

EIR Special Report

The new international terrorism

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

A new wave of international terrorism is stalking the world. It is led by a horde of mujahideen mercenaries: human flotsam, like the 1920s "rootless" veterans of World War I, cast upon the world in the wake of the 1980s Afghan war. This is the worst terrorism yet; it is much worse than that of the 1970s. It is coordinated from the capital of a former U.S. ally, London; worse yet, it was created with complicity of former U.S. Vice President (and, later, President) George Bush. It threatens you, and your family: perhaps directly, perhaps indirectly. We must mobilize to fight it, and to defeat it.

Therefore, the special problem which must be addressed by this series of **EIR** reports on the new international terrorism, is that, since persons such as Vice President George Bush, Oliver North, and numerous other U.S. and British officials, among others, were involved in helping to create it, there is a corresponding, high-level tendency, among certain authorities, to conceal key facts. The fact that the terrorism occurs, can not be hidden—not usually; what is covered up, is the fact that terrorism has a "mother," and also, occasionally, an "uncle."

Some readers will remember, that back during the 1970s, **EIR** performed a similar function against the international terrorism of that period. As in the 1989 myth, that Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen had been murdered by the (actually non-existent) Baader-Meinhof gang: Then, during the 1970s and 1980s, as now, official agencies preferred to evade the fact, that there were certain very influential agencies behind terrorist actions. Now, as then, few official intelligence and law-enforcement agencies, so far, have found the political courage to address the roots of the problem. Today, the fear, among relevant intelligence and law-enforcement agencies, of exposing a Thatcher government, or a "power-broker" such as George Bush, leaves it to private agencies, such as **EIR**, to fill the gap.

Directly to the point: As we have said, the heart of the new international terrorism is a legion of trained terrorists, formerly known as the mujahideen veterans of the 1980s Afghan war, which Vice President Bush and the British



George Bush and Margaret Thatcher at the White House, August 1990. Bush and Thatcher played a leading part in creating, arming, and deploying the mujahideen veterans of the war in Afghanistan, who have now emerged as the core of a new terrorist capability worldwide.

Thatcher government played a leading part in creating, arming, and deploying. Once the Soviet forces had retreated from Afghanistan, the Anglo-American-sponsored mujahideen, together with their massive drug- and arms-trafficking apparatus, were dumped on the world, a legion of “special forces”-trained mercenaries, for hire.

Today, that legion of mercenaries is a keystone-element within a new international terrorism, which reaches westward across Eurasia, from Japan, coordinated through a nest of terrorist-group command-centers in London, into the Americas, from Canada down to the tip of South America. During this month and next, **EIR** will provide two Special Reports on this new international terrorism, exposing the key organizations, and how they are interconnected.

In this present, first, report, we concentrate upon the keystone role of the mujahideen veterans of the Thatcher-Bush Afghan war. We show how these mujahideen are functionally integrated with every London-coordinated group operating currently in, and out of South Asia. In the coming, second part of our report, **EIR** will focus upon the principal London-coordinated terrorist networks currently operating in the Americas. This latter element features another leftover from the days of former Vice President Bush’s so-called “Iran-Contra” drug-and-weapons rampage. In the second report, the key is a London-based **Revolutionary Communist Party** and its ally, the London-directed, Fidel Castro-led terrorist army known as **The Forum of São Paulo**.

‘Ethnicity’: the key to terrorism

In the following sections of this first report, we present some methods to aid the professional and laymen, alike, in mapping and tracking this terrorist menace. Tracking the terrorists by that method, **EIR** shows that 1990s South Asia terrorism is linked to the terrorism of earlier decades through the network of international drug- and weapons-trafficking connections which is pivoted upon a triad of **Pol Pot’s Khmer Rouge, the Sri Lanka “Tigers” (LTTE)**, and sundry facets of the Pakistan-centered Afghan veterans’ mujahideen. This drug- and weapons-trafficking triad, is a keystone for armed irregular-warfare activities among a large assortment of so-called “ethnic minorities,” all coordinated presently from London, which have been manipulated by British intelligence, continuously, over a period of between 150 and more than 200 years to date. That is the core of what we present, in this issue, as the South Asia component of the present wave of international terrorism.

The South Asia accumulation of so-called “ethnic and religious minorities,” is centered along the southern political borders of China (and, extending into Tibet and Sinkiang), from northern Laos, westward, through Kashmir and Pakistan, into Algeria’s anti-Islamic Salvation Front GIA terrorism, and beyond. The connections are not limited to that westward band of “ethnic and religious minorities,” but that band represents the hard core of the phenomenon.

London’s strategic use of “ethnicity” and religious sects, is not limited to South Asia. The activation of these long-

standing assets, is key to all British long-term strategy in the Americas, Eurasia, and Africa, during the past 20 years. It is the basis for the British monarchy's genocide campaign against Rwanda and Burundi, and London's current efforts to bring about the total destruction of Nigeria and Sudan. It is also an integral component of London's strategic orientation toward the intended dissolution of Canada, of the United States, and of every presently existing nation of Central and South America. *Ethnicity*, whether in the foreign-directed insurgency within Mexico's federal state of Chiapas, Africa, and Eurasia, or the ongoing destruction of Australia, is the theme of the new, massive wave of international terrorism which London offices are directing today.

Look at British geopolitical strategy for Eurasia, and the way in which London's South Asia terrorism operations are deployed in support of that Eurasian strategy.

First, for the benefit of those who are unfamiliar with the key facts, "Britain" or "British," as used here, does not mean institutions of self-government representing the population of the United Kingdom. England under King Henry VII was an emerging modern nation-state, modelled upon King Louis XI's success in creating the first modern nation-state in France; with the accession of James I to the English throne, in 1603, England ceased to be a nation, and became instead a virtual mere plantation, a virtual colony of an international, Anglo-Dutch financial oligarchy, which, today, controls the marketing of the largest portion of those raw materials on which the world's population depends for its existence. "British," as used in this report, signifies a collection of several thousand either very rich, or otherwise powerful persons, from many nations, who herd around those British and Dutch monarchies, used, as were Venetian doges of old, as rallying-places for coming together to exert their global, imperial power.

Think of Royal Dutch Shell, ITT, Rio Tinto Zinc, or global British press-empires of Lord Beaverbrook's heirs, such as Rupert Murdoch or the Clinton-haters of the Canada-based Hollinger Corporation. Think of the network of British-controlled intelligence organizations, radiating from the Chatham House for which the treasonous Sir Henry A. Kissinger has worked the past 45 years, or the fascistic swamp-creatures of Mont Pelerin Society conservatives, such as the U.S. Heritage Foundation and Prof. Milton Friedman's acolytes. It is those agencies, like Hollywood "body-snatchers from outer space," who employ the British Isles as their breeding place. That typifies the functional meaning of the term "British Empire" in the strategist's, or anti-terrorist specialist's lexicon.

That use of the term "empire," references the example of the control still exerted by the rotting Byzantine Empire even during the process of its dismemberment, during the centuries prior to Venice's "Fourth Crusade" creation, the Latin Kingdom. *That* British imperialism, formerly the world's leading maritime power, is still the world's leading financial imperium. Still, today, through its far-flung intelligence net-

work, and through its corrupting cultural influence upon former colonies, and even the United States itself, London, together with Oxford and Cambridge, exerts a malignant Byzantine quality of influence over the destiny of the planet as a whole.

A Paris boulevard publication, the famous **Paris Match**, recently described the British population as "half-wits."¹ The mouth of Lord William Rees-Mogg, Newt Gingrich booster, former London **Times** editor, and U.S. President Clinton's most tenaciously hateful enemy, has become the world's largest open sewer-pipe of demented ravings on a large array of topics. Rees-Mogg, for years the official "Josef Goebbels" of the British oligarchical mob, echoes the Yahoo-like intellectual qualities which are presently characteristic of the leading British families whom he has so long represented.² Nonetheless, whether allegedly half-witted, plausibly demented, or not, those decaying oligarchical relics are still very dangerous. It is that monstrously decadent, but still very poisonous British, Byzantine-like, imperial influence, which is the guiding hand behind the deployment of the new terrorist wave we are considering here. It is the current strategic doctrine of that Byzantine agency, which must be understood, to define and to defeat the new international terrorist threat.

When the British (as we have defined them here) speak of their strategy, their foreign policy, the two most indicative code-words are "geopolitics" and "balance of power." "Balance of power" is the favorite gutterance in Sir Henry A. Kissinger's *obiter dicta*. "Balance of power" is the term former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher uttered during a relevant recent broom-stop in South Asia. Current British balance-of-power doctrine for Eurasia as a whole, is summed up as follows.

The crux of world strategy today, is the prospect of cooperation among nations grouped around Moscow, Delhi, and Beijing, for the purpose of fostering the general economic renaissance of Eurasia. This economic boom is sought through a network of large-scale infrastructural projects which link the potential technological powerhouses of a revived European economy to the great concentrations of the world's population on the coasts of the Pacific and Indian oceans. This network of infrastructure development is termed, in policy shorthand, "the Eurasia Land-bridge."

The idea of creating such a railway-corridor-based land-bridge, was first put afoot during the 1890s, by such notable figures as France's Gabriel Hanotaux, Germany's Wilhelm von Siemens, and Russia's Count Sergei Witte.³ To prevent

1. Sabine Cayrol, "Nous n'avons même pas à leur répondre. Une semaine à Londres et on a compris: ils sont vraiment 'crazy,'" **Paris Match**, cited in the *Daily Telegraph*, Sept. 1, 1995.

2. Scott Thompson, "His British Lordship Spills the Beans," **EIR**, Feb. 17, 1995, pp. 37-40.

3. Dana S. Scanlon, "The Defeat of Hanotaux and the Coming of the Entente Cordiale with London," **EIR**, March 24, 1995. William Jones, "A Continental League for Eurasian Development," **EIR**, March 24, 1995.

this, Britain, then led by the Prince of Wales who became King Edward VII, launched a series of ventures which put the partners of the mid-1890s—France, Germany, and Russia—at one another's throats; the result was known as World War I.⁴

In 1933, out of fear that Weimar Germany might enter into economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, British interests, including the Prescott Bush who was the father of U.S. President George Bush, put Nazi Adolf Hitler into power in Germany, and aided Hitler into 1938, to ensure that a devastating war erupted to ruin both Germany and Russia once and for all.⁵

During October-November 1989, the government of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher responded to the crumbling of the "Wall" between eastern and western Europe, by declaring virtual war on Germany. The screeching Mrs. Thatcher's expressed fear, was that a reunified German economy, would turn its development potential eastward. "Fourth Reich!" Thatcher's minions shrieked! Thatcher acted with her lackey's, President George Bush's, support, to prevent the economic reconstruction of former East Germany. To the same purpose, Mrs. Thatcher's Britain, supported by President Bush, launched the effort to turn the former Soviet Union into an economic wasteland, a raw-materials-exporting, "Third World" region, which could never again become a part of a Eurasian challenge to London's imperial interests.

So, since October-November 1989, London's greatest fear has continued to be, that continental western Europe might enter into a Eurasian economic development program, from the Atlantic, to the Pacific and Indian oceans. Since the defeat of Mrs. Thatcher's stooge, President George Bush, in November 1992, London's fear has been that the United States might support a policy of Eurasian economic-development cooperation among nations grouped around Germany, Russia, and China. Now, since the election of France's President Jacques Chirac, the British oligarchy has reacted like a school of sharks in a feeding frenzy, with threats against the Presidents of both the United States and France, and with accelerated efforts to drown the world in the new wave of mujahideen-centered international terrorism.

What Baroness Thatcher's "balance of power" utterance signifies for all Asia, is the following. Britain is currently committed, by ongoing actions, to the disintegration of Pakistan, India, and China. The mechanisms currently in play to this effect are centered around the intent to utilize a London-orchestrated balance-of-power conflict between India and Pakistan, over Kashmir issues, as a lever for prompting the degree of balance-of-power conflict between Delhi and

4. Webster G. Tarpley, "London Sets the Stage for a New Triple Entente," and "King Edward VII: Evil Demiurge of the Triple Entente and World War I," *EIR*, March 24, 1995.

5. Webster Griffin Tarpley and Anton Chaitkin, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1992), pp. 26-44.

Baroness Margaret Thatcher, during a visit to India in August 1995, pronounced her desire that U.S. foreign policy be governed by "the balance of power." This "is only new," she said, "because during the Cold War years, it was placed in cold storage. As a result we are inclined to forget that in principle it is a force for cooperation and not just for conflict. For example, in relations between Japan, China, Russia, and India, the operation of a balance of power should ensure that there is some check on what otherwise might turn out to be serious threats to other countries' interests. It is also vital that the United States remain engaged in the Pacific as a crucial balancing force. Similarly, within Europe a balance of power should be encouraged to check the power of a united Germany."

Beijing wanted to foster the crumbling of China's Tibet and Sinkiang regions. The internal dynamic of this overall game, is London's deployment of its terrorist-linked "ethnic" assets, to foster the internal dismemberment of both India and Pakistan, while employing the same "ethnicity games" to catalyze the conflict among India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and China. The mujahideen veterans are the key to the quality of effectiveness of the sundry, interlinked "ethnic" assets which London offices are deploying.

London's target: the nation-state

"Gentlemen: I must inform you, that our unsinkable ship, the *Titanic*, is sinking. While you were gambling in the ship's Mont Pelerin casino, the owners boarded all the ship's available lifeboats, and have departed. I suggest you make your arrangements accordingly, and quickly."

The exact date this "*Titanic*" will sink is uncertain. It could be next week, a few weeks downwind, or months ahead. The only outcome which is certain, is that it will go under soon. The ship in question is the world's present monetary and financial system. The "owners," by which one signifies the international financier oligarchical families, have, in point of fact, already taken to the lifeboats: They have left the doomed stock markets of the world, taking flight in their investments in precious metals, strategic minerals, fossil fuel resources, and shrinking world food supplies. Governments might stabilize the situation, by putting the Federal Reserve System and other central banking systems into government-controlled receivership; if governments lack the courage to do that, the whole system, monetary systems, financial institutions, and the negotiability of money itself, will simply disintegrate, and that at a time not far distant.

The kernel of the international oligarchy agrees with that picture of the present world financial situation. They have expressed their agreement, as did London's Sir Jimmy Goldsmith some time past, by taking to the lifeboats, getting off

In this Special Report

This report is divided into two principal sections, following Mr. LaRouche's introduction: first, an overview of "London's afghansi," and second, a case study of South Asian terrorism. Both sections are built around maps showing the theaters of operation of the terrorists, the routes of their weapons traffic, and their drug smuggling. We demonstrate that the new terrorism can be traced directly to the veterans of the Afghan War, the mujahideen, who have now turned up all around the world, financed mainly by drug money, as a mercenary army for hire. They intersect a host of ethnic terrorist organizations, all of which have headquarters in London.

Section I, beginning on p. 9, shows how the United States fell into a geopolitical trap, prepared by the British, in Afghanistan. We expose the controllers of the mujahideen from London and the United States—including from the U.S. Congress. Finally, we present profiles of some of the most important afghansi groups and their international collaborators in Algeria and the Philippines.

Section II, beginning on p. 37, focusses on terrorism and ethnic insurgency in India, with detailed profiles of the most important groups and who controls them.

the British economic ship before it sank. The fact that the world as it has existed for all this past century, is now about to go out of existence, contributes a significant margin of added energy of desperation to every leading potential and actual crisis throughout the world. That consideration is key to the hysteria expressed by the antic Lord William Rees-Mogg, and to the vast scale and intensity with which the new wave of international terrorism is being deployed.

The question posed implicitly to every member of the Anglo-Dutch-led international financial oligarchy, is whether the oligarchy itself is going to survive, or not. Will the oligarchy outlive the obliteration of its own present, worldwide monetary and financial system? Clearly, in running out of speculation in financial paper, into physical possession of the most vital raw materials, the oligarchy has shown its determination to outlive the general extermination of money, banks, and stock markets. One might ask, therefore: What more does the oligarchy have to fear than that? The answer to that question is: the modern form of nation-state republic; to understand the oligarchy's fear on that account, one need but conjure up the name of U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton.

Could a nation-state outlive the collapse of a worldwide monetary and financial system? The brilliantly successful revival of what appeared to be a hopelessly bankrupt, March

1789 U.S.A., under the leadership of President George Washington and his Treasury Secretary, Hamilton, is living historical proof that a nation-state following the same anti-British principles as did Washington and Hamilton, could survive quite nicely. To bring this about today, several principled measures are indispensable:

1. Put the old bankrupt monetary and financial systems into receivership, and reorganization in bankruptcy, by the relevant national government.

2. Create immediately a new supplementary issue of national currency, in the form of negotiable currency-notes of the public treasury, and put those notes into circulation through selective measures of lending for capital improvements in physical production and basic economic infrastructure.

3. Create a national bank, as both an agency of deposit for the national government, and as a primary lender of government issues of currency-note credit for productive investment.

4. Use the power of the state to launch a range of productive and infrastructural investments sufficient to bring about rapid expansion of productive employment up to a prescribed "full employment" level.

5. Enter into protectionist forms of tariff and trade agreements, both to protect national productive investments (and employment), and to foster an expansion of mutually beneficial hard-commodity trade among nations.

The enactment of such emergency measures by a strategically decisive aggregation of nation-states, means an end to the power of that pack of parasites which has ruled the modern world too long, the Anglo-Dutch-centered international financier oligarchy. Such measures are the only means by which existing nation-states could survive a collapse of the severity now in progress. Governments which would, ordinarily, lack the political courage to undertake such reform measures, are being challenged by the kind of onrushing collapse which would tend to impel even the most timorous regime into bold recovery measures. Hence, the oligarchy is at the extremes of hysteria, in its determination to destroy existing nation-states, especially the United States of America, before the point is reached that such recovery measures might be forced onto the table for immediate action.

That hysteria is key to the way in which London-centered forces are pushing for Quebec separatism now: to use that as the first of a series of chain-reaction developments intended to bring about the weakening, and de-centralizing, and early dissolution of the U.S.A.—among other existing nation-states. That is why London's terrorist and other assets are being used in the effort to destroy the present governments of Sudan, Kenya, and Nigeria, as London has already unleashed its genocide against Rwanda and Burundi. This is the consideration underlying the unleashing of ethnicity-accented international terrorism within South Asia and the border-areas of China.