcements against science and technology become the hallmark of every nation's outlook. That is why, since the end of World War II, the major thrust of the Socialist International networks is the creation of supranational institutions such as the International Monetary Fund/World Bank and the host of organizations spun out of the United Nations as a vehicle for institutionalizing the notion of limited sovereignty. Any time a nation has to secure a means for carrying out its strategic policy through mechanisms other than its own national institutional channels, it is in effect surrendering its sovereignty.

The Socialist International Conference held last December in Washington, D.C. marked a strategic shift in this overall international deployment. At this confer-

In this section

I. Legitimizing terror: who wins, who loses by Paul Goldstein

Carter's deal with Khomeini is illegal and unconstitutional by Edward Spannaus

II. Colombian terror targets Reagan by Valerie Rush

III. Terrorist controllers plan a new Russell Tribunal by Dolia Estévez Pettingell

Chiapas becomes a Jesuit time bomb by Dolia Estévez Pettingell

ence, led by Willy Brandt of West Germany, Olof Palme of Sweden, Anthony Wedgwood Benn of Great Britain, and representatives of over 30 other nations, the policy commitment to "liberation movements" in the Third World was fully announced. Not only was support for "armed struggle" openly proclaimed, but behind the scenes a more insidious policy was discussed for destabilizing the Reagan administration with left-right confrontation, in Central America and domestically.

Internationally, throughout 1980, terrorism had reached a new dimension. Following the takeover of the U.S. embassy in Teheran by the Muslim Brotherhood students with the support of Socialist International agents, Ramsey Clark, the former U.S. Attorney General, a major series of terrorist deployments occurred against U.S. embassies in Libya and Pakistan. Next, the

The ILA example

The oldest and most prestigious institution promoting violations of national sovereignty is the International Law Association (ILA), founded in London at the end of the 19th century. From its inception, the ILA has served as an instrument of Europe's "black nobility."

The head of the U.S. branch of the ILA, C. Clyde Ferguson, began his career as the civil rights adviser to New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller and became a founding trustee of the Institute for Policy Studies, the Washington-based command center for New Left terrorism and terrorist support groups. In 1964, Ferguson became the U.S. expert at the United Nations Subcommittee on Discrimination and a Harvard Law School dean. As of 1980, he was also working with Richard Falk at Falk's Institute for World Order.

The chairman of the Canadian branch of the ILA is a higher-level special operations officer, Major Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, whose law firm runs the Bronfman family holdings. As a veteran of British intelligence's Special Operations Executive, Bloomfield became the head of the Permindex organization when it was founded in the early 1960s. Permindex has been implicated by French authorities in dozens of assassination attempts against Charles de Gaulle, and by New Orleans D.A. Jim Garrison and others in the John Kennedy assassination. Bloomfield's pet project for the 1980s is the creation of an international commando "strike force" on the Entebbe model, operating under "international law."

M-19 terrorist organization seized the Dominican embassy in Colombia, where the U.S. ambassador was taken hostage. In almost every case, the question of negotiation and recognition of the terrorists' right of action was brought out. In each case, the sovereignty of a nation's embassy was violated, making it an act of war. It was the clear Carter administration pattern of not only doing virtually nothing in the face of such attacks, but actually facilitating them, that led to a further escalation of international terror.

This situation is most sharply demonstrated in Italy, where the Socialist Party (PSI) has deployed its offspring, the Red Brigades, as the key weapon against the republican form of government. The PSI has continually intervened on behalf of the Red Brigades' "legitimate rights" to force concessions from the Italian government.

The role of U.S. Ambassador Richard Gardner, a Socialist International-linked operative, in supporting the PSI's efforts is thoroughly documented. Gardner's father-in-law belongs to the Luzzato family, a prominent Venetian clan whose ties to the networks controlling terrorism have been well known to Italy's counter-terror experts since the PSI helped create terrorist networks out of the 1960s New Left. In addition, the entire PSI leadership has been in the midst of destabilizing Italy since the assassination of Aldo Moro.

Ramsey Clark and international terror

The unique position of former Attorney General Ramsey Clark in both controlling the deployment of international terror and managing the conflict resolution outcome is important in understanding this operation. Clark's associates include the entire support apparatus for the Iranian terrorists as well as the Red Brigades, Baader-Meinhof gang, and U.S.-based left-wing terrorist organizations. They are also tied into the "one-world utopian" institutions integral to rationalizing the attacks by terrorists as legitimate political expressions. The International Law Association, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the National Lawyers Guild, and the variety of U.N. legal appendages have been and continue to be involved in mediating terrorist activity. All these associations have been intimately linked to the Socialist International networks which control the terrorist deployments.

The battle against international terror can be won if the Reagan administration defines its first struggle against this evil by categorically rejecting the Carter-Khomeini agreement. Second, a declaration of war against the Socialist International terrorist and antisovereignty operatives is essential. The political intention of the new administration would thus be absolutely clear: to destroy the political-judicial basis upon which international terror functions.