

## LaRouche slams London's terror war vs. Clinton

by Jeffrey Steinberg

In a campaign white paper released on July 31, Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche detailed London's role as the command center of a global terror campaign, targeting President William Clinton, and some of America's strategic allies around the world. The motive behind this Anglo-Dutch- and French-led "strategy of tension" against the Clinton administration, can be summed up in one word: "geopolitics."

LaRouche's campaign organization, the Committee to Reverse the Accelerating Global Economic and Strategic Crisis, released the report to provide campaign supporters, government officials, and the public with the relevant background to properly evaluate and probe the most recent incidents of egregious terror-warfare against the United States: the June 25 bombing of an American GI housing compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia; the July 17 downing of TWA flight 800, off Long Island, New York, which is still being investigated as a likely terrorist attack; and the July 27 pipe-bomb attack against Centennial Olympic Park, in Atlanta, Georgia.

In a radio interview with "EIR Talks" on July 31, LaRouche expressed his satisfaction that the Clinton administration, and the FBI, under Director Louis Freeh, has been conducting a proper investigation of both the TWA and Atlanta terrorist attacks.

"So far, my view is, as much as I've seen of it, that President Clinton, especially in the past week or so, in taking charge—both politically taking charge of policy in the TWA case, and, also, in getting on the case quickly and properly in the Atlanta case—has done a good job." He continued, "My impression of what Freeh has done in directing the FBI's role, in, particularly, the case of TWA in recent weeks, and, also, so far, in the Atlanta case, is excellent. . . . I see nothing wrong with what they're doing, and they seem to be avoiding the

Pan Am 103 investigation, that kind of fraud. Of course, this was possible because Pan Am 103, even though it was an American aircraft, crashed over British territory. Therefore, the British were able to get in the middle of that, and pull off a fraud, which, for various reasons—because, after all, Bush was pretty much in charge of this sort of thing at that time—the Americans went along with."

President Clinton, since his July 25 visit to New York City to meet with the families of the 230 people who died in the crash of TWA 800, has ordered a clampdown on leaks to the media about the progress of the investigation. On July 26, FBI Director Freeh flew to New York to be briefed on the status of that probe. So far, despite a preponderance of evidence that TWA 800 was a target of a terrorist attack—by either a bomb planted on board the plane, or a missile fired from the ground—the government has declined to identify the cause of the mid-air explosion. Until conclusive forensic evidence has been discovered, the administration is, reportedly, keeping all options open.

President Clinton has also succeeded in forcing Republicans, including presumed GOP Presidential nominee Bob Dole, and the GOP leadership in Congress, to back the White House initiatives, and avoid cheap shots against the President. After a White House meeting on July 29, the President announced a series of counter-terror measures aimed at enabling federal and state law enforcement agencies to expand their tracking of suspected terrorist groups.

The President was also able to avert disaster at a summit on international terrorism that had been scheduled for Paris on July 30. The meeting, called at the initiative of French President Jacques Chirac, during the Group of Seven summit in Lyons, France in June, was to be an ambush of the United States by the Anglo-Dutch and French "Entente Cordiale"

forces, out to enhance the powers of the “Gang of Four” one-world-government bodies—the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization. Although European Commission Vice President Sir Leon Brittan launched into a strident anti-American tirade, the U.S. delegation, led by Attorney General Janet Reno, held its ground, and the attempt to subvert American anti-terror policies fizzled.

### **The LaRouche memo**

It was in the context of British geopolitical warfare against the Clinton administration’s policies, especially toward Russia and China, that LaRouche drafted his campaign paper on the new international terrorism. He began with a blunt assessment of the current strategic situation:

“The United States of America, and its vital policies in every part of the globe, are presently under attack by international terrorism. That terrorism is an instrument of policy, akin to the methods of general war, deployed under the cover of organizations which are headquartered, chiefly, in London. Although many will object to this statement, what we have stated is the hard fact, on which not only your welfare, but even your life, and also that of your family might depend. There is nothing actually mysterious concerning Britain’s strategic motives in fostering this terrorist targeting of President Clinton’s U.S.A.

“Since President Clinton was inaugurated, in January 1993,” LaRouche continued, “the United States, and its overseas interests have been hit by successive waves of international terrorism. Nothing like this occurred on U.S. territory, during the time the Soviet Union was the principal opposing strategic power. All of these attacks on U.S.A. territory, occurred after the 1993 inauguration replaced London’s asset, George Bush, with a President educated in the patriotic school of Georgetown University’s famous Carroll Quigley, Bill Clinton.”

LaRouche then got to the heart of the matter: “London’s motive today, as in every strategic commitment of the British Empire since Lord Kitchener’s Sudan campaign of 1898, is, as the British themselves insist, ‘geopolitical.’

“The world history of the Twentieth Century, has been the history of Britain’s geopolitical dogma: that the Eurasian mainland must never be permitted to enter into economic cooperation, based upon transcontinental railway links, as envisaged for it by the circles of U.S. President Abraham Lincoln. Britain’s effort to prevent such a project, is called ‘geopolitics.’ The leading results of that ‘geopolitical’ dogma, so far in this century, have included two World Wars, more than thirty years—until 1989—of threat of global nuclear war, and the presently ongoing spiral of collapse of the world’s banking systems.”

LaRouche then reviewed the specific series of Clinton administration policy initiatives that directly challenge Britain’s and its Dutch, French, and other allies’ geopolitical in-

terests. Among these policies are: President Clinton’s intervention to resolve the bloody mess in Northern Ireland; his effort to secure a just peace in the Balkans; the administration’s campaign to implement a Middle East peace, against the London-based terrorist forces of Israel’s Ariel Sharon and Syria’s Hafez al-Assad; the effort to stabilize the Korean peninsula; the U.S. opposition to British plans to provoke a conflict between China and Taiwan, and launch other “separatist” destabilizations to break up China; and Clinton’s efforts to collaborate with Germany to “develop a constructive relationship with Russia.”

LaRouche then emphasized: “The United States today has only one significant enemy in the world, the Entente Cordiale and its accomplices. Yet, some lunkheads believe, nonetheless, that Britain is the U.S.A.’s closest ally!”

“The concept of terrorism as a strategic weapon of warfare between major powers is not new,” LaRouche pointed out. “It has been the strategic policy of the British Empire since Jeremy Bentham took over British foreign intelligence in 1782.

“Although terrorist forms of action by individuals and small groups do occur, most of the terrorism which has occurred during recent decades was deployed as a covert form of special warfare by one major power against another. The covert war which Margaret Thatcher and George Bush conducted during the 1980s, as surrogate war, against the Soviet Union, in Afghanistan, was among the lalalaloozas of covert special warfare. It is the special warfare organizations built up under British and U.S.A. direction, during the 1980s, which provide the principal axis for the organization and deployment of international terrorism today.”

### **How to defeat terrorism**

LaRouche then focussed on another crucial challenge: “The principal problem in defeating such forms of terrorism deployed covertly by major powers (not Iran, Libya, etc., but major powers), is political. The population of the targetted nation must support its government in the way this kind of warfare demands.”

Expressing optimism that terrorism can be defeated, LaRouche continued: “Like any other beast, the terrorist depends upon his own style of eco-system. Those who understand covert operations, know how to track the terrorist in his own special eco-system. The foremost consideration in such tracking operations, is to concentrate, first, on defining the agency which deployed the terrorist as a delivery-boy, and not to be trapped into limiting oneself to tracking down delivery-boys. . . .

“One does not win a war, by capturing and convicting a few enemy soldiers. The same is true in war against terrorism. . . . If the U.S. is afraid to call London to account for maintaining the facilities through which terrorist operations are coordinated, and goes seeking to blame some Arab nation, instead, we would lose the war against terrorism.”