

ion”—including such myths as that the election of Tony Blair as the new prime minister of Great Britain, signifies a positive change in British policy. He contrasted such myths to the reality of what is required to overcome the world crisis. Today, a New Bretton Woods Conference is required, to put the world monetary system through a bankruptcy reorganization. How should this happen? President Clinton should invite the heads of state of China and other nations to a weekend conference, LaRouche said; they should work out the agreement, and announce a new system on Monday morning. This would immediately do what is long overdue: Collapse the power of the International Monetary Fund.

LaRouche described the key countries of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, from the standpoint of their machine-tool capabilities. There are three key areas, from this point of view: In South Asia, the three main countries are Japan, Taiwan, and India. On the opposite end of the Land-Bridge, there is the area of the European Triangle formed by Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, which once had the biggest concentration of machine-tool capability, worldwide; and third, there is the potential provided by what remains of the Soviet military-industrial complex. This capability grew out of 19th-century cooperation of the United States with Russia. Because of this particular capability, the Soviet Union, despite its inferior civilian economy, proved capable of producing weapons that could challenge the West.

The European Triangle area has to export machine-tool design capabilities, to build them up in other areas of Eurasia, LaRouche said. This is just the opposite concept to the present-day practice of “outsourcing.”

LaRouche criticized harshly the fact that no European country is presently capable of providing leadership. Instead, there is “partnership,” which agrees to do nothing. The leaders are worried about “opinion,” not about their nations; they are afraid of their own populations. They change their opinions, in the way that women change fashions.

What is real leadership in contrast to this? LaRouche gave the example of the late Jacques Rueff, the French economist who had told him how he had once convinced French President Charles de Gaulle to back the “heavy franc” currency reform, which everyone else opposed: Rueff told de Gaulle that he “put the reputation of his life’s work” behind it. Leaders like him, like Franklin Delano Roosevelt or Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, never listened to opinions, but always understood real leadership as serving the interests of the nation.

This principle of leadership defines the catalytic role of the BüSo party, as a “precious little party” that is indispensable for the political debate in Germany, in the coming turbulence, LaRouche said.

The party convention passed two resolutions: one denouncing the pro-Kabila policy of the Green party; the other calling for the exoneration of LaRouche, and of his five associates who are still, scandalously, being held as political prisoners in the United States.

London’s terrorists set sites on Saudis

by Omar Abdul Aziz

With Tony Blair’s newly elected Labour government in Britain, it is expected that the doors will be opened wide for a major escalation of London-based international terrorist campaigns, especially by the MI-5-controlled so-called “Islamist” terrorist groups targeting the nations of the Middle East and these nation’s cooperation with the U.S. administration.

The traditional sympathy expressed by the Labour Party toward terrorist groups actively fundraising and organizing terrorist attacks overseas was further strengthened earlier this year. In January and February, Labour MP George Galloway, a mouthpiece for Lord Avebury, the House of Lords’ top terrorist godfather, led a hard fight against a “Conspiracy and Incitement Bill” presented by Conservative Nigel Waterson to the House of Commons. The bill would have banned individuals residing in Britain from plotting and conducting terrorist operations overseas. The Labour Party led the effort to defeat the bill. Although Waterson was a member of the ruling Conservative party, the government did not endorse his bill, contributing to its defeat.

As part of his fight on behalf of terrorism and against the bill, Galloway said: “We are all in favor of controlling terrorism in Britain . . . but we are talking about terrorism in other countries, and what is defined as terrorism by foreign dictatorships. . . . The bill will criminalize such people, even though they have not broken any law in Britain . . . or caused any harm to the Queen’s peace in her realm. They will fall open to prosecution in this country under the bill because they are inciting, supporting, or organizing events in distant tyrannies, which are clearly offenses under the laws of such tyrants.”

Following Blair’s election, a London-based Arabic daily, *Al-Quds Al-Arabi*, which gives open support to the likes of Osama Bin Laden, the Saudi terrorist financier, reported optimistically that “The Blair government will ‘disturb the sleep’ of the Saudi ruling family.” Bin Laden and a network of Saudi opposition groups, all based in London, have given support to the bomb attack against the U.S. military barracks in Khobar, Saudi Arabia. *Al-Quds* quoted “observers” in London who said that “Saudi Arabia lost all its friends in the British government and Parliament in the recent elections.” It professes that “Tony Blair’s assertions that he will support human rights issues will mean that the doors will be opened to Saudi and

other Arab dissidents to come to Britain, and to stop the pressures put on Britain to deport those who are now active." The British government has come under attacks from the leaders of at least nine Third World nations for providing a safe haven for terrorists actively operating against these nations.

Media lies geared up

The British mass media have also made major contributions to these campaigns, targetting specifically the United States' relationship to the Gulf states. The British Broadcasting Corp. and Channel 4 have aired several programs and documentaries, while the major newspapers, such as the *Independent*, and *Al Arab* and *Al-Quds Al-Arabi* have issued a wide range of reports, exposing the vulnerabilities of the Saudi government and the ruling al-Saud family. The monody of the coverage is to put the blame for Saudi Arabia's economic difficulties exclusively on the corruption of the ruling family and the U.S. military and economic presence in the kingdom. The "corruption" theme is not new, but, linking that theme together with one on the U.S. presence, provides cover for bringing the Saudi opposition into the picture. The British media conducted dozens of interviews with Bin Laden and Mohammed al-Masaari, leader of the London-based Committee for the Defense of Legitimate Rights (CDLR), portraying the two as advocates for the miserable and impoverished people of Saudi Arabia against the tyranny of al-Saud and the United States. In all the interviews with Bin Laden, the British media made sure that all his threats and marching orders to his followers were aired.

This destabilization campaign was recently brought to the United States through such Anglophile media mouthpieces as the Associated Press, Cable News Network, and CBS. CNN produced a 21-minute report featuring the same theme as a film broadcast by the British Channel 4 in January 1997. It includes an interview with Bin Laden conducted in Afghanistan. This would be the first time for such a program to be broadcast in the United States. Meanwhile, Associated Press correspondent Charles J. Hanley wrote a series of articles featuring the situation in the Saudi Kingdom. His articles were close copies of the articles written by British journalist David Hirst almost a year ago.

The 'Iran did it' line

While these destabilization campaigns increase in density, the British and their collaborators across the Atlantic continue to pursue the effort to link Iran to "Islamist" terrorism planned and carried out by London-centered terrorist groups. Exemplary of this is the case of the truck-bombing of Khobar towers, in Saudi Arabia in June 1996, in which 19 U.S. servicemen were killed. The media immediately put out the line implicating Iran in the terrorist attack, because of its alleged support to the so-called "Saudi Hezbollah," a group of Saudi Shia Muslims fighting against the "Wahhabi regime" of al-Saud, as the yellow press likes to put it.

Recently, Canada's Federal Court ruled that Hani al-Sayegh, a Saudi who was arrested in Ottawa in March, was a member of a Saudi terrorist group, presumably "Saudi Hezbollah." Al-Sayegh is accused of driving the car that signalled the bomb-filled truck to drive up to the U.S. base in Saudi Arabia. According to his lawyer, the ruling means that al-Sayegh will be deported either to Saudi Arabia or to the United States, since he is wanted in both countries for questioning. An outpouring of media accusations tying the alleged Saudi Hezbollah member to Iran, would be tailor-made for those who wish to see an American military strike on Iran, or at least create a campaign similar to the "Mykonos trial" in Germany, which attempted to link the Iranian leadership to the assassination of Iranian dissidents in Berlin.

What is peculiar about this case is that the Canadian authorities are targetting only the Shia Muslims, because they can easily claim to link them to Iran, where the majority follow the Shia sect. For example, the Canadians have not carried out any serious investigation into another Saudi, Ali Fahd al-Shihri, who was arrested in November 1996, and who is well-connected to al-Massari's CDLR in London. The CDLR protested al-Shihri's arrest, and accused the Canadian authorities of ill-treating him. However, as CDLR's collaborators at *Al-Quds Al-Arabi* reported, al-Shihri would have been deported to the country he came from—Great Britain.

Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of
Executive Intelligence
Review

Order from:
**Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.**
(800) 453-4108
(703) 777-3661
fax (703) 777-8287

\$4.95 plus shipping (\$4.00
for first book, \$.50 for each
additional book). Virginia
residents add 4.5% sales tax.

