NATO hands behind new Italian terrorism?

by Claudio Celani

In the early morning of May 20, two professional killers assassinated Massimo D’Antona, adviser to the Italian government and leading member of the national trade union CGIL, as he left his house to go to work. The murder occurred while Italian Prime Minister Massimo D’Alema was on his way to meet NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, in Brussels, to officially pressure NATO to accept Italy’s proposal for a cease-fire in Yugoslavia.

The murder was soon claimed by a terrorist organization which had long ceased to exist: the Red Brigades. Born out of a faction of the Maoist ’68 Movement, at the Sociology Department of Trento University, the Red Brigades became the most dangerous terrorist group, responsible for the murder and kidnapping of tens of politicians and public officials, including Aldo Moro (1978), American NATO general James Dozier (1983), and many others. Eventually, the Red Brigades disbanded after most of their members were arrested.

The last terrorist episode claimed by the Red Brigades was the assassination of Sen. Roberto Ruffilli, in 1989. In reality, as EIR and a few other experts have pointed out, the real “masterminds” of the Red Brigades were neither found, nor identified.

“The whole history of Italian terrorism shows that terrorism has been used to keep Italy under a regime of ‘limited sovereignty,’” Sergio Flamigni, a former senator, member of several Parliamentary investigating committees on terrorism, and author of books on the Red Brigades, told EIR. “Today, Italy has a government promoting a visibly autonomous policy inside NATO. It is a natural policy for Italy, not only because the current government is progressive, but also because of the Catholic sentiments among the majority of the population. They are hitting now to deny Italy’s right to an autonomous foreign policy.”

Flamigni’s statements, delivered a few hours after the assassination of D’Antona, point to a correlation between the murder and the Italian government’s efforts to steer NATO members away from the British war policy. Premier D’Alema himself has hinted at this correlation: He immediately stated, on his return to Rome, that D’Antona’s murder occurred “in a moment of a serious international crisis.” D’Alema also refused to talk about “terrorists” and instead characterized the murderers as “a gang of assassins.”

More explicit than D’Alema, was Umberto Ranieri, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, who declared on May 25: “Behind red terrorism . . . there is the belief that Italy must remain a weak link of the Western chain and a part of the world where an armed attack can be played in order to unleash processes of political dissolution.”

The morning of D’Antona’s murder, the Italian Prime Minister had gone further than any other NATO government, by visiting NATO headquarters in Brussels to push for a cease-fire. “I am very well aware that the Italian position is different from NATO’s, but I explained our proposal and I was at least listened to carefully,” said D’Alema, in a statement to journalists, after his visit.

The Italian proposal aims to clear a negotiation deadlock, based on the fact that both China and Russia, permanent members of the UN Security Council, insist that any Serbian troop withdrawal from Kosovo must be preceded by a halt in NATO bombings over Kosovo and Yugoslavia. The Italian proposal, therefore, envisions a NATO cease-fire once the UN Security Council, including China and Russia, has issued a common resolution, based on the G-8 draft agreement, which will have been accepted by Belgrade. At the same time, the Italian government is pushing for a reconstruction plan for the Balkans, and has said that, in order to be successful, such a plan must be out of control of the International Monetary Fund.

All this is enough to motivate a terror offensive against Italy from that faction that is responsible for NATO’s Balkan war and for continued IMF dictatorship: the faction centered in the City of London.

D’Alema in the cross-hairs

On May 22, at an emergency meeting on security, heads of the Italian intelligence service declared that Premier D’Alema is at the top of a list of 130 potential terrorist targets. The secret service had warned, a few months ago, about the regrouping of “left extremist violence,” which could develop into a resurgence of terrorist acts. These warnings had then been confirmed by a series of arsons and other violence against NATO barracks and cars. Then came the assassination of government adviser D’Antona.

On the night of May 23-24, the symbol of the Red Brigades was sprayed next to the front door of Premier D’Alema’s private home in Gallipoli, in southern Italy.

In addition to the direct threat against D’Alema, the choice of D’Antona as victim of the “Red Brigades” also indicates a sophisticated scenario for a domestic “strategy of tension” to paralyze the government’s foreign policy. D’Antona was, in fact, a mediator between labor interests, which he represented, and industry. A professor of labor law, D’Antona was not known to the public, but he had been
the author of important legislation, such as the regulation of strikes in the public sector. In the delicate process of reforming social welfare policies—which Italy is unfortunately undergoing, as are all European countries—D’Antona represented the moderate faction, espousing some deregulation, in exchange for social peace. In terms of the Balkan war, D’Antona represented the government position, as opposed to other trade union and party factions, which have insisted that the government should openly break with NATO.

Recently, all factions of the government majority had united in support of a document voted up by Parliament, which obliges the government to “seek a bombing halt as soon as possible.” Before the vote, D’Alema had indicated that such a vote would have strengthened the government in its international action. Now, after D’Antona’s murder, and since the “Red Brigades” stated in its document that they killed D’Antona because of government support for “the brutal NATO aggression against Serbia,” some observers fear that supporters of the British line inside NATO might use the climate of terror to intimidate and stop the peace movement altogether, and undercut Italy’s effort to settle the Balkan crisis through diplomatic means. That effort to achieve a diplomatic solution has been staunchly opposed by only one NATO state: Great Britain.

What is more, as we will see, these factions opposing the present Italian government’s foreign policy, intersect circles that historically have been identified as the “higher level” of terrorist structures.

Who are the Red Brigades, really?

Police investigations are now focussing on the group of “second generation” Red Brigades terrorists who participated to the last terrorism wave of the 1980s, who were never arrested, and who, according to this police hypothesis, have recruited a “third generation” of younger members to carry out a new terror wave. The leadership of the new Red Brigades, according to this view, is made up of the “second generation,” largely based in Florence.

Investigators point to the fact that, during the kidnapping of Aldo Moro, the “strategic leadership” of the Red Brigades used to meet in the Florence area, in a still-unknown location. Although such analyses contain an element of truth, the history of the Red Brigades, and especially the 55-day-long imprisonment of Moro, show that, in addition to the “official” Red Brigades, there was a parallel structure that actually managed the whole operation—from the initial shootout with Moro’s bodyguards, to the handling of the prisoner, to his execution. An enormous amount of evidence has been collected, implicating military, political, and intelligence structures that are linked to NATO.

For instance, 13 years after Moro’s kidnapping, it was discovered that, at the moment of the kidnapping, on March 16, 1978, at 9:00 in the morning, a secret service official, Colonel Guglielmi, was at the site of the kidnapping. Guglielmi was a high official of the secret NATO “stay-behind structure,” called Gladio. Also, 39 out of the 92 bullets that were shot to kill Moro’s bodyguards, it was found, came from a secret stock of ammunition originally provided to Gladio.

Even more spectacular, was the discovery in 1981, that all heads of the secret services, police, armed forces, and so on, who were in charge of police operations during the Moro kidnapping, were members of a secret freemasonic lodge called “Propaganda Due,” known as P-2. The P-2 was, in the official characterization by former President Francesco Cossiga, “a patriotic Lodge of Atlantic obedience.” Cossiga was police minister during Moro’s kidnapping, and he put the intelligence services and police under the control of P-2 members. Furthermore, Cossiga formed a “crisis committee” that centralized all police operations and filled them with P-2 people. Before doing this, Cossiga had made sure that the existing anti-terrorism police, who had been quite effective until that moment, were totally dismantled.

The P-2 Lodge was nominally headed by Licio Gelli, a secret police agent under Fascism, who had been recycled by James Jesus Angleton, the former head of CIA Counterintelligence, into the Italian secret services at the end of World War II. According to one source, however, the real hierarchy of the P-2 was to be found in the Montecarlo Lodge, of which Henry Kissinger was a member. This fits with the political reconstruction, now universally accepted, as to why, and by whom, Moro was really murdered. As reported by Moro’s widow, before a Parliamentary committee, Kissinger wanted to stop Moro’s project to involve the Italian Communist Party in government responsibilities, and Kissinger personally threatened Moro, saying: “You should stop pursuing your political plan to bring all forces in your country to collaborate directly. Now, either you stop doing that or you will pay for that. It is up to you to decide.”

The long arm of the British

However, if one looks clearly at the role of Francesco Cossiga, the man who was rewarded for Moro’s death by becoming Prime Minister one year after Moro was killed, one sees the British hand at the top of the whole structure. Cossiga had direct connections to the British establishment, of which he is a fanatical admirer. His philosophical model is the British cardinal John Henry Newman, a 19th-century admirer of the Roman Empire and the Roman system of law. Cossiga periodically visits Great Britain, and was characterized by Margaret Thatcher as “the only real politician in Italy.” Cossiga started his career under the late President Antonio Segni, a fellow native of Sardinia, who appointed Cossiga as his liaison to the secret services. In 1962, when Italian nationalist and industrialist Enrico Mattei was assassinated, Cossiga was Segni’s liaison to the head of the secret services, Gen. Gio-
vanni De Lorenzo. A new investigation by Pavia prosecutor Vincenzo Calia, while establishing that Mattei was assassinated, has also reconstructed the cover-up of Mattei’s murder for which De Lorenzo’s people were responsible (see EIR, Dec. 5, 1997).

Cossiga, after the secret P-2 Lodge was uncovered, protected the P-2; after the secret Gladio organization was uncovered, he protected Gladio. In 1989, as President, Cossiga proposed an “amnesty” for all Red Brigades terrorists. Through the P-2, the Gladio network, and the political structure around Cossiga, one can see very well that the idea that Red Brigades terrorism is a sociological phenomenon, or a “communist-steered destabilization,” is nothing but a fairy tale. Thus, the idea that the hypothesized third generation of the Red Brigades is something different from red terrorism of the 1970s and 1980s, is a fairy tale as well. If there is a continuity, then the same NATO-connected structure that managed the old Red Brigades is using the new Red Brigades.

General Clark lies

Not accidentally, the network that historically has protected Red Brigades terrorism, is today pushing the “sociological phenomenon” explanation or, alternatively the “Serbian connection” as the stringpullers of the new Red Brigades. The first to set the tone was none other than NATO commander-in-chief Gen. Wesley Clark, who said that he detected a “Serbian hand” behind recent terrorist acts in Italy. Speaking in Vicenza, allied air headquarters, Clark said: “Let’s just say that such acts are part of the strategy pursued by Milosevic and others.”

Curiously, while Clark was uttering these remarks, EIR learned from reliable sources that a former official spokesman for Gladio, who is still an active participant in the networks, was calling Parliamentary experts to tell them that if they were looking for an international connection behind the Red Brigades, they should look at Belgrade. A strange coordination between the Gladio network, which is officially dissolved, and NATO headquarters! Reached by EIR, the former Gladio spokesman elaborated his thoughts. Although he specified that the “Serbian connection” was a hypothesis, he thinks that NATO’s air war is so successful, that Serbia’s dictator Milosevic is retaliating with terrorism against Italy, which is the main “aircraft carrier” for NATO. Of course, given this hypothesis, Milosevic’s retaliation would damage the one country in NATO that is pushing the hardest for a bombing halt.

Interestingly, another former Gladio leader, Gen. Gerardo Serravalle, had different ideas. Serravalle told EIR that he thinks the NATO air war is a failure. “Whenever you start a war,” Serravalle said, “you have to plan a ground offensive. And a ground war in Kosovo would be a tremendously bloody war. General Clark is a complete incompetent. I would not even give him a depot to guard. If he was the one to come out with the Serbian connection, then this connection is automatically discounted.” Serravalle agreed with the view that the current Balkan destabilization is a traditional British geopolitical game.

Cossiga’s men on the Blair line

While the majority of Italy’s military establishment is firmly opposing a ground war in Kosovo, one minority voice is calling for shifting to Tony Blair’s side. This is Gen. Carlo Jean, a protégé of Gladio and of his P-2 friend Francesco Cossiga. Jean, who is currently the Italian representative at the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, was Cossiga’s military adviser when Cossiga was President (1985-92). Since the very first day of the NATO air war in Kosovo, Jean has called for a ground war. He motivated his call in a more recent article, published in the daily Il Sole-24 Ore, by citing the British example: Blair calls for a ground war, he said, “because he is the heir of British imperial power, which knows how to use force.”

In an essay published in the geopolitical quarterly Limes (Fall 1992), Jean laid out very bluntly the meaning of the “new NATO strategy” which is now being tested in Kosovo. “International Law,” Jean wrote, “is evolving toward overcoming the limits established by the United Nations Charter . . . with incalculable consequences for national sovereignty and for the concept of citizenship as such.” In fact, he wrote, “the right/duty of humanitarian interference is being affirmed . . . in a way similar in many aspects to the ideology of Europe’s civilizing mission that gave ethical justification to European colonialism in the last century.” The right of “humanitarian interference” (the justification used for the current NATO deployment in Kosovo), Jean reveals, corresponds to a “unitary conception of the world, and to a system of values that is universally recognized, connected to free market.” Such a “system of values” has, “in the course of history, distinguished more maritime countries [that is, Great Britain] from continental empires.”

War is defined in a new way, as a “international police action,” Jean wrote, but it remains war. The difference is, that with war you have an enemy; with a police operation you have a criminal. “One who violates the rules of the international status quo is not a Hostis but an Inimicus, and a criminal to be condemned, even if it is a state. . . . [T]he demonization of the adversary is the most effective way to achieve domestic and international support.”

In order to achieve such support, Jean stated, you manipulate public opinion by wrapping your arguments in the robes of values generally accepted by that population. This is the role of mass media: “In modern information society, it is not important to tell the truth, which, as an objective fact in itself, does not exist, but to manipulate it according to one’s own ends.”

Jean apparently is not aware of Abraham Lincoln’s views on this matter: that you can manipulate all of the people some of the time, but not all the people all of the time.