

Balkans of southeastern Europe; not only are its political entities unstable, but they tempt and invite the intrusion of more powerful neighbors, each of whom is determined to oppose the region's domination by another."

Brzezinski concluded his war mantra: "The Eurasian Balkans . . . are of importance from the standpoint of security and historical ambitions to at least three of their most immediate and more powerful neighbors, namely, Russia, Turkey, and Iran, with China also signaling an increasing political interest in the region. But the Eurasian Balkans are infinitely more important as a potential economic prize: an enormous concentration of natural gas and oil reserves is located in the region, in addition to important minerals, including gold. . . . An independent, Turkic-speaking Azerbaijan, with pipelines running from it to the ethnically related and politically supportive Turkey, would prevent Russia from exercising a monopoly on access to the region and would thus also deprive Russia of decisive political leverage over the politics of the new Central Asian states."

While spouting his typical geopolitical filth, Brzezinski also betrayed the underlying motive for his latest drive to

destroy Russia, in concluding chapters of *The Grand Chessboard*: to prevent the realization of LaRouche's Eurasian Land-Bridge.

"Potentially," he wrote, "the most dangerous scenario would be a grand coalition of China, Russia, and perhaps Iran, an 'anti-hegemonic coalition' united not by ideology but by complementary grievances. It would be reminiscent in scale and scope of the challenge posed by the Sino-Soviet bloc, though this time China would likely be the leader and Russia the follower. Averting this contingency, however remote it may be, will require a display of U.S. geostrategic skill on the western, eastern, and southern perimeters of Eurasia simultaneously."

It was precisely this insane, imperial geopolitical outlook that Russian President Putin denounced, when he spoke in Germany in recent days, about the need to bring to an end—once and for all—the mentality and the actions of the disastrous Cold War era, actions that are typified by Brzezinski and Kissinger's geopolitical rantings, and by the "Clash of Civilizations" response, advocated by Kissinger, Brzezinski, and Huntington, to the events of Sept. 11.

Why The Real Name Is 'Osama bin London'

by Michele Steinberg

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak was asked by the Sept. 22 issue of the French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, why he said that London is "the greatest base of terrorism in Europe." Mubarak revealed that warnings that he personally, and his government's intelligence services, had delivered to Britain and the United States, about their harboring known terrorist groups and individuals, had gone unheeded. Mubarak said, "I had warned [then Prime Minister] John Major, who didn't listen to me. I repeated it this week to the BBC, when they asked me questions about people to whom Great Britain granted asylum. I sent a message to [Prime Minister] Tony Blair recommending he be cautious."

When the *Le Figaro* interview turned to the United States and the 1993 World Trade Center bombing by networks associated with Sheikh Abdul Omar Rahman—who was a fugitive from Egyptian justice—Mubarak said, "The Americans accepted [Rahman] because he had assisted them in the fight against the Soviet invader [in Afghanistan]. I had warned them that they could not trust such an individual. They asked

me: 'Do you want us to send him back to you?' I answered them: 'Are you joking! Keep him in your country, I don't need him. But one day he will make you pay dearly for your hospitality.' Three months before the bombing . . . Rahman was still the good friend of the Americans."

During British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw's visit to Iran the same week, London's *Daily Telegraph* acknowledged that Iranians blame Britain for terrorism and irregular warfare in their country, and even suspect some British institution's hand behind the networks involved in the Sept. 11 disasters in the United States.

For the readers of *EIR*, the statements by Mubarak are not new. On Jan. 11, 2000, *EIR*'s editors prepared a memorandum for Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called "Put Britain On The List of States Sponsoring Terrorism," using the information provided by Egypt, and nine other nations—Israel, France, Algeria, Peru, Turkey, Germany, Libya, Nigeria, Yemen, Russia, and India. The memo documented their protests to Britain over London's giving asylum, funding, and free rein to terrorist recruitment, fundraising, and training. The memorandum was delivered to top U.S. officials of the Defense Department, Justice Department, the FBI, the CIA, and both Houses of Congress. Had the lengthy dossier been taken seriously, and had the warnings of *EIR* and its founder, Lyndon LaRouche, been heeded then, the tragedy of Sept. 11, 2001 might have been averted.

But of great concern, is that the evidence pointing to London, and from there to the rogue elements of the Anglo-American-Israeli geopolitical interests, not be ignored this time.

Roads Lead To London

The Sept. 22 interview by President Mubarak turned out to be only one of several revelations about London in the ongoing investigation into the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, where more than 6,500 people died.

In the week before Mubarak's interview, reports began to surface that British centers were also used for major financial transactions suspected of having links to the attacks. According to highly placed U.S. law enforcement sources, a series of highly suspicious large speculative transactions had been tracked to dummy accounts in three of Britain's offshore centers: the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands of Jersey and Guernsey. Investigators from the U.S. National Security Agency and Financial Intelligence Center (Fincen), along with the Interpol and its European branch, Europol, and Russian security agencies, have been working with a high degree of coordination, said these law enforcement sources, to crack the mystery of whether there was "insider trading" against airline and insurance industry stocks in the days preceding the Sept. 11 attacks. Few details have emerged publicly about these transactions, but as a result of the attacks of Sept. 11, the speculators made a financial killing, as airline stocks fell drastically when the U.S. stock exchanges reopened on Sept. 17 in New York, and the insurance industry stocks also declined, in anticipation of more than \$50 billion in insurance claims from the New York attacks alone.

On Sept. 23, the *Washington Post* reported that these suspicious transactions had been discussed at the meeting of European finance ministers and central bankers in Liège, Belgium, on the subject of the next stage of the euro currency. The *Post* reported that Ernst Welteke, president of Germany's Bundesbank, had told a meeting of European finance ministers and central bankers that some transactions in sales of shares in airlines and insurance companies, along with major trades in gold and oil, led investigators to hypothesize that "people connected to the terrorists must have been trying to profit from this tragedy."

According to Washington sources familiar with the Fincen investigation, the high degree of sophistication of the money-laundering operations traced to the British centers has again poked large holes in the idea that the Sept. 11 attacks were the work of Osama bin Laden. The complexity seen in the financial side of the operations, supplements what *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized since Sept. 11: that the great sophistication in the hijacking operation required high-level complicity from rogue elements inside the United States.

EIR has documented since 1996, when bin Laden first emerged as the international news media's new "Carlos the Jackal," that the name bin Laden has simply been a code-word for "Islamic terrorism" in order to justify attacks on Arab and Muslim countries, such as the unjustified bombing of Sudan in August 1998 after the attacks on U.S. Embassies

in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar-Es-Salaam, Tanzania. Islamic countries have been branded, since as early as the late 1970s by Zbigniew Brzezinski, then National Security Adviser to President Jimmy Carter, as an "Arc of Crisis." After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the British-American-Israeli geopolitical crazies of the Brzezinski school went even a step further, with the "clash of civilizations" thesis of Brzezinski protégé Samuel Huntington, who wrote that in the post-Communist world, all new conflicts would be centered around religious and ethnic differences.

New Leads Open

Despite the *refusal* of official U.S. agencies to name London as a major problem, its role as a terrorist base is so central, that even the false trails, confusing tips, and fake identities have led to Britain. The following leads have already emerged; and to ignore them would constitute a breach of security which endangers lives throughout the world:

- On Sept. 26, the *Times* of London reported that "11 of the hijackers who took part in the attacks in America stayed in Britain this year before going on their suicide mission." Of these 11, says the *Times*, 3 each were on the two aircraft that hit the World Trade Center, and on the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania, and 2 were on the plane that crashed into the Pentagon. At least 4 of the 11 names were "experienced fighters who had fought in Chechnya" against the Russian government. On Sept. 18, the *Daily Mail*, another major British newspaper, reported that the FBI had turned over to Scotland Yard the names of five people that the United States says were among the Sept. 11 hijackers. "Britain has been a base for some years for the co-ordination of operations linked to bin Laden," writes the *Daily Mail*, adding that "previous suicide bombings have been linked through London."

One major problem, however, is that the *identities* themselves of the so-called "19 hijackers" that the FBI and U.S. Justice Department have come up with are *false trails* (see box). A well-placed Washington intelligence source told *EIR* that Saudi and other warnings, that at least 7 of the 19 names put out by the FBI are erroneous, point again to the sophistication of the Sept. 11 attack network. In several cases, the individuals established their false identities more than a year before the attack. "It was a very sophisticated and coordinated shift of identities," the source said, that goes "way beyond the prowess of the so-called Al Qaeda, or bin Laden organization." But despite these contradictions and inconsistencies, whoever was using the identities that the FBI claims appeared on the passenger manifests, had been based in Britain.

- The Sept. 9 attack that fatally wounded Afghanistan's opposition leader Ahmed Shah Massoud, head of the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance, was planned in London. Massoud died at most a few days later—there were conflicting reports and denials—but the attack was only two days before the strikes against the World Trade Center and Pentagon. Evidence indicates that organizations central to Osama bin Lad-

en's network—identified as such by *EIR* in 1998—were involved.

On Sept. 20, the Arabic daily *Al-Hayat* interviewed Yasser Al-Serri, a member of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad who enjoys asylum in Britain, even though he has a murder charge which carries a death sentence waiting for him in Egypt. His organization, Egyptian Al-Jihad Al-Islami, is part of bin Lad-

en's alleged international Islamic front, Al-Qaeda. British authorities have for many years resisted Egyptian demands to extradite Al Serri to be tried on murder charges in Egypt.

Al-Serri admitted that he had provided the "journalist" credentials for the "reporters" whose booby-trapped video camera exploded during the interview with Massoud on Sept. 9. Al-Serri alleges that he was "fooled" by the two Arabs

Riemann And Counter-Terrorism

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

September 28, 2001

During the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, the occurrence of what was usefully called "terrorism," usually signified either the practices of British Foreign Office assets, such as Danton/Marat; or, in the latter part of the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries, "propaganda of the deed"—politically motivated use of methods of major felonies, such as acts of exemplary violence, blackmail, and so on.

Today, in the age of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, what has come to be called "international terrorism," since 1968-69, is a special form of warfare deployed covertly either by governments, institutions of governments, or powerful financial cliques which approach—and sometimes exceed—the power of the relevant governments. In such cases, what is called "terrorism" is often better called "covert methods of irregular warfare," which is what happened to the United States on Sept. 11th.

For example, Brzezinski's Afghansi since the late 1970s, and the assortment of pranks which came to be known popularly as "Iran-Contra," merely typify an amassing of a vast assortment of persons who have adopted killer-for-hire as their customary, preferred sort of employment. Government agencies, and other putatively "respectable" institutions, which prefer to act anonymously, dip into the labor-pool of thuggery, assembling teams who conduct the covert irregular warfare which a screaming mass media enjoys describing as "International Terrorism." By calling this "international terrorism," those who deploy such acts of warfare mask their roguish deeds with forms of denial such as "Who, me?!" or, "Me? I never touch the stuff."

Naturally, the British Commonwealth being the far-flung British Commonwealth, and managing the Irish being the practice that it is, a lot of the hirelings of what is called the "international terrorist" trade pass through British ductways and safe-house arrangements. By calling

all this "international terrorism," the public, and even many officials of government, are fooled.

Thus, we have a situation, as the events of Sept. 11th show, in which the national origin, or religious persuasion of the persons deployed to such monstrous effects does not necessarily lead the investigator to useful findings. Sherlock Holmes becomes a useless nuisance; Dupin is to be preferred, instead.

The key to unravelling operations such as those of Sept. 11th, lies not in the parts of the actions, but in the form of organization and of political effects of the yet-to-be-determined agency which has recruited the bits and pieces as expendable help for the operation which should concern us. Those of us who have spent decades tracking these forms of irregular warfare, are presented at this moment, with a situation in which the objectives and motives of the mysterious agency behind the Sept. 11th attacks are known with relatively great, and increasing precision.

Who would and could organize such an operation? We know, or should know the answer to that question. Given our knowledge of the objectives, motives, and general nature of the perpetrator, we have forewarning of what kind of actions we must expect from him in the near future, and can therefore design flanking actions which will tend to eliminate the possibility of the still-unknown adversary's realizing his ultimate objectives, even if we do not yet know who he is.

Yes, the pool of resources for international terrorism should be dried out. However, that, at its best, will be no more than a necessary housekeeping chore, if a sometimes bloody one. The primary objective must be to neutralize—and, hopefully, also identify—the high-ranking cabal which has assembled and deployed the capability whose first public actions have been witnessed on Sept. 11th.

That answer, to that question, will not be found in the Middle East, or Central Asia. Irregular warfare's ability to outflank modern regular military capabilities, is the ability to sneak up with a knife, or piece of wire, from a place very close to the intended victim. The question is, through what kind of powerful institutions, including some very high-ranking, and very capable types residing inside the U.S. itself, could it sneak up on the security institutions of the U.S. in the way that was done on Sept. 11th?



Buckingham Palace, freely gazed on by well-known terrorists living in Britain, as well as unknown ones. EIR's memo on the problem, presented to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in 1999 but ignored, needs to be reopened.

(both Algerians with reportedly false Belgian passports), who told him that they wanted to report on the situation in Afghanistan. He gave them journalist credentials from his "Islamic Observation Center," which they used to get a visa from the Pakistani Embassy in London. Al-Serri nonsensically claims that he knew nothing about the two men; a journalist seeking entry to Afghanistan, needs recommendations and security clearances from Islamic groups with connections to the Taliban, to certify, for example, that he is not agent of an Arab or other government. Al-Serri certainly has that kind of pull with Taliban and bin Laden.

While the connection between the Massoud assassination and the Sept. 11 attack is not known, the fact remains that Al-Serri's Islamic Observation Center is one of the cases identified by *EIR* in the memorandum to Albright demanding that Britain be sanctioned as a terrorism center.

- Perhaps the most preposterous element in the entire avoidance of naming Britain as a terrorist-sponsoring country, is the list of organizations provided in President George W. Bush's own Executive Order of Sept. 24, 2001 — the so-called "Executive Order on Terrorist Financing."

In releasing the order, Bush stated, "We will starve terrorists of funding . . . rout them out of their safe hiding places, and bring them to justice." In an addendum to the order, an "Annex" of 22 organizations, individuals and businesses, none other than Yassir Al-Serri's Islamic Jihad of Egypt is listed as one of the immediate targets whose assets are to be frozen and bank accounts seized. This is considered the "hot list" of suspects being considered by top U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Yet, Britain has ignored request

for the extradition of Islamic Jihad leaders living in Britain since 1991!

In its January 2000 memorandum, *EIR* warned the U.S. government about Britain's dangerous harboring of this group: "The Islamic Group, and its subsidiary arm, Islamic Jihad, are headquartered in London. In February, 1997, the British government formally granted permission to Abel Abdel Majid and Adel Tawfiq al-Sirri to establish Islamic Group fundraising and media offices in London. . . . Abdel Majid was implicated in the October 1981 assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, and he subsequently masterminded the escape of two prisoners jailed for the assassination. In 1991, he fled to Britain and immediately was granted political asylum . . . [despite the] fact he was sentenced to death *in absentia* for the bombing of the Egyptian Embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan in November 1995, in which 15 diplomats were killed.

"Abdel Tawfiq al Serri . . . has also been granted political asylum in Britain, despite the fact that he was also sentenced to death *in absentia* for his part in the 1993 attempted assassination of Egyptian Prime Minister Atif Sidqi."

Another organization on Bush's "hot list" is the Algerian Armed Islamic Group (GIA), whose ability to openly organize, recruit, and raise funds in London had also been protested by the government of Algeria. Again, Britain ignored Algeria's official protest.

The above case studies are just a tiny sample of the detail provided by the *EIR* dossier, which has been ignored by U.S. agencies, or suppressed by those with interest in using these groups. That dossier should be reopened now.