

British pawprints on Oklahoma bombing

Lyndon LaRouche had the following comments on the weekly radio program "EIR Talks" on April 27.

EIR: What do you see as the critical elements in analyzing the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma?

LaRouche: First, one must take all the sociologists and put them in a zoo someplace, and don't let the press interview them, because the idea of looking for the motivation of "some poor schnook," as we would say in Brooklyn, who actually may have been involved in the incident, is the most stupid kind of investigation in the world. The characteristic of all terrorist acts is that some poor dupe is manipulated on some pretext into doing something which has nothing to do with the motivation in the mind of the person who does the manipulating.

What we're looking for here, in a fairly sophisticated type of terrorism which was not seen in the pre-1989 period, that is, not seen in practice, is obviously some large agency which is conducting similar or related acts of terrorism throughout the world. And therefore, we're not looking at "some poor schnook," or some militia, this or that. We're looking at trying to find out who's behind it.

EIR: The *Strategic Investment* newsletter of British Lord William Rees-Mogg about a month and a half ago had a scenario involving the militias and U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno. How does that fit in?

LaRouche: The problem is that all of the capabilities involved, seem to be a continuation of the same group of people who organize the motivation of assassination threats against the President from Britain, and Lord Rees-Mogg; Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the *Telegraph* correspondent in Washington; James Adams, all these kinds of characters, going through the *American Spectator*, and so forth, using Larry Nichols, this guy who was tied in with George Bush in drug-running operations . . . all seems to be the same sort of thing, with the same motivation, the same profile.

Remember, the militias were started by George Bush, essentially, under his Presidency, as a concomitant feature of launching of the Persian Gulf war in 1990-91. And so, they do have a kind of a pedigree. They also have a political pedigree, along with some of the other funny right-wing groups which are on the Bush league side of the neo-conservatives, of trying to destroy the United States through privatization, decentralization, destroying the federal govern-

ment, which conforms to a plan which is sometimes called the "Nine Nations of North America." They are, in profile and in ideology, at least from the top down, dominated by something coming out of Britain. . . .

You have a notorious fellow by the name of Liebman who's got quite a track record, and this fellow was used by Rees-Mogg and company, to spread the report that the militias were going to be targeted for a Waco-style operation by the FBI, or words to that effect. That was the Davidson report. This was seen to drive everybody crazy; this made no sense, there was no track of such an operation. It was just through this Liebman connection via Rees-Mogg, Davidson, and so forth.

However, later, when the terrorism incident occurred in Oklahoma City, then people played back to that, and said that because of that report which had been circulated by Rees-Mogg, that some desperadoes in the militia or related environment, had suddenly taken to the hills, pulled out big explosives and blown up the Oklahoma federal office. This was their dirty role.

So obviously, the British played a crucial part *before the fact* in creating the pretext which the British exploited *after the fact* to try to explain the provocation authorship of this terrorist incident. This is typical sociology. They all want to say: "Here's the motive of the group for doing it," as if the big motives for this act were anywhere but London.

We cannot yet prove that the British monarchy, as typified by the faction of the monarchy which is associated with Rees-Mogg, directly deployed a terrorist act of a type which did not exist prior to last year anywhere in the world, but which has been on the British books of the Tavistock Institute et al. for years. And that the British deployed it, in the same general Tavistock mode that the British monarchy created the Mau Mau in Kenya through their influence over people like Jomo Kenyatta. And then, once Kenyatta and others had deployed the Mau Mau, a British-designed operation, then the British sent in Kitson and others, with South Africans and what-not, as Kitson describes in his book, to set up a counter-Mau Mau to drive the Mau Mau crazy and into corners, and then the British Army cleaned them up.

What you had in this case, was a Mau Mau/counter-Mau Mau operation, in which both sides of the operation are set up by the British, using a British-designed type of terrorism, in a very sophisticated application. And then saying that a couple of "Jomos" came out there with a big pile of ammonium nitrite and oil, and somehow just violently, madly, whatever, did this act—that's a bunch of bunk.

The point is that you've got the British pawmarks all over this place, Rees-Mogg's pawmarks; and even the people they claim were assets of the terrorist operation, are their own assets, that is, part of the Evans-Pritchard following, pro-Bush league, anti-Clinton crowd. The thing stinks up and down, and the obvious suspects are within the British monarchy-oligarchy.