

Why President Reagan must halt Khomeini's Islamintern terrorism now

by Judith Wyer

The air strikes by Israeli and French fighters against Khomeini-allied terrorists in Syrian-occupied Lebanon have polarized the NATO alliance and brought into question whether the four-nation multinational peacekeeping force will remain intact. The day after the Nov. 17 French attack on numerous terrorist outposts of the pro-Khomeini Hizballahi (Party of God) near Baalbek in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley, Great Britain and Italy, both participants in the Lebanese force, condemned the strikes.

Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti's condemnation came as Mitterrand arrived in Venice for a state visit. Though Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi has remained publicly silent about the incident, it is reliably reported that the Italian denunciation cast a dark shadow over Mitterrand's talks with Craxi. According to certain French radio reports, Italian forces may be withdrawn from the U.S.-led Multinational Force in Lebanon in retaliation for the French strikes. This, needless to say, is precisely what Moscow is looking for. European sources say that not only Italy, but Britain as well, is quietly looking for ways to remove their forces from Lebanon. Both have shown little resistance to the Soviet bid to split the Atlantic alliance and Finlandize Western Europe. The British Foreign Office stressed that "London was not informed beforehand of such action. We cannot but regret that such action was taken as it will lead to an increase of tension in the Lebanon." The West German government has remained conspicuously silent.

By contrast, on Nov. 18 Secretary of State George Shultz praised the bombing raids, which are seen as a response to the terrorist massacres of U.S., French, and Israeli forces in Lebanon over the past month. The day before the State Department revealed that France had informed the United States in advance of the mission, an announcement London took with particular offense.

France and Israel have pledged further raids against the terrorist training camps, and the United States is expected to assemble the largest-ever armada off the Lebanese coast by mid-November, increasing the potential for U.S. aid in the cleanup of the terrorist nests.

These raids came after a sudden breakdown in U.S.-mediated efforts to resolve the Lebanon crisis. The turning point was the Nov. 12 arrival in Lebanon of President Rea-

gan's newly appointed Mideast envoy, Donald Rumsfeld, which was greeted by Syria and its Soviet-backed allies with an escalation of fighting in Lebanon, marking the worst breach of the Sept. 26 ceasefire. Rumsfeld's visit was linked to a carefully planned round of diplomacy involving Lebanese President Amin Gemayel and Syrian President Hafez al Assad to advance decisions made during the Lebanese national reconciliation talks earlier this month in Geneva. The participants in the Geneva talks, which included Gemayel, Syrian Foreign Minister Abdul Khalim Khaddam, and Lebanon's rival warlords, agreed to temporarily put aside their objections to the May 17 U.S.-Israel agreement, a major obstacle to solving the Lebanon crisis. Rumsfeld and Gemayel were to have made separate visits to Damascus early in the week of Nov. 14, but a sudden "illness" on Assad's part forced postponement of those talks.

The day before Rumsfeld's arrival in Lebanon, Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam had conferred with his Soviet counterpart Andrei Gromyko to assess the Lebanon crisis and the Geneva talks. The same day Syrian Defense Minister Mustaffa Tlas conferred with Bulgarian leaders. The contents of both communiqués were identical in their condemnation of U.S. aggression in the Middle East as the cause of such hot spots as Lebanon.

The Kissinger disciples in the State Department and its press outlets such as the *Washington Post* continue to argue that the Assad regime can be dissuaded from its longtime objective of gobbling up Lebanon into a so-called "Great Syria," and shed its Soviet alliance. *The Washington Post* on Nov. 18 urged the Reagan White House in a lead editorial to make no retaliation against those who perpetrated the Oct. 23 bombing of U.S. Marines, and make no move against Syria irrespective of its destructive role in Lebanon.

The *Post* echoes the foolish State Department argument that somehow Damascus can be pried from Moscow's clutches in future Mideast negotiations. But as recent history shows, Syria is a tool by which Moscow intends to destroy U.S. influence in the Middle East in alliance with neo-Nazi-controlled Muslim terrorists.

Since the Khaddam-Gromyko meeting, there has been widespread speculation that Moscow is pressing Syria to pull back from its genocidal military assault on Palestine Libera-

tion Organization chief Yasser Arafat and his loyalists stranded in northern Lebanon. But only four days after the Moscow meeting, Syria and its Palestinian and Libyan allies resumed a bloody offensive against Arafat, overrunning two Palestinian camps and killing hundreds of Palestinian and Lebanese civilians.

Syria remains Moscow's most prized tool in winning increased Soviet influence in the Mideast through diplomatic and military means. The syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft reported Nov. 14 on a visit he had just completed to Damascus, where he interviewed Assad.

According to Kraft, Assad will make no compromises with the United States on Lebanon until Washington agrees that Moscow is a recognized party to peacemaking efforts in the Middle East—a concession Reagan cannot make under conditions of global Soviet provocations. Moscow's bid to oust PLO chief Yasser Arafat and bring the liberation movement under Syrian control is a pivotal aspect of the Soviet power play in the Middle East.

Syria is the leader of a block of outlaw states including Libya and Iran which are acting on behalf of Moscow and Moscow's neo-Nazi allies, based in Switzerland and London. This coalition aims to eliminate Arafat and turn the PLO into an arm of the same Teheran-centered Islamic terrorist movement which committed atrocities against U.S., French, and Israeli troops in Lebanon. They want to destroy the national sovereignty of the nations of the Mideast in order to impose an Ottoman imperial-style federation of tribal and ethnic entities. The Reagan White House, in contrast, has built its policy upon preserving the nations of the region, first and foremost Lebanon.

The September White House reassessment of Mideast policy appears to have come out on the side of Defense Department which advocates a balanced U.S. relationship with Israel and the moderate Arab states, Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia. Recent actions by these Arab countries suggests close coordination in a bid to isolate the Assad regime and come to the rescue of Arafat.

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has been the most vocal Arab supporter of Arafat. During his Nov. 6 speech to the Egyptian Parliament, Mubarak stressed that there could be no peace in the Middle East without a solution to the Palestinian problem. Later he told the press that without Arafat the Palestinian quest for statehood was all but dead. As the head of the oldest and the first industrialized state in the Arab world, when Mubarak defended Arafat, he was defending nationalism.

While the United States and its allies have attacked Iranian-backed terrorists in Lebanon, thus far avoiding Syrian positions, this alone is insufficient to stop the onslaught of Islamic fundamentalism against nation states. The only way to stop these fundamentalist shock troops is to bring down their command, the Khomeini dictatorship, something the Reagan White House has threatened but refrained from carrying out—with signs that one source of the counter pressure is Israel.

Within days of a White House leak that it was considering retaliation against Iran, a longtime supporter of the Khomeini dictatorship, Israeli Minister Without Portfolio Ariel Sharon, arrived in the United States to lead an Israeli campaign to steer the White House away from any effective action against Khomeini by putting the blame for the Marines atrocity solely on Syria. Sharon was acting in concert with his good friend Henry Kissinger, another Khomeini supporter, and the Swiss-based neo-Nazis who run the Muslim Brotherhood, who, as *EIR* has reported, are planning the "final solution" of the Jews using Khomeini-style Muslim fanaticism.

According to French intelligence sources, Khomeini's followers are already planning a new wave of terrorism against both the French forces in Lebanon and inside France including utilizing terrorist "kamikazes" wired with explosives to kill French President Mitterrand.

The Shi'ites in Lebanon, who at over one million comprise its largest ethnic unit, are being increasingly drawn into Khomeini's anti-Americanism, as erstwhile moderate Shi'ite leaders like Al Amal's Nabi Beri are losing power. The Shi'ite religious leader, Shiekh Shams'Edin, has announced his intention of radicalizing the 600,000 Shi'ites in south Lebanon as a massive force of resistance to continued Israeli occupation of Lebanon.

Sham'Edin is himself is not a radical, but is, as a religious leader, capable of being used by the radical Khomeini-allied Shi'ites grouped around Houssein Moussavi, the Baalbek terrorist controller. Sham'Edin told Evans and Novak on Nov. 16 that he was urging the Shi'ites in south Lebanon to "Refuse the occupation, do not communicate or normalize relations with the enemy, express your refusal every minute every day." For the first time, Shams'Edin is now holding Washington responsible for Israel's actions in Lebanon. This not only suggests further actions against Israel, which never experienced serious trouble with the Shi'ites, but also that the U.S. Marines may be subject to new terrorist attacks. Shams'Edin sent a warning to the U.S. State Department that the Shi'ites would not tolerate continued Israeli occupation. Since Nov. 1, seven Shi'ites helping form an Israeli-allied militia in south Lebanon have been frequently attacked, recently in a car bomb blast.

A Mideast diplomat reports that within hours of the French attack, a diplomat from the Beirut Iranian embassy and a representative of Moussavi's terrorist group met in Beirut to consider what kind of retaliation would be taken against France, Israel, and the United States.

On Nov. 16, the State Department made an unusual announcement that Undersecretary of State Kenneth Dam had made a courtesy call on the Iraqi Interests Section (the unofficial Iraqi embassy; the United States and Iraq have no formal relations). This follows a statement late last month by Shultz praising Iraq for the first time. Whether these are just threats to intimidate Iran, or whether the United States and France are prepared to back up Iraq and give Iran the same treatment its terrorist agents got in East Lebanon remains an open question.