

Plot to kill Farrakhan

"Things fall apart; the center cannot hold; / Near anarchy is loosed upon the world, / the blood-dimmed tide is loosed. . . . / The best lack all conviction, while the worst / Are full of passionate intensity. . . . / And what rough beast, its hour come round at last, / Slouches toward Bethlehem to be born?"—William Butler Yeats, "The Second Coming," 1919.

Yeats's invocation of Satan, quoted above, provides an apt starting point to identify the mindset of those forces now at work in the construction of a plot to murder the leader of the Nation of Islam, Minister Louis Farrakhan. For that murder, a ritualistic replay of a routine all too familiar in the 1960s is being prepared, with the same combination of deliberateness and frenzy as would characterize a Southern lynching of the turn of the century.

The newest twist is a claim, circulated in the national press as a "precondition" for Farrakhan's execution, that he authored the assassination of former Nation of Islam leader Malcolm X in 1965. The Nation of Islam filed a \$4.4 billion suit against the *New York Post*, for a March 12 banner story entitled "Widow Pins Murder On Farrakhan." The article reported that Malcolm X's widow, Betty Shabazz, had, on a New York television talk show, asserted in response to interviewer Gabe Pressman's question, "Do you believe Farrakhan had anything to do with the death of your husband?" "Of course, yes. Nobody kept it a secret. It was a badge of honor."

The question of course, is, if it was not a secret that Farrakhan had been so involved, why was he not indicted or arrested for the murder? And why would the *New York Post*, known for an editorial stand toward New York's African-Americans that would make the most rabid Apartheid proponent blush with shame, become the champion of "cracking the Malcolm X case"?

On March 19, speaking in Fresno, California to a capacity crowd of over 2,500 people, Farrakhan said, "They've already determined that I must die." He also asserted that his adversaries were seeking "trial and false

imprisonment and setting me up for murder." And, he pointed out that the same press that call him anti-Semitic, had, during his lifetime, labeled Malcolm X as "a minister of hate and anti-Jew. . . . They have always used one black man against another. They couldn't find anyone alive to do it, so [they] raise one from the dead."

Statesman and physical economist Lyndon LaRouche, himself the target of confirmed assassination threats, was the first, to the best knowledge of this journal, to have corroborated this assessment. On March 21, he issued a statement that a live operation against the life of Louis Farrakhan was, in his view, ongoing. LaRouche's statement appears in full in the *New Federalist* newspaper.

Any assassination of a major public figure, carried out by an intelligence agency or combination of agencies, is a "major production," prepared far in advance. To ensure success, such an operation must 1) isolate the figure from the general public; 2) divide the figure from his/her constituency, for the which purpose, a particularly effective technique is the fomentation of at least the perception of "factional strife within their organization"; 3) initiate, or imply, that "legal action is about to be taken" for financial or other transgressions; 4) successfully represent the figure as "megalomaniacal," "eccentric," "unstable," "weird," etc.

LaRouche points out that "the presently escalated level of threat to Minister Farrakhan has occurred in the midst of an ongoing destabilization of the U.S. government's executive branch," and that, in the midst of press focus on the Whitewater scandal, such an assassination could be carried out with far less risk to its perpetrators than normally. Specifically, LaRouche cites the Hollinger Corp., an international media empire, as potentially culpable.

Hollinger, which now owns 80 newspapers in the United States, has not only been the main purveyor of the Whitewater scandal, but also, in its London *Sunday Telegraph* of March 20, printed a half-page feature entitled "American Jews Worried at the Rise of Black Anti-Semitism." Author Hugh Davies describes Farrakhan to his British readers as "an eccentric fringe figure who, at

trials are not moving forward. Whether the ADL is directly involved in that, I can't say; but based on their past activities, I would not be surprised, and I think we need to generate as much public pressure as possible to see to it that this research goes forward. And just as we are questioning funding patterns on the local level, in terms of AIDS education and prevention and care, we also have to look at the same pattern on the level of AIDS research, that out of \$3.5 billion appropriated for AIDS research last year, a mere \$500,000 was

received by a minority institution, namely, Howard University. If you calculate that out, that's .0014% of the total research budget allocated to a minority institution.

EIR: You do continue in your efforts to build a national network that is capable of delivering this new treatment that you're working on. Isn't that true?

Dr. Muhammad: Yes. We are attempting to do that, and meeting, in some cases, very stiff resistance to our efforts.

60, plays the violin obsessively and lives in a fortress-like compound. . . . But this one-time choir-boy from Boston . . . now fills 25,000-seat arenas with his so-called sermons." This article appears on page 27, juxtaposed to Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's latest Whitewater diatribe against Clinton.

Indeed, the Clintons are increasingly being described by the British press in similar terms. James Adams of the *Sunday Times* of London wrote in the March 20 issue, "the administration has responded with a mixture of paranoia and panic. . . . Now [Clinton] sees the media as his enemy and himself as the subject of a wide-ranging vendetta. . . . Hillary, in more danger than her husband from Whitewater, also embraces the conspiracy theory."

On the role of the press in shaping the climate for assassination of a prominent figure, LaRouche recalls, "I possess an official FBI document which identifies the existence, in November 1973, of an active FBI plot, run out of the New York City FBI office with the knowledge of the Washington, D.C. headquarters, to have the Communist Party U.S.A. arrange my personal 'elimination' on or about the close of that year. . . . It was this FBI operation which the January (1974) *New York Times* rushed in to cover up with wild and massive libels against me. . . ."

"How often did the *New York Times* step in to cover up for the FBI in similar circumstances? I have received no evidence that that crowd in government close to the ADL, or the old Confederacy sympathizer families running the *New York Times* ever stopped doing such things."

The journalists that work for the ADL are, in many cases, no less gangsters than their controllers. For example, *Times* columnist William Safire, according to sources, helped to open up some of the Bahamas-based gambling operations of Meyer Lansky, and was the public-relations man for the Permindex-connected Lionel Corporation, the 1950s model for what was termed "Murder Inc."

Permindex was headed by Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, who assisted the notorious racist J. Edgar Hoover in establishing Division Five of the FBI, the "counter-intelligence," "dirty tricks," and "wetworks" di-

vision. This division has crusaded against everything from Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement, to "black anti-Semitism." The FBI used JDL founder Meir Kahane and his organization against "black militant groups" in the U.S. starting in 1969, as part of Cointelpro, the now-exposed, illegal assault against all forms of political dissent of that era.

The mass ferment that Farrakhan is intersecting—he spoke to 9,000, predominantly African-American men, in Washington, D.C. on the theme, "Stop the Killing"—is undeniable. Recently, Farrakhan announced that he would start a voter registration drive throughout America, where, in local elections, sometimes no more than 10% of the electorate—which only makes up 50% of the eligible adult population—votes. In Washington, he called for a million-person rally to protest the economic disenfranchisement of the poor.

Dr. King did not live to see his 1968 Poor People's March, conceived as a statement against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. In Farrakhan's case, the option to use some "distracted Zionist" of the Baruch Goldstein variety, backed up by a several-score-deep hit squad, informers, press, etc., if cleared by several co-ordinating sections of intelligence agencies, including international agencies, cannot be ruled out.

What might be the broader strategic significance of an assassination of Minister Louis Farrakhan? Can the President of the United States suffer the same fate? What would happen as a result, in America's cities—more than 100 of which burned in the wake of the 1968 assassination of Martin Luther King?

More importantly, what happens to the soul of a country that allows the powerful to kill at will? If the U.S. will acquiesce to such lawlessness, as it has already done in the cases of earlier assassinations and attempts, and if the country continues its decades-long descent into a condition in which "the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity," it could not hope to survive. In that case, the "beast that slouches toward Bethlehem" will be fully recognizable to us, for we will have created ourselves to be in its image.

—Dennis Speed

For example, in the summer of 1992, when we were able to present our research in the area of Alpha Interferon to the National Medical Association meeting in San Francisco, and the House of Delegates of the NMA passed a resolution of clinical trials of Alpha Interferon, we were informed some time later that the National Institutes of Health demanded and got the mailing list of the NMA, and letters were sent to each and every member of the NMA telling them that Alpha Interferon didn't work and that was not the way to go.

So we're just fighting uphill, going upstream; but we believe that if you're truly committed to right principles, then those right principles have a way of enduring any attack, and when the dust settles, those who are standing on correct principles, will emerge victorious.

So we try to be very careful about our principles and make sure that we have those in order. We don't much care whether it's the ADL or others who take unprincipled stands against us, because we know in the end, we will win.