Were the Bournes trying to stage an Iran hostage replay in Grenada?

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Two individuals who played pivotal roles in the "social experiment" which put Jimmy Carter in the White House may have been complicit in a Soviet-inspired plan to seize American students attending St. George's Medical School on Grenada as hostages, according to the preliminary results of an EIR investigation. The two individuals in question are Dr. Peter Bourne, the Carter family psychiatrist who was forced to resign from his position as White House adviser on drug abuse in 1978 when he was caught writing phony prescriptions for Quaaludes, and his father, Dr. Geoffrey Bourne, a former major in the British Army's Special Services.

The Bourne-again hostage crisis

EIR researchers are currently investigating reports that Peter Bourne, a visiting professor at St. George's, and Dr. Geoffrey Bourne, who has served as the school's vice-chancellor for six years, were sympathizers of the Oct. 12 Soviet-backed coup led by Gen. Hudson Austin, and that they deliberately tried to undermine U.S. plans to evacuate the school's students, almost all of whom are young American citizens and prime targets for a hostage caper.

According to eyewitness reports, Geoffrey Bourne sought to keep the students on Grenada in spite of mounting evidence that Austin was mentally unbalanced at the least—he had, after all, just come to power over the dead bodies of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and his supporters—and was little more than a puppet for Soviet, Cuban, and Libyan interests in the region. Under the circumstances, it would have been impossible for any responsible administrator to have ignored the possibility that Austin and his thugs might be eyeing the American students as potential hostage victims.

Indeed, according to documents discovered by American forces during their mop-up of the island and revealed by the Reagan administration Oct. 26, the Austin government, in conjunction with Cuban advisers, had been giving "serious consideration" to seizing Americans as hostages.

Had this plan to recreate the Iran hostage crisis succeeded, not only would hundreds of American lives been imperiled, but the ensuing drawn-out process of negotiations could have had a devastating effect on the Reagan administration at a time when the Soviet Union is mounting a global offensive against U.S. strategic interests. Moreover, as administration spokesman have pointed out, the presence of American captives on the island would have made it extremely difficult for the United States to execute its plans to prevent the Soviets and their allies from consolidating their grip on the island, which was clearly intended to become both an important East bloc military base and a staging ground for terrorist and assassination deployments against Americans, among others. Over the past two years in particular, Grenada has become a favorite haunt for various terrorist-linked black separatist groups, many of whom enjoy direct Libyan patronage; the Libyans have invested over $4 million in the airport that was being constructed on the island.

Bourne: Austin coup 'a laughing matter'

Based on interviews with several of the principals, as well as other lines of inquiry, investigators have put together the following partial picture of the Bournes' activities in the days leading up to the U.S. intervention.

In the wake of the Austin coup, many of the St. George Medical School students became alarmed that they were precluded from leaving Grenada. Consequently, they would not be able to return home, and that there was no reason for them to leave Grenada.

According to one student, who has requested anonymity for fear of reprisal by the school, Bourne met with General Austin on Oct. 21. Later that day, Bourne assembled the St. George's student body and, laughing and joking, told them that Austin "had the situation under control," that the week's developments, in which hundreds of Grenadians were murdered, would make a "great cocktail party story," and that the school would continue functioning without interruption "come hell or high water."

Bourne then warned the students that if they did leave the island, they would receive neither a refund nor a credit for the current semester, nor would they be assured of a position if they decided to return. As one student put it, "Bourne tried to blackmail us into staying."
At the same time, according to student sources, Bourne was relaying the same "everything is under control" pabulum to Charles Modica, the school’s chancellor, who was then in the United States. Based on this information, Modica called a widely publicized press conference shortly after the U.S. invasion was made public, claiming that the St. George student body had never been in danger and that the Reagan administration’s action was not only unnecessary, but had endangered the students far more than the Grenadan political situation.

Although several students have confirmed that at least 50 percent of the medical school’s students wanted to leave the island in the days immediately preceding the U.S. invasion, Bourne further complicated U.S. evacuation efforts by telling Gen. Austin that only 10 percent of the students were serious about leaving. During the weekend of Oct. 27-28, the State Department tried to convince Austin that the majority of the students did indeed want to come home, but Austin, citing Bourne’s misinformation, insisted that they were wrong.

Despite Bourne’s assurances, the vast majority of the students were convinced that they were in grave danger. Echoing the sentiments of many of his fellows, one student told EIR, "The students couldn’t believe that anyone in their right mind could be telling us what Bourne was telling us—that Austin was under control—because it was clear to all of us that Austin and his people were going bananas. . . . We knew, too, that the Grenadian people were upset, unbelievably upset, about the Austin coup. . . . Austin was clearly a desperate man. We were angry at Bourne, because he wasn’t being frank with us about the situation. We knew that we could be taken hostage."

Another student, Earl Caldwell of Chilmark, Massachusetts, said after arriving back in the states that "the [U.S.] invasion took place at just the right moment. . . . I was seriously afraid on Monday [the day before the invasion] that a truck might pull up and round up the students. I thought that could actually happen."

Covering for the Soviets?

Why did Geoffrey Bourne try his utmost to keep St. George’s students on the island in the midst of an extremely dangerous situation in which a hostage-seizure was an obvious possibility? The answer can hardly be that he was ignorant of the political developments on the island, or the dangers they posed to his charges. In fact, both Geoffrey and Peter Bourne boasted of their intimate ties to ousted Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, as well as to Austin and his co-conspirator, Deputy Prime Minister Bernard Coard, a boast confirmed independently by several sources.

A far more likely answer is that Geoffrey Bourne and his son Peter were part of the overall Soviet gameplan for Grenada, and had been assigned particular responsibility for setting-up the American students as hostage victims, playing a similar role to that of the State Department in the Iran hostage crisis. One St. George’s student has reported overhearing a conversation between Geoffrey Bourne and one of Austin’s top aides right before the U.S. intervention in which Bourne told the aide that "he was going to call the People’s Revolutionary radio station and tell it that the students are going to bear arms and help to defend the revolution."

Even now, after the U.S. has accumulated massive evidence about Soviet plans for Grenada, the Bournes are publicly insisting that the American military operation was uncalled-for. Geoffrey Bourne is quoted in the lead editorial of the Nov. 2 New York Times stating that "From the point of view of saving our students the invasion was unnecessary," and Peter Bourne has been stating much the same thing at every opportunity.

The taking of U.S. hostages in Iran was preceded by similar traitorous action by U.S. citizens—then with backing from the Carter State Department. Months before the hostage-taking, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark was marching, with State Department approval, at the head of an anti-American pro-Khomeini rally. Then, after the hostages were seized, Carter appointed Clark as an American special envoy to beg release of the hostages. The U.S. chargé d'affaires in Teheran, H. Bruce Laingen, was strangely absent during the seizure of the Embassy. He was later found to be meeting with Iranian Foreign Minister Ibrahim Yazdi at the time of the seizure. Laingen, accompanied by two aides with access to a telex machine, stayed in Yazdi’s office during the entire siege.

These were just some of the curious, never-explained events surrounding the Iranian hostage-taking. Was the same treatment in store for U.S. students in Grenada? Does the Bourne family involvement, indeed, suggest that some of the same forces were at work? Only a no-holds-barred investigation of the treasonous forces at work in the Grenada affair will tell.

Warren Hamereman, Chairman of the National Democratic Policy Committee, sent a mailgram to Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd Oct. 31 calling on him "in the spirit of honesty and seeking out the truth" to ensure that any Congressional investigation into the Grenadian situation "does not cover up" the Bourne family’s role. As Hamereman points out, the Grenada developments "appear to be one of the keys to directly unlocking the secrets of Billygate [the scandal surrounding Billy Carter, who was acting as a paid agent for Muammar Qaddafi while his brother the President was turning a blind eye to Libyan-backed terrorist activities], both through the Bourne connection and through the overt Libyan involvement in Grenada."

The Bourne family pedigree certainly points to the possibility that they were involved in the Soviet operation on Grenada. Trained at Oxford, Geoffrey Bourne has had a long career in intelligence-related activities, and, according to as-yet unconfirmed reports, was involved with the Communist Party of Great Britain. He came to the U.S. in 1957, where he took a teaching position at the Coca Cola Company-funded Emory University, and later became the director of the Yerkes Primate Center in Atlanta, where classified defense-related research is conducted. In light of Great Britain’s violent
opposition to the U.S. clean-up of Grenada, researchers are now looking into the possibility that Bourne’s long-standing connections to British intelligence indicate that he may have been a key point-man for joint Anglo-Soviet operations in the Caribbean.

Peter Bourne is an even more obvious case. A psychiatrist who has specialized in “drug abuse,” he has been involved in radical-leftist operations since at least the mid-1960s. He spent two years in Vietnam profiling U.S. special forces under stress, then set up the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, a radical peace group with Soviet ties. Counseling programs run through such groups served as covers for turning veterans into Manchurian candidate-type assassins à la John Hinckley. Bourne was also a board member of the Institute for Southern Studies, the southern arm of the terrorist-supporting Institute for Policy Studies. Unconfirmed reports say that Peter Bourne was picked up by the KGB while working for the U.S. State Department’s Agency for International Development.

Reportedly, Peter Bourne was also involved in the development of the black separatist movement in the United States during the 1960s, working in particular with Stokely Carmichael, whose All American People has been involved in terrorist training sessions on Grenada. The younger Bourne teamed up with Jimmy Carter in the late 1960s, becoming an intimate friend and adviser, and an appointee in Carter’s gubernatorial and presidential administrations.

Capitol Hill briefed on feasibility by Fusion

by Marjorie Hecht

“I very much welcome the U.S. development of beam weapons for the defense of Europe,” Col. Marc Geneste of France told a Capitol Hill gathering in Washington on Oct. 26. “The missing link in our defense is how to defend Europe against the Soviet SS-20s at our borders. Beam weapons can do it.”

Geneste was speaking at a briefing on beam defense sponsored by the Fusion Energy Foundation and held in the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Eighty-five representatives from industry, government, scientific organizations, Congress, and foreign embassies were present at the meeting to hear the FEF make public its proposed crash program, starting at $10 billion a year, to develop defensive beam weapons capable of intercepting nuclear missiles.

The announcement of the detailed Manhattan Project-style program was made in conjunction with the release of a new book authored by the FEF, Beam Defense: An Alternative to Nuclear Destruction. The 176-page paperback, published by Aero Publishers, Inc. of Fallbrook, California, is the first popular book on the defensive weapon systems, which President Reagan committed the nation to develop on March 23.

In addition to Colonel Geneste, the briefing featured Dr. Steven Bardwell, director of plasma physics for the FEF and editor-in-chief of Fusion magazine, and Criton Zoakos, editor-in-chief of EIR. Geneste, a 25-year career officer with the French army, is well known for his role in the development of the neutron bomb.

A threadbare ‘nuclear umbrella’

Colonel Geneste recounted the “progressive erosion of European confidence in its main ally,” as over the past 30 years the United States adopted the strategic policy of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). Using a series of cartoons drawn by his son, Geneste vividly described how Europe was “sleeping quietly under the U.S. nuclear umbrella” in the early 1950s. The first problem arose in 1957, he said, when Sputnik put some holes in the umbrella. At that point, General de Gaulle decided to open his own little nuclear umbrella.

By the early 1960s, Geneste said, President Kennedy’s and Defense Secretary McNamara’s decision to build up the U.S. strategic capability had shifted the balance of forces
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