

# British escalate 'special operations' war in Northern Ireland

by Mark Burdman

With each passing day, the situation in and around Northern Ireland seems more and more like a sequence of events being played out from a written script. On the evening of Sunday, Feb. 18, a bomb exploded on a double-decker bus in London, on a busy street not far from the headquarters of the BBC World Service. One person was killed, and several wounded. This bomb, like the earlier one on Feb. 9 in the Docklands-Canary Wharf area of London, was reportedly claimed by the Irish Republican Army (IRA). In between the two events, a bomb that was near to detonation, was defused in London's West End. Service on significant sections of the London Underground (subway) was interrupted for hours, and other activities in the city were severely disrupted. Police later said that the bomb contained 11 pounds of Semtex explosive, and would have caused hundreds of casualties, had it detonated.

An endless array of commentators has popped up over the past day, to declare, in unison, that "it's back to war" in Northern Ireland. British government ministers, typified by the minister for Northern Ireland, Sir Patrick Mayhew, have been issuing ice-cold declarations, that any further steps in the "peace process" would exclude the Sinn Fein political party.

This, of course, has been the British policy from the beginning. Among the more elaborated variants of "the line," was the lead article of the Feb. 20 London *Independent*, written by Northern Ireland-based correspondent David McKittrick. He claimed that what is now happening, has "the inexorability of a nightmare." The Docklands bombing was "the start of a series. . . . We are in the middle of a phased escalation, with attacks in Belfast next on the agenda." Before too long, there will be a "resumption of loyalist violence" by Protestant paramilitary groups. And so on.

To an increasing number of informed experts and observers in Europe and in the United States, however, all of this, seems a bit too "set-piece." Hints are filtering out in some of the continental European press, that the hypothesis of "IRA responsibility" for the bombings, must be tempered by the known, long-standing, and curious relations of the

British secret services to the IRA military structure. Certain spokesmen for Ireland's Sinn Fein political party are suggesting that the readiness to immediately blame the IRA might be misplaced, that the responsibility for the bombings must be further investigated, and that certain "hard-line" elements in the British establishment have been looking for a "pretext" to up-end the peace negotiations.

## 'These are typical British methods'

Indeed, if the scenario now unfolding in Britain-Northern Ireland seems to take on the appearance of what one American wit once called "déjà vu all over again," there is good reason for it. As *EIR* founding editor Lyndon LaRouche stressed in a Feb. 15 interview with the "EIR Talks" radio program, the whole process is being "orchestrated" by the British themselves.

In LaRouche's view, the Northern Ireland conflict is typical of "British policy for the post-World War II period," based on "managing conflict" through what came to be known as "special operations," or "special forces operations." Such "operations" have been "generally orchestrated by the British psychological warfare institution known as the Tavistock Institute. And one of the key figures in this, whose books are bible for both the British Strategic Air Services [SAS] and the forces on the British side in Northern Ireland, is Brigadier Kitson." This "doctrine" has dominated British operations in Northern Ireland since 1969-70, from the time when "the Irish resistance, the Catholic resistance people" were put in Long Kesh prison, and "tormented, tortured, in crimes against humanity by the British."

According to LaRouche, what was done, was modelled upon what Brigadier Frank Kitson did, in particular, "in Kenya, in the so-called Mau-Mau insurrection of the 1950s." This insurrection was "created in London, by British intelligence, created out of the Tavistock Institute associations." Under British direction, the Mau-Mau operation of Jomo Kenyatta et al. was launched, while, "in the same process . . . the British MI-5, working with Tavistock and with Kitson's involvement, set up what was called the counter-Mau-Mau. That is, you had people who *simulated* being Mau-Mau, run-

ning terrorist operations against the villages, which had been heretofore political sympathizers of the actual Mau-Mau. Because the people of Kenya could no longer tell the difference between the real Mau-Mau, and the counter-Mau-Mau, on this basis, the villagers shunned the Mau-Mau; the Mau-Mau were driven into one area of Kenya, where the British forces, military and paramilitary forces, could easily round them up and eliminate them as a force, even though the residue of this operation still lingers on.”

LaRouche continued: “That’s what they did in Northern Ireland. They created the IRA Provos by these same methods that were used to create the Mau-Mau. They used Long Kesh in order to create this kind of operation, that is, fanatics. They controlled them. They knew how to manipulate them. And therefore, they created *controlled, deniable assets*: terrorists. They did the same thing on the Northern Ireland Ulster Protestant side. They created terrorist gangs, with Provo-like elements in them, which would commit atrocities. And under these circumstances, British elements of the Paras and SAS, could insert themselves and commit atrocities in the name of either the Ulster Protestant extremist groups, or the IRA Provos. And, on that basis, this horror show in Northern Ireland has been orchestrated since the beginning of the 1970s.”

The Feb. 9 Docklands-Canary Wharf bombing was “obviously orchestrated” by the British, “by a combination of provoking the IRA, and using units, counter-Mau-Mau units, which were called sleeper units,” in order to commit terror in London, in an area where there would be maximum “havoc,” in order to “get things going there,” LaRouche said. “*These are typical British methods*: gang-and-countergang operations, divide and conquer. . . . You’ve got British assets, who, for various similar reasons, Tavistock reasons, can be used and manipulated to do anything against their own cause, simply by having somebody pull the right wire or push the right button; and that’s what happened.”

### ‘Almost too authentic to be true’

Knowledgeable sources on both sides of the Atlantic may not be prepared to go as far as LaRouche, but certainly do not accept at face value, the British “party line” on the IRA. One retired U.S. military officer, who was posted to the American embassy in London in the 1980s, told *EIR*, that there was extensive discussion on the diplomatic circuit, at that time, that there was British SAS control over, or manipulation of, IRA terrorism.

A cautiously worded article in the German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on Feb. 12, by London correspondent Bernhard Heimrich, pointed to certain curious features of the British secret services’ relationship to the IRA. When, after the first bomb explosion on Feb. 9, the IRA claimed authorship, “everything was almost too authentic to be true,” he asserted. “Nobody knows whether the British secret services really were taken so much by surprise, or whether . . . they

just pretend to be.” There are “hints” that the secret services “know more” about the nature of IRA operations than they publicly let on, wrote Heimrich. He pointed to one tell-tale, curious practice: “In its telephone contact with the authorities, the IRA makes use of the insertion of a code word, which only it and the enemy know. The system of arranging this code is one of the best-guarded secrets of this war in the dark.”

### Slap in the face for Clinton

As *EIR* reported last week, and as LaRouche emphasized in the Feb. 15 interview, the most important purpose of the bombings, is to “defeat Clinton internationally,” by “*destroying* the peace in Northern Ireland.”

This has been virtually acknowledged by a senior commentator in France who is a mainstay of the anglophile Entente Cordiale branch of the French political class. Writing in the daily *Libération* on Feb. 20, Jacques Amalric described the “IRA bombings” as a “serious slap in the face for the President of the United States.” According to Amalric, the recent developments in and around Northern Ireland represent a greater threat to the ambitious Clinton foreign policy than either the volatile Middle East, where matters are relatively stable for the moment, or Bosnia, where a “real tragedy” may occur, but where American troops are enforcing a fragile peace, at least for the moment.

Northern Ireland is where Clinton was hoping, more than elsewhere, “for a breakthrough initiative,” wrote Amalric. The President was even willing to “anger [British Prime Minister John] Major a bit,” by extending “gestures of understanding” for Sinn Fein and its leader Gerry Adams, “who was received with honors at the White House.” What is now happening, can “tarnish the image as a man of peace that Bill Clinton has been building up over the past months.”

### Seeing through the British charade

LaRouche further emphasized that a key factor in the “orchestration” of the Northern Ireland irregular warfare, is “to save Major’s candidacy.” Major has a perilously small majority in the Parliament, and urgently requires the support of the Ulster Unionist Party, to stay in power. As a concession to the Ulster Unionists, Major suddenly proposed in late January, without prior consultation with the Irish or American governments, that the precondition for “all-party peace talks,” be elections for a Northern Ireland Assembly, the which Assembly would take the place of the traditional parties.

In an interview with *Libération* (given seven hours before the bus bombing, and later published on Feb. 20), Sinn Fein leader Adams declared that he was “outraged” that “narrow and personal” considerations of the British prime minister, concerned with “protecting his own interests,” could “take the peace process in Northern Ireland hostage.” Adams charged that “London has reneged on its commitments,” and that it was the “obstacle” thrown up by Major, rather than the

Feb. 9 bombing, that “shattered the peace process, and led to the breaking of the cease-fire.”

Similarly, in a Feb. 17 interview with the German daily *Frankfurter Rundschau*, parts of which were reprinted by the *Berliner Zeitung* and Austria’s *Die Presse*, Sinn Fein Vice Chairman and Chief Negotiator Martin McGuinness charged that the bombings were a pretext welcomed by London “hard-liners” to disrupt the peace process, and that Major “broke his promise. His commitment for peace is nonexistent. . . . The British prime minister was offered a golden opportunity to cut through the knot of the entire conflict, and he wasted this opportunity. . . . What else can be said about it, than that the Irish peace process has been sacrificed on the altar of British calculation?”

The *Berliner Zeitung* version of the McGuinness interview added the observation, that there is suspicion in certain Sinn Fein circles about the automatic readiness, without further investigation, to hold the IRA responsible for the terror bombings.

### A Mountbatten-Windsor ‘Reichstag Fire’?

For the skeptics and empiricists who will object that what we have outlined above is, as one London strategist put it, “over-conspiratorial,” a couple of other important considerations must be kept in mind.

Certain British spokesmen, most explicitly such as Sir Peregrine Worsthorne of the Hollinger Corp.-owned London *Sunday Telegraph*, in his Feb. 4 column, are screeching that Britain must move rapidly toward establishing the infrastructure of an overt (rather than traditional low-intensity) police state, at a time when the welfare state must be dismantled, and when mass protests from the poorer elements of the population can be anticipated.

Since Feb. 9, security is being reinforced throughout the United Kingdom, supposedly in response to new bomb threats from the IRA, not only in London but also in Britain’s provincial cities. Highest-level meetings of Britain’s police, security, and intelligence officials have been taking place. Obviously, this provides a perfect occasion for implementing the infrastructure that Worsthorne and co-thinkers desire.

Since Feb. 9, security is being reinforced throughout the United Kingdom, supposedly in response to new bomb threats from the IRA, not only in London but also in Britain’s provincial cities. Highest-level meetings of Britain’s police, security, and intelligence officials have been taking place. Obviously, this provides a perfect occasion for implementing the infrastructure that Worsthorne and co-thinkers desire.

One “IRA threat” being reported by British security officials, is to the British royal family. In the current mood of a British establishment aware that the U.K. itself is entering a period of grave constitutional crisis and that the global financial system is on the brink of major shocks, it is not to be excluded that what were formerly “unthinkable,” might now become “thinkable,” and that an attack on a leading royal would be “arranged.” It need be recalled, that Lord Mountbatten was assassinated in 1979. Certain British planners might think it useful, to then blame leading adversaries of the Crown for this, in what could be likened to the Nazis’ cynical use of the Reichstag Fire for political ends. The British secret services have, previously, exploited high-profile assassinations of leading public figures, to accomplish political goals.

---

## Reviews

---

# Chatham House pushes new strategy for Empire

by Mark Burdman

---

### **Economic Opportunities for Britain and the Commonwealth, Discussion Paper 60**

by Katharine West

Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1995

66 pages, £7.50

---

On March 29, 1995, London’s Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), often referred to as Chatham House, sponsored a conference entitled “Britain in the World.” Various British government ministers and senior establishment policymakers were joined by the soon-to-be-knighted Henry Kissinger and others, to discuss how Britain might escalate its neo-imperial offensive around the world. *EIR* was among the few publications outside Great Britain at the time, that assessed the importance of that conference (see *EIR*, March 31, 1995, “British Elites Gather to Reverse ‘Inevitable Decline’”).

One of the polemics, was that British policymakers have been too narrowly focussed on problems in continental Europe. Now, they said, they must instead play the “globalist” cards that Britain has, capitalizing particularly on the areas of the former Empire that today comprise the (British) Commonwealth.

The criticism of the “Euro-focus,” was largely premised on a view that continental Europe would be destroyed. Western Europe, caught in the stranglehold of a Maastricht Treaty that was, in large part, architected by the British-allied late French President François Mitterrand, was adjudged, not incorrectly, to be heading into economic and political collapse, while eastern Europe and Russia would be destroyed by International Monetary Fund “reforms” imposed by Margaret Thatcher and George Bush.

The “Commonwealth as the new face of Empire” polemic confirms what *EIR* and its founding editor Lyndon LaRouche have repeatedly stressed: The “Empire” never, in fact, died, but today exists in a somewhat modified form from its heyday of the 1688-1940 period. Great Britain exercises vast control