

Corporation "scenario" or "script" form at a semi-public briefing in New York City on June 9-11, 1976. Approximately fifty government officials, think tank planners, and field controllers were present at the briefing, held at the Ralph Bunche Institute under the rubric of a "Conference on International Terrorism in the Contemporary World." Among the participants were H.H.A. Cooper of the LEAA; Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General who had instituted the Operation Garden Plot terror-counterterror program during the late 1960s; officials of the HEW, CIA and State Department, and Senator Jacob Javits.

Such semi-public briefing sessions — institutionalized through a "traveling circuit" of regularly scheduled "academic" conferences — represent the mechanism through which the broad network of terrorist planners, controllers, media apologists, etc. receive advance profiles on pending terrorist operations, obscured through appropriate "aesopian" language. The conferences furthermore represent the formal settings in which more detailed and covert informal briefings and marching orders can be delivered.

On the direct internal features of the Entebbe operation: Wilfred Böse, the chosen field leader for the Entebbe operation, was in the custody of French Interpol-associated police authorities only a month before the hijacking! Through Interpol channels, the French *Défense et Sécurité du Territoire* (DST), turned Böse over to the West German *Bundeskriminalamt* (BKA) in approximately June, 1976. Böse had been in French custody for his complicity in the murder of two DST by Carlos Ramirez Sanchez.

It is a matter of record that the BKA *released* Böse in his own custody on the basis that he was able to provide a permanent address in the BRD. That address was the Frankfurt headquarters of the "Red Star Collective" — an anarchist-terrorist group with documented connections to both Carlos Ramirez Sanchez and the Baader-Meinhof gang! Such facts were known to BKA officials at the time of the Böse release.

Despite such recent contact with French and West German intelligence agencies directly associated with Interpol data banks, Böse and five other *known* terrorists were able to board an international Air France jet flight armed with weapons and explosives. Such a boarding could not have occurred without the active complicity of Interpol. First, the electronic surveillance (metal detector) equipment at the Athens and Tel Aviv points of

entry are 99 percent effective in the case of an average passenger. In the case of such known terrorists, the successful boarding of the plane by five such persons could have only transpired through "police escort" around the standard security check point.

It is relevant that in a recent British gun running trial, an Interpol agent housed in Scotland Yard was identified as the "fixer" for precisely such bypassing of airport security personnel. In that case, the Yard Interpol officer was conducting British mercenaries destined for Angola through airport security at Heathrow Airport without even a passport check on the basis that Interpol was "in pursuit of a broader operation" and had requested that local and airport security personnel forgo normal procedures so as not to interfere.

It should be noted that airport security at both Athens and Tel Aviv airports have close working relations with both Israeli intelligence, the Shin Beth, and the Israeli military intelligence. Given the connections between these institutions and the Interpol computer and related services, it should be considered that there is strong circumstantial evidence that Israeli intelligence operatives were in on the project from the initiating moments when the terrorists boarded the plane successfully.

At least 72 hours *before* Israeli commandos launched their raid on the Entebbe Airport in Uganda, the CIA's Lieutenant General William Yarborough reported to an interviewer in the U.S. that he was aware of crucial internal details of the raid, including the planned use of Kenya as a launching point. None of this information was made public until *after* the raid had occurred.

Yarborough's own dossier represents a crucial tract for investigation. He was in attendance at an earlier spring, 1967 terrorism "conference" in Glassboro, New Jersey at which he candidly announced that "95 percent of all the terrorism in the world is conducted through the CIA." In addition to having initiated the U.S. Special Forces program at Ft. Bragg, Yarborough served in National Security Council posts simultaneously to the tenure of McGeorge Bundy and Marcus Raskin. He joined with Bundy, Ramsey Clark, Cyrus Vance and others in constituting the Operation Garden Plot project in the U.S. — modeled on a similar program that he designed and implemented in West Germany when he was serving as counterintelligence chief of the U.S. Command in Heidelberg at the time that the student radical project was getting off the ground there.

EXCLUSIVE

How The Myth Of Nuclear Terrorism Was Created

The so-called threat of nuclear terrorism popularized by the nation's press is a myth concocted by a few Rockefeller-controlled think tanks: the Rand Corporation, Mitre Corporation, and the Ford Foundation. Not surprisingly, these same think tanks authored the Carter energy program.

The nuclear terrorism scenario serves one purpose: it

provides the credible cover for Carter's ban on nuclear energy. As such it plays an integral role in forcing de-industrialization on the U.S.

It is impossible for terrorists to steal nuclear materials and build a bomb. Nor is terrorist takeover of a nuclear power plant a credible blackmail threat. These facts have been extensively documented in the following

locations among others: *Executive Intelligence Review*, Vol IV, No. 25; The U.S. Labor Party pamphlet, "Stop Ralph Nader: Nuclear Saboteur"; *New Solidarity*, August 12, 1976; and the Fusion Energy Foundation Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 3.

How then was this myth created and propagated?

The grand-daddy of this psychological warfare campaign was a nuclear terrorism feasibility study commissioned in the early 1970s by the Ford Foundation as a feature of its massive energy policy project then under the direction of David Freeman, now a top aide to Carter's energy czar James Schlesinger. The study, entitled: "Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards" was prepared by Theodore Taylor, a former nuclear explosives designer-turned environmentalist, and Mason Wilrich, a former assistant general counsel to the arms Control and Disarmament Agency now a consultant to the Rand Corporation. The report, completed in 1975, is a comprehensive blueprint for building a credible "basement atomic bomb," utilizing available unclassified government and scientific documents. Although the report does not prove this can be done, it sets a standard for nuclear terrorist threats and scenarios to be used in the propaganda campaign.

Following an extensive search through the unclassified documents the authors write:

"Any group with 10 kilograms of plutonium oxide and a substantial amount of high explosives could design and build a crude fission bomb. The person, or persons, would have to be inventive, adept at using lab equipment and machine tools, and understand some essential concepts and terms used in publications, and would have to know where to get the publications. He would also have to be willing to risk serious injury or death."

The report makes this appear believable by separately detailing each aspect of the design and production of a crude bomb, the particular problems arising in each step and the solutions to those problems. Taken as a whole, however, this process adds up to a small Manhattan project, despite the authors' assertions that it does not.

To give the report additional credibility the Ford Foundation removed this list of available unclassified documents from Theodore Taylor's public version. Next, national security clearance from the Atomic Energy Commission and National Security Council was applied for, and was of course granted.

Immediately following the report's publication for mass distribution in 1974, the Ford Foundation funded Public Broadcasting System television network commissioned an MIT physics student to prepare a design for an atomic bomb using the Ford Foundation report as a reference. A year later a major psychological warfare documentary film aimed to condition the public to the threat of nuclear terrorism was ready to be aired. Titled "The Plutonium Connection" the PBS film counterposes the design of an atomic bomb by a college physics student, pronounced plausible by a panel of Swedish scientists to apparent sloppiness in security and inventory accounting at nuclear reprocessing facilities and military bases to produce the desired message: nuclear technology could be dangerous in the wrong hands. Following production of this documentary, the FBI moved to enhance the scenario's credibility by

classifying the bomb plans and destroying any evidence of the hoax.

With the crucial building block of "technical feasibility" in place, the nuclear terrorism threat was turned over to specialists and scenario designers at the Rand and Mitre Corporations.

In 1975 both of these think tanks produced studies on nuclear terrorism comparing the technical requirements with the capacities and motivation of various existing and hypothetical terrorist and criminal organizations. A profile of a nuclear terrorist group and an array of possible scenarios was developed.

Not surprisingly the Rand report was prepared for a series of Ford Foundation sponsored seminars on nuclear proliferation. Its author, Brian Jenkins, is Rand's top specialist in surrogate warfare terrorist scenarios and originated the concept of a "nuclear Pearl Harbor" in the summer of 1976.

Jenkins prefaces the Rand report by listing a series of terrorist threats and incidents which have already occurred, involving nuclear facilities or nuclear hoaxes. He justifies the report with the statement:

"Sober scientists, sensationalist journalists, imaginative novelists and perhaps a large portion of the public are inclined to agree that the threat of nuclear action by terrorists exceeds the threat of nuclear accident or nuclear attack by a hostile foreign power."

In Rand systems analysis language, Jenkins portrays the spectrum of potential nuclear terrorists as ranging from "common criminals, disgruntled employees, eco-guerillas, political extremists (anarchists, leftists, rightists, racists or separatists) and outright lunatics." The threat is immediately narrowed to the "political extremists" (Rockefeller's Institute for Policy Studies-Interpol-run groups) "the Irish Republican Army, Palestinians, Japanese terrorists, Black September, the United Red Army, Baader Meinhof, Weather Underground, and the New World Liberation Front."

Jenkins gives these terrorists an array of possible actions: a nuclear hoax; a nuclear hoax with a phony device; a low-level but well publicized sabotage of a nuclear facility; seizure of a nuclear facility control room, perhaps with a warning to "set it off" or destroy it with conventional explosives; overt theft of a nuclear weapon or plutonium; radioactive contamination of a symbolic site; detonation of a nuclear device in a remote area; and detonation of a stolen or home made bomb in a populated area. His conclusion is: "Of course the investment and skill would increase with the type of action, but all would be within the capability of a group such as the SLA."

Consequently, Jenkins creates a category of "eco-terrorists," anti-nuclear extremists who would sabotage the construction of nuclear facilities or might occupy a functioning nuclear power plant to demonstrate the inadequacy of existing security precautions. These eco-terrorists could also take covert action by stealing nuclear materials and secretly pollute a waterway, blaming a nearby nuclear facility for the contamination.

In the Spring of 1975, the Mitre Corporation simultaneously released a report with substantially the same content, authored by David Rosenbaum, a specialist in terrorism and drug smuggling now em-

ployed by the Government Accounting Office to prepare reports for Congress on energy.

Although the above reports comprise the core of comprehensive "authoritative" documents on nuclear terrorism, several of the other Rockefeller-linked think tanks have contributed additions and refinements.

In the Spring of 1976, Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute, included nuclear terrorism in a study titled "Nuclear Proliferation, 1975-1995". Under the heading of "Local Munichs" he states:

Successors to the Japanese Red Army or Baader Meinhof Gang could see nuclear terrorism as suitable means of realizing their stated goal of pulling down existing bourgeois society.

Kahn does not bother to argue whether nuclear terrorism is possible but simply footnotes the Ford Foundation study. He also designs a few of his own scenarios under a heading "Bizarre Events."

A New Arcadius: In 400 A.D. Arcadius destroyed the ancient Greek temple of Apollo. His purpose was to go down in history as having done so. A future romantic in possession of nuclear weapons might use them in a spectacular fashion for a similar reason.

The Nutty Pacifist: A fanatic pacifist with nuclear weapons might set one off in an attempt to shock the world into disarmament.

Leopold and Loeb with Physics BA's: Leopold and Loeb killed boy to see what it was like to kill someone. Their successors with physics BA's might build a weapon using stolen materials and detonate it, perhaps to see what New York would look like without the World Trade Center.

Nuclear Luddites: If by the early 1990s technological constraints have eroded, poor countries might have access to nuclear weapons. They might use these to gain access to more of the global wealth, or they might launch an attack against an industrialized country in blind frustrated rage at the industrial world, their perceived source of torment.

In the Spring of 1976, the Worldwatch Institute collected all of the published material on the nuclear terrorism threat into one digest, "Nuclear Power: The Fifth Horseman." Written by Denis Hayes, it leans heavily on the yellow journalism aspects of the "nuclear threat." For example, glossing over the contradictions of the potential "homemade" nuclear bomb, Hayes emphasizes the effect of an impossibility:

"Left in a car just outside the exclusion zone around the U.S. Capitol during the State of the Union address, such a device could eliminate the Congress, Supreme Court and the entire line of succession to the Presidency."

With the Carter Administration's domestic energy program and foreign policy thrusts, a new wave of warnings on nuclear terrorism has emerged.

In the Winter of 1977 issue of International Security magazine, David Rosebaum updates his 1975 Mitre report, pointing to the Soviet Union as the most likely backers of nuclear terrorism. Similar propaganda on Soviet terrorism was then released in the national media in coordination with the Carter Administration's build-up to the unsuccessful SALT II negotiations. In line with the Carter policies toward the Mideast, Rosebaum identifies Israel as the most likely target of nuclear terrorism in the near future, naming Libya as the most likely perpetrator.

In late March the Ford Foundation released a "comprehensive" study "Nuclear Power, Issues and Choices," prepared jointly with the Mitre Corporation. James Schlesinger immediately hailed the report as identical to the Carter Administration's then unannounced energy program. In the context of calling for an end to nuclear energy and a return to primitive energy sources, the report underlines the real import of nuclear terrorism: "Whether terrorists are actually in a position to carry out their threat (nuclear terror) is probably less important than their plausibility....warn that the worldwide development of civilian nuclear power provides additional opportunities for terrorists to employ nuclear energy as a weapon."