

**Dec. 7:** The Belgian **Communist Combatant Cells** blow up two pylons supporting telecommunications aeriels close to an air base near Liege, Belgium. The CCC staged five bombings in October against industrial and political targets.

**Dec. 11:** A NATO oil pipeline in Belgium is blown up in five different locations, responsibility claimed by the Belgian **Communist Combat Cells**. The pipeline is the NATO emergency line designed to supply the German front in wartime.

#### 'Denial of ground'

**Oct. 24:** Colombian Air Force plane is attacked by an armed narco-terrorist plane and damaged; no casualties. Col. Orlando Pena announces operation to burn more than one million coca plants.

**Nov. 4:** Peruvian **Shining Path** (Sendero Luminoso) terrorists dressed in military uniforms attempt to blow up transmission towers of the TV stations and microwave antennae of EntelPeru. This would have cut Lima off from outside communication.

**Nov. 5:** **Shining Path** carries out synchronized nighttime attack which cuts power to eight cities in Peru. Three electricity poles are downed, cutting power to eight provinces, including the capital. Bomb is set off outside the economics ministry in Lima; policeman and youth killed, at least 40 injured. The key remaining bridge between Ayacucho and Huanta is blown up, derailing a train. Interior Minister Oscar Brush Noel says: "The fight is not against a native group. Rather, the armed forces are confronting an international conspiracy against the Peruvian democracy."

**Nov. 7:** **Shining Path** launches attacks in three separate districts of the central department of Huanuco, killing six persons, among them a governor, three lieutenant governors, and the president of a peasant community.

**Nov. 10:** The Venezuelan press reveals that the government has proof of meetings between Colombia's M-19 terrorists and a Venezuelan terrorist group, presumably Bandera Roja.

**Nov. 19:** Cocaine traffickers in Peru murder 17 workers in a U.S.-financed program to destroy coca crops.

**Nov. 25:** A Somalian airliner is hijacked to Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, by anti-Somalian rebels. Evidence indicates the hijackers were supported by the pro-Soviet government of Ethiopia and by Qaddafi's Libya. The hijackers are eventually given asylum in Libya.

**Dec. 3:** Sri Lankan government clashes with Tamil separatist guerrillas. North Korean involvement with the Tamil rebels is considered likely.

## The U.S. policy fight over Kuwait hijack

by Paul Goldstein

There is no doubt that the Dec. 4 hijacking of a Kuwaiti airliner and killing of two American diplomats aboard were the work of a murderous gang of fanatic Muslim fundamentalists tied to the Iranian regime of Ayatollah Khomeini. However, the cooperation of the Khomeini government in aiding and abetting the hijacking is only the surface of the operation. Whatever U.S. State Department officials are stating about this situation must be suspect, even though two of their officers were killed, for it has been the consistent policy of the State Department not only to covertly support the Khomeini regime, but to ensure that the real opposition to the mad ayatollah is never allowed to efficiently operate against the fundamentalists.

Moreover, U.S. intelligence and counterterror experts are gravely miscalculating the nature of Muslim fundamentalist terror, based on a whole set of false assumptions about who controls terrorism and what policy direction must be taken to combat it. Rather than judging the present terrorist onslaught from the strategic standpoint of who benefits—which leads the analyst directly to Soviet Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov and the KGB—Secretary of State George Shultz is using his so-called hardline approach to terrorism as a means of shoring up his political position vis-à-vis the White House. Behind Shultz's grand gestures and vague demands for "pre-emptive or retaliatory" strikes against unspecified "state-sponsored terrorism," there is no coherent analysis. The KGB's role is conveniently obscured.

Look at the crucial components of the hijacking:

First, the majority of the hijackers were members of the Al Dawa group, the Islamic fundamentalist opposition to the Iraqi government of Saddam Hussein, based in Teheran and led by a fanatic named Hakim. Members of this organization have been in a Kuwaiti prison since the kamikaze attack against the U.S. embassy in Kuwait last spring. The current hijacking was ostensibly staged to get 17 members of the group released. The history of this groups dates back to World War II, when the Abwehr (German military intelligence) supported the Al Dawa against the British occupation of Iraq. Practically all key Abwehr intelligence operations were picked up by either British or Russian intelligence

following the war.

Second, members of the Lebanese Shi'ite militia were in on the operation. This is the same group involved in the April 1983 attack on the U.S. embassy in Beirut and the October 1983 murder of 241 U.S. Marines. This group has been interfaced with Khomeini's intelligence service, Savama, through individuals such as Ayatollah Khoinié who have been trained at the KGB's Oriental Institute in Tashkent or the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow. Many of the Revolutionary Guards of Khomeini's regime were similarly trained.

Third, members of the Palestinian terrorist organization of Abu Nidal, which formally had its headquarters in Baghdad and Damascus, were expelled from Iraq as part of the arrangement to reestablish U.S.-Iraqi relations. At least two or three members of their organization were involved in the hijacking, and about 300 members are floating around Europe and the Mideast, an assassination time bomb ready to explode. According to a European intelligence source, only as recently as Nov. 27, members of the Abu Nidal group were involved in the attempt to blow up the U.S. embassy in Rome. It must be emphasized that the Abu Nidal organization had been in the main controlled by Syrian intelligence, which has strong KGB links. Up until their expulsion from Baghdad, certain Iraqi intelligence factions sought to use Abu Nidal against their opponents. In nearly every assassination carried out by this organization, including the murder of PLO moderate leader Issam Sartawi, the forces to benefit were those opposed to the Reagan-Weinberger peace plan for the Mideast, which sought cooperation with moderate Arab forces. In every case, it is the Soviet KGB which stands to gain.

No Khomeiniac group of Islamic fanatics is capable of carrying out such a sophisticated and coordinated operation. Even the "Islamintern" apparatus set up in the summer of 1983 has neither the logistical infrastructure nor the operational training, despite the presence of North Korean kamikaze trainers in Iran, to conduct such an operation. Only a Soviet Shi'ite, top KGB official, and Politburo member like Geidar Aliyev and his special Islamic bureau could have concocted and planned this operation, which serves as an integral part of the Ogarkov Plan for defeat of the United States and the West.

### **The 'New Yalta' strategy**

The Russian imperialists calculate that if Washington cannot be coaxed into giving up its strategic position in the Mideast, Persian Gulf, and Asia through Russian diplomacy—with the help of the Socialist International governments of France's François Mitterrand and Greece's Andreas Papanandreu—then the United States must be "pin-pricked" by surrogate terrorism into acquiescing to a "New Yalta" division of the world into imperial spheres of influence. And if this deal is not accepted, and given the fact that the United

States is moving in the direction of a new strategic doctrine as outlined by President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative and underscored by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's operational military doctrine, then the Russians might launch a preemptive military strike.

This is the key to understanding the difference of approach between Shultz and Weinberger on the issue of terrorism. Shultz's approach is being determined by a factional move by pro-Kissinger forces inside the Reagan administration—the advocates of such a "New Yalta" deal with Moscow—to gain dominance in foreign policy overall. According to U.S. intelligence sources, Shultz is demanding total control of anti-terrorist operations. This move is aimed at deploying U.S. forces in the same ill-conceived manner as the deployment of the U.S. Marines in Lebanon, which Weinberger and the DOD opposed.

Not only do Shultz's grand-standing statements on terrorism obfuscate the KGB control and facilitation of international terrorism. The State Department's policy has the effect of blinding U.S. intelligence capabilities in the region, while also blocking Weinberger's bid to cooperate with moderate Arab forces. Moreover, supported by proposals from a recent Anglo-Israeli-sponsored conference on combating terrorism held under the auspices of the Jonathan Institute in Tel Aviv, Shultz and strongly pro-Israeli elements of the Reagan administration and inside U.S. intelligence want to use the Mossad rather than U.S. counterterror forces. They argue that Israel has "more experience" in dealing with this issue and that there is a popular consensus inside Israel for conducting these operations, whereas in the United States, both Congress and the population at large abhor using "dirty means" to stop terrorism.

Contrary to Shultz, Weinberger advocates not using military force when there is an undefined objective militarily. The notion of "limited wars" is not acceptable according to this doctrine, and diplomacy based upon using the military as a pawn in a diplomatic maneuver will not be tolerated (see Weinberger's Nov. 28 speech to the National Press Club, excerpted in the Dec. 18 issue of *EIR*). Weinberger's conception of a U.S. anti-terrorist policy is based upon doing what is necessary without "publicly announcing beforehand" in some grand dramatic "diplomatic gesture" what the United States will do. The Pentagon and U.S. intelligence have set up a Joint Special Operations Program under the direction of Weinberger for such a quiet yet effective operation. Assistant Secretary of Defense Noel Koch is running the day-to-day operational capabilities of this program.

One final point: Given this situation, is it not possible that the Russian embassy in Kuwait facilitated the takeover of the Kuwaiti airliner at the very time that Weinberger was on a trip to the Mideast, in an effort to demonstrate to the Arabs that the United States has no credibility as a "superpower"? And does not Shultz's so-called hardline complement this KGB operation?