

only efficient way to fight the sects. Of course, one must denounce the political use of sects.

Q: What are the possibilities of a real schism within the Church between your tendency and the conservatives?

A: This is a big problem. It is true that the communities [*comunidades de base*] do not want the schism. What they want is to be recognized by the Holy See as genuinely ecclesiastic. In Nicaragua, for instance, the communities say that the problem with the bishops is not so much a religious or moral split. We are not breaking with them on issues of faith or Christianity, but on political issues. The problem is not religion but a political problem. So, to prevent a break, we must be able to find political options within the Catholic Church, political options that are based on the particular social class each one of us belongs to.

Q: How do you see the Church in Latin America?

A: It depends. In Mexico it is very conservative due to the selection of bishops. There are a few who are really extraordinary but they do not carry very much weight. It is not like the Church in Brazil where there are big numbers of very open-minded bishops.

Q: Do you think the phenomenon of Camilo Torres [Colombian guerrilla-priest killed in 1969, student of Houtart] will be reproduced?

A: A historical phenomenon does not reproduce itself. His life and death, as a personal testimony, reproduces itself almost every day in Latin America. How many priests have been killed in Central America? But every time there are different circumstances. Whether the political commitment should be an armed commitment or not really depends on the circumstances. The political commitment to fight for the oppressed people by priests and nuns will increase and radicalize. This tendency will tend to strengthen within the Catholic Church.

Q: You knew him [Camilo] at Louvain?

A: Of course. He had a very appealing personality, he was very charismatic, very pleasant.

Q: Why did Camilo take to arms?

A: Because he had used every other means before taking to arms. He participated in every single reform movement, he tried to work with the government in agriculture reform. He was left with no option. The opposition against him was so strong that he could not continue moving from one side to another fearing that he could get shot. At the end, he could not sleep in one single place for more than one night.

Q: I just don't see how you can do this without splitting from the Vatican.

A: It is a crucial problem. We are faced with a paradox. If the official Church takes the side of the party of oppression, even if it is not badly intended, no one should be surprised if—as it happened in Europe—the popular classes increasingly take over the Church. Then, the official Church will remain as the Church of the middle classes. What we will see is the emergence of new type of political regimes and social organizations. I'm sure this will mean the progressive abandonment by the official Church of the masses. This would take one or two generations, but there is no doubt that it will happen. But I have to go now to the south of Belgium for an anti-missiles demonstration.

Q: I have heard that the Soviets have offered the Nicaraguans the installation of missiles.

A: It would very good if it actually happened, it would make the Americans reflect a little. By the way, the missiles the Soviets are talking about are not like the one the Americans want to put in Europe. The Soviet ones are air-missiles, defensive arms in case the Nicaraguans are attacked.

'Four points address roots of Central America conflict'

The following interview with Luis Yanéz, president of the Ibero-American Cooperation Institute of Spain, was conducted in Madrid on April 20 by Paris bureau chief Katherine Kanter and Elisabeth Hellenbroich.

EIR: Recently, Lyndon LaRouche, head of a faction of the Democratic Party, the National Democratic Policy Advisory Committee, made a proposal to solve the Central American crisis that includes the following points: freeze all arms shipments into the area; establish an international mediating commission under the leadership of [Colombian] President Belisario Betancur, which could be the Contadora group; cut off U.S. aid to Israel, which is supplying weapons to both sides; and promote great enterprises for the region, including the construction of a new Panama Canal. What do you think of this proposal from Mr. LaRouche?

Yané: Well, I believe that these are constructive suggestions. The comment that could be made about what makes the proposal as a whole constructive—rather than to comment on the specific points, which, in any case should be left to the governments of the region, or to those governments seeking to bring peace to the area—is that it addresses the roots of the problem; these are problems that are historic in nature, about social inequalities, about the absence of re-

forms during the last 50 years, about conditions that are almost prehistoric in the countries of the region. I believe the spirit of these proposals is being made concrete by the Contadora group, by the five countries that are seeking a negotiated solution, and which, of course with the support of other European countries such as Spain, we believe can be a way to solve the problem.

But, in fact, these initiatives must overcome the rigidity and intransigence not only of the United States or Reagan, let us be fair, but also that of the government of Nicaragua, which does not accept the withdrawal of the military advisors, of the military assistance it receives from Cuba and the Soviets. But I hope and believe, that if there were, if ways could be developed, to guarantee to the parties that certain accords would not be violated, I believe that there is still time to reach a peaceful and negotiated solution in the region.

'The CFR crowd is using conflict to oust Reagan'

The following is an April 22 interview made available to EIR with an expert on Ibero-American affairs, who has extensive contacts in the Reagan administration and in Central American governments:

Q: What is behind the furor over Central America?

A: There is a basic agreement between Henry Kissinger and associates at the Council on Foreign Relations [CFR], and the Soviets that the main objective of their deployments in Central America is not control of this or that country but the ouster of Ronald Reagan from the White House by the 1984 elections or sooner. Reagan is thus far performing according to profile. He is being drawn into a deeper involvement without the possible backing of the American people. Once Reagan takes the plunge, he will find himself politically isolated. The country will be polarized and his administration will be paralyzed. The CFR establishment plans to then pull the plug on his administration.

Q: How is the administration dealing with the CFR?

A: Reagan and his closest advisers suffer from the delusion that they can work around the CFR crowd, that they can make deals with them. They think that by being clever, they can force the CFR crowd to go along with their policy on Central America. The CFR crowd is letting them believe that, but once they get Reagan out on a limb, they will cut him to shreds.

Q: Where is this CFR policy laid out?

A: The recent meeting of the Trilateral Commission in Rome discussed this strategy to collapse the administration. This meeting was informed by discussion at strategy sessions of the Socialist International which reportedly bemoaned the problems in the United States of mobilizing large numbers of people against the administration, especially the failure of the so-called peace movement.

shirts to wave, and they need something like a Vietnam to touch off explosions on the campuses. This is scheduled to happen in the fall, around the slogan of "Reagan is a warmonger."

Q: What is the strategy, once Reagan is out?

A: The next government, most likely a government like the Carter administration, will work out a negotiated settlement with the Soviets, using the Socialist International as intermediaries.

Q: What is your assessment of the administration?

A: The administration is beset by traitors and fools. The State Department, especially George Shultz, [Undersecretary] Lawrence Eagleburger, and [Assistant Secretary] Thomas Enders are playing a treacherous role, waiting for Reagan to stick his head in the noose. In the meantime, they are letting a confrontationist grouping around the President gain the upper hand and push the policy toward a crisis point. They will then use the crisis to stage a palace coup against the President, with the help of the media and congressional networks.

Q: What alternatives does the administration have?

A: The problem is that I guess we have no policy options because we are stuck in the anti-communist profile. If Reagan goes for a confrontation, as it looks like he is doing, I am afraid that his government is finished. The structure for this war is in place already in places like Mexico. It is just waiting to be ignited. The political damage will be immense. The CFR and Kissinger are just licking their chops at the prospects. It's a hell of a mess.

Q: What are the prospects for Central America?

A: A process has been set in motion that will lead to 20 years of butchery, of tens of millions of dead. Even if things are stopped in El Salvador and Nicaragua, they will start up again somewhere else. The fighting will continue, because the Soviets want it. Kissinger and his friends recognize this. They don't care. It gives them something to crisis-manage. . . .

What I am afraid that we will learn is that the Soviets have a better profile of the American population than the President of the United States. We are about to polarize the country, to have a Vietnam-like explosion. We can have a "Bay of Pigs" disaster without even going ahead with an invasion.