

in the movie "Dr. Strangelove") addressed a crucial meeting of the Pugwash Conference. Dr. Szilard proposed that an agreement be struck between Washington and Moscow that, should either side ever carry out a nuclear attack against a major population center in the other country, a reciprocal attack would be "permitted" against a similar size city to avert all-out thermonuclear war.

Such mad logic has been a recurring theme in superpower relations ever since the launching of the Pugwash charnel. Dr. Henry A. Kissinger is one of the preeminent Pugwash participants whose policies have gained wide prominence in the present Bush administration.

Whether Dr. Swire's view proves to be accurate or not, recurring evidence does now exist that both the Bush and Thatcher regimes have been engaged in a top-down coverup of the Lockerbie tragedy. In a recent syndicated column, Jack Anderson charged that in April 1989, Bush and Thatcher spoke by phone and agreed to conceal the fact that both U.S. and British intelligence knew with "95% certainty" that the PanAm 103 bombing had been carried out on orders from Ayatollah Khomeini and current Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani, the man whom official Washington has labeled a "moderate," with the logistical backing of the Syrian regime and the active participation of the PFLP-General Command of Ahmed Jibril.

Since the Bush-Thatcher conversation, both U.S. and British intelligence have worked to systematically cover up the Lockerbie massacre.

In late January, a team of investigators, an attorney, and a polygraph specialist for Pan American World Airways traveled to London, where they interviewed three PanAm employees who were working in the baggage area of Frankfurt International Airport the day of the bombing. According to sources close to the investigation, at least one of the three, a Turkish-born West German citizen, failed the polygraph test. When a PanAm attorney attempted to pass the findings of the polygraph on to Scottish investigators, he was reportedly visited by Scotland Yard agents and was threatened with arrest for interfering in an official investigation.

Upon the group's return to the United States, the polygraph specialist was immediately served with a subpoena to appear before a federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., according to news accounts. Ostensibly convened to gather evidence on the Lockerbie massacre, the grand jury has been identified as a key part of the Bush administration's damage-control effort.

The grand jury probe is being headed by Department of Justice attorney Brian Murtaugh, a former U.S. Attorney in North Carolina who gained some notoriety for his prosecution of Dr. Jeffrey McDonald, a retired Green Beret physician who was convicted of murdering his family. Sources close to the McDonald case believe that the prosecution covered up a Manson-like murder cult which actually did the murders and seriously wounded Dr. McDonald.

---

## The Cartagena Summit

---

# Andean nations reject Bush military sprees

by José Restrepo

Although the U.S. news media presented the Feb. 15 Cartagena anti-drug summit as a big success for the war against drug trafficking, and the U.S. President George Bush said, "we have in fact created the first anti-drug cartel," the reality is that the Presidents of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia rejected Bush's main proposal: using U.S. military personnel to control the air space over and in the international waters around the Andean countries.

Colombian President Virgilio Barco opened the summit with a reminder: "We Colombians are on the firing line. For us, it's more than a war of words. We are upholding our convictions in order to defend the very essence of our democracy. We shall move forward in spite of the sacrifices that we have had to take on. No, Colombia will not weaken. We will not let the death of thousands of Colombians be in vain." However, Barco stressed that in order to win the war, Colombia needs economic justice and that the advanced sector must crack down on drug consumption and money laundering with the same seriousness with which Colombia is crushing the drug traffickers.

Barco and other moral Ibero-Americans yearn for a United States willing to help win the battle against the narco-terrorists afflicting their countries. But, despite Bush's flashy video bits, they did not find it.

### Where's the beef?

"For Colombia," said Barco, "Colombia who has had to bear the very expensive cost of this struggle, the success is not based on only getting more external aid but in receiving fair treatment on our exports and that the United States and the European Community help us." The other two Presidents, Peru's Alan García and Bolivia's Jaime Paz Zamora, also sought trade and economic assistance from the U.S. "Where's the beef?" García asked.

President Barco especially remonstrated the United States for undermining the International Coffee Pact which used to guarantee reasonable prices for Colombia's biggest legal export and for impending U.S. tariff sanctions against Colombia's second top legal export, cut flowers.

However, Bush, at the press conference after the meeting, said that although the United States will help these coun-

tries fight drugs, the U.S. will make no commitment to offer greater trade opportunities for the products which are critical for their economies.

In a Feb. 14 NBC interview, Barco said U.S. military deployments inside Colombia or U.S. warships around it would not be "accepted by the Colombian people." "It's as if we were to send our troops to Washington; that would not be acceptable," he said. When Barco was asked about the possibility of U.S. naval drug interdiction operations and U.S. military intervention, he replied that Colombia does not need foreign troops to fight drugs.

For Colombians and other Ibero-Americans, U.S. military intervention evokes the image of Bush's December 1989 Panama invasion. That is a particularly sensitive matter for Colombians, who had their former Panama province stolen from them "fair and square" by Teddy Roosevelt's gunboats in 1903. "We Colombians will not applaud Marines in any Latin American country and much less on our territory," the four labor federations proclaimed at a Feb. 14 protest march of 10,000 workers against Bush's visit. "Tomorrow's visit by the North American President to our country is *non grata* to us," they declared.

In his opening speech, Barco outlined what the program to fight drugs should be: "We have to offer economic and social alternatives to the peasants that grow coca. We have to dismantle the cartels and their infrastructure for processing and trafficking drugs, we have to stop the flow of chemical input from industrialized countries. We have to control the sale of arms used by the criminals for violence. And fundamentally, we have to reduce the demand for drugs in the big cities of the developed countries."

Bush's Panama invasion poisoned the well for what could have been productive U.S. military collaboration with the Andean countries against the drug traffickers. Barco has staked his presidency on winning a shooting war against the drug cartels, because they threatened the sovereignty of his republic. Now, an imperial Bush threatens and rips up the sovereignty of U.S. allies. After what happened to Panama, no nation dares to allow a U.S. military presence.

At the summit, Bush proposed a string of radar bases manned by U.S. military personnel, in the Andes Mountains. At the short press conference on leaving Cartagena, The colombian press quoted Bush, "But the stories about the U.S. mission are so distorted that I felt it better to continue speaking in general terms about our military efforts, instead of asking the cooperation of any of those three countries. . . . They were very frank with us on things that maybe they wanted me to do more or disagreed with. But I think interdiction is very important. . . . Therefore, we are not going to insist."

### **U.S. accepts talks with narco-terrorists**

On the eve of the summit, Bush's ambassador to Colombia Thomas McNamara, said the U.S. government would not

object if the Colombian government were to reverse course and begin negotiations with the drug traffickers, according to daily *La Prensa*. McNamara insisted the U.S. would not interfere in any future agreement Colombia could make with the cartels. He thereby offered a green light to former President Alfonso López Michelsen and presidential candidate Ernesto Samper Pizano to continue helping drug kingpin Pablo Escobar and the so-called Extraditables force Barco to negotiate peaceful coexistence with the drug cartels.

Samper and others took the opportunity of the Cartagena summit to ask again for the legalization of narcotics. Samper published an ad in *El Tiempo* which said there must be a clear commitment by the drug-consuming countries to control consumption "or we must enter into discussion for international legalization."

Enrique Santos Calderón, publisher of *El Tiempo* newspaper, said that if the U.S. is not ready to put its hands in its pockets, it would "be better to think of the legalization alternative." Others, who before the U.S. ambassador's green light did not dare to call for that policy, such as Francisco Santos, one of *El Tiempo's* columnists, and Jaime Castro, a minor Liberal Party presidential aspirant, are now also promoting legalization.

In the opening statement in the press conference in Cartagena, President Barco reiterated: "Before beginning this dialogue, I want to deny the rumors on supposed negotiations with the narco-terrorists. Those rumors are completely and totally false. The government's policy has *not* changed; that is quite clear. The drug traffickers have to end their illegal trade, turn themselves in and submit to justice. Colombian law is not negotiable."

---

## Documentation

---

### **Bush, spokesman for a drug-dependent empire**

*The following joint declaration of the Andean Labor Party, the Mexican Labor Party, the Venezuelan Labor Party, and the Independent Solidarity Movement (of Peru) was released on Feb. 11:*

The anti-drug summit in Cartagena attended by Presidents Virgilio Barco, George Bush, Alan García and Jaime Paz Zamora is, first and foremost, an insult to the intelligence of the Ibero-American people. It is abundantly clear that the meeting was not intended for serious discussion. It will be a fleeting encounter, of less than six hours duration, conceived by Bush's public relations staff as a spectacle for United

States' television viewers.

Above all, it is futile for Ibero-American heads of state to gather together to discuss a war on drugs with the man directly responsible for having installed in Panama—through military aggression—a government intimately tied to the laundering of money from the drug-trafficking cartels.

In fact, the U.S. occupation forces are in Panama to support a triumvirate of narco-politicians. The scandal is so outrageous that it has even reached the front-page of the *New York Times*, which published on Feb. 6 a portion of the evidence linking Guillermo Endara, Ricardo Arias Calderón, and Billy Ford to drug-money laundering and, specifically, to the Cali Cartel and its chief, Gilberto Rodríguez Orejuela.

This is not to say that the war on drugs directed by Colombian President Virgilio Barco has not won some important

victories. It has delivered some magnificent blows to the drug trade. It has dislocated a portion of its logistical and communications apparatus, it has considerably damaged its military capability, and it has managed to extradite to the United States a number of the drug traffickers demanded by that country.

But while Colombia's soldiers and police officers are giving and risking their lives in that war, U.S. diplomatic spokesmen are openly sabotaging it. For example, U.S. Ambassador to Colombia Thomas McNamara told the press that "the solution to the drug trafficking problem is not extradition," a statement which constitutes nothing less than a transparent offer to negotiate the issue with the drug mafias, just as they have been demanding.

In Peru, Political Attaché to the U.S. Embassy Mark

## Bush economics keeps Peru hooked on cocaine production

President George Bush's Feb. 15 "war on drugs" summit with the Presidents of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia was bound to be a cruel joke. While Colombian President Virgilio Barco is indeed waging a war to the death against the traffickers, the other three Presidents are, at best, trying to limit the world's \$600 billion a year narcotics economy. Behind the media show of military interdiction and the substitution of coca fields by other export crops lies a cynical toleration for drug production, money laundering, and consumption.

Peruvian President Alan García stated in the Feb. 12 *Caretas* magazine, "After 10 years, we know that police repression and penal sanction have failed against the economic profits" brought by the drug economy. He contended, "Although illegal, the sale of coca brings in foreign exchange and resources to society." He warned that if Peru stopped producing cocaine, its currency would lose more than three-quarters of its current value. He thus embraced the logic economist Guido Pennano uses to conclude that the narcotics trade should be legalized. García also approved Feb. 12 "free enterprise" advocate Hernando de Soto's idea of legalizing the 200,000 coca leaf growers.

García even brought three leaders of the coca growers with him to negotiate with Bush's delegation at the Cartagena "war on drugs" summit, with the acquiescence of

National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft. Scowcroft evidently is seeking a backroom deal with the cocaine cartels, similar to the one he and his "former" boss Henry Kissinger cut with the world's biggest heroin traffickers, the Chinese Communists.

Washington's bipartisan brain defect may be seen in a year-long study by a Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and William Roth (R-Del.). Its report approvingly states, "The democratically elected governments of Peru and Bolivia are and will continue to be preoccupied with problems that pose a more immediate threat to their countries than drugs." The State Department openly accepts Peru's line that coca growers should not be antagonized until terrorism is defeated.

Nunn and Connecticut Democrat Joseph L. Lieberman wrote a piece entitled, "Hooked on Coca" in the *Washington Post* Feb. 14. They say no Andean country can stop farmers from planting coca. "This failure stems from two factors: the desperate economic conditions in that part of the world and the consequent political instability. . . . All three countries have become financially hooked on the foreign exchange from their drug trade."

### Cocaine causes economic cancer

Poverty and drugs do go together. But the big lie that poverty *causes* drugs is used by Nunn and the U.S. media to fool people into thinking legalization is the only solution. The Peruvian and Bolivian experiences prove the opposite: Drug money flows are a cancer to national economies. They can bring a certain kind of "growth," but they twist and destroy the organism's whole metabolism in the process. You don't fight cancer by replacing it with something else to keep the organism as it is. It is absurd to think countries in which the cocaine economy is as big as the legal one can be helped by gradually replacing coca

Dion gave a press conference to explain why the war on drugs must be put off indefinitely. According to Dion, it is more appropriate for Peru to dedicate itself "first to solving the economic crisis, and to the defeat of terrorism." As if the Peruvian economic crisis and that of other nations in the region were not in great measure a result of the decomposition sown by the drug economy! As if terrorism and the drug trade were not intimately linked!

Presidents Alan García and Jaime Paz Zamora argue that to eradicate the drug trade, one must concentrate on crop substitution and not on military operations. They point to the fact that there are thousands of impoverished peasants who dedicate themselves to coca cultivation to survive, and suggest that these be given the resources to earn their living another way. What they overlook is the reality that it is not

the impoverished peasant who has organized the lucrative drug trade, nor who is its beneficiary.

It is not a matter of waging war against the peasant. What must be destroyed is the entire military, logistical, banking and communications apparatus of the drug trade, which exercises control over the peasants, exploiting them and degrading them by forcing them into an illegal activity that is destroying the lives of millions of human beings while ruining their own nation. Destroy the drug mafias' apparatus and you shut down the flow of narcotics to the drug markets; the mafias can no longer exercise their power over the peasants; and then there can be crop substitution. A total war by each sovereign nation against the drug-trafficking mafias is also a war of liberation for the oppressed peasant.

Nothing should be expected of George Bush and his ad-

bushes with coffee or cocoa trees, as García and Nunn propose.

At least \$2.5-3 billion a year is paid to Peruvians for cocaine. The bigger traffickers launder their money through the big Lima banks and transfer it directly into their accounts in the United States, Cayman Islands, etc. Part of the cash is paid out in the jungle. Peruvian financiers fly daily to the jungle towns with suitcases full of Peruvian intis and return to Lima with a load of dollars.

The whole economy now revolves around those dollars. The Lima banks open at 9 a.m. At 10, bank employees go out to the street with wads of intis and buy dollars, pushing the dollar's value up a bit. Before the bank closes at 12:30, they are back out, buying back their depositors' intis, perhaps at a small profit. A few years ago, black market operations were concentrated on Lima's Ocoña Street; now there are black markets in every business district.

The exchange rate fluctuates wildly. Everytime the dollar goes up, so do prices of everything. This "free market" of narco-dollars guarantees that no government economy policy could save the real economy.

In 1985 and 1986, when García was chasing the drug traffickers out of the country and repressing Ocoña Street, Peru's production of the food and industrial products needed for its society's consumption grew 8% and it had a healthy surplus for export. Since García capitulated to the drug money launderers in 1988, the economy has gone into free-fall. Last year, production fell another 12% and consumer prices increased 2,775%, by official count.

García responded to the economic crisis by sacrificing more and more of the real economy to International Monetary Fund policies supported by President Bush. He propitiated the international narco-bankers by paying the IMF \$42.3 million in arrears in December. There is 26% less

money, in real terms, circulating in the economy today than a year ago, according to the bank association. The illiquidity has driven up interest rates, harming industry, mining, and fishing.

### Sachs shock

García's disastrous attempts at IMF austerity are not enough for Washington, which makes clear that only a government which gains full IMF approval will get even the token economic aid to help crop substitution discussed at Cartagena.

Peruvian neoliberal ideologue Hernando de Soto penned a commentary in the *Wall Street Journal* Feb. 13, championing the legalization of coca growing peasants in the jungle. De Soto, financed by the National Endowment for Democracy and praised as a model by George Bush, advocates Peru receiving the same Nazi shock policies Harvard University professor Jeffrey Sachs applied to Bolivia starting in 1985. A reporter for Peru's *Clave* magazine agreed with de Soto that Sachs's policies had reduced inflation in Bolivia, "but with 25,000 unemployed miners working growing coca." De Soto responded, "You are telling me about costs, but the objective—lowering inflation—is achieved."

Clearly, Bush economics drives 10 workers into cocaine trafficking for every one who might be taken out by "crop substitution" programs. By usurping much of Peru's best land and agricultural capital, the cocaine boom has thrust Peru into the world's 15 worst nourished populations. Every year, 85,000 children die of malnutrition alone. Do García, Bush, or Nunn propose the great projects which could double Peru's food production? Hardly. García suggests that the U.S. aid production of chocolate and instant coffee in the jungle for export to the United States.—Mark Sonnenblick

ministration. Bush has no war plan against the drug trade. His plan is little more than to limit the flow of drugs into the United States, not to crush it. William Bennett, the Bush administration's drug czar, is the man who said that all he hopes and expects to achieve is a 50% reduction of drugs coming into the United States *over the next 10 years*. By then, our nations will have been destroyed; they will become pathetic drug-producing *haciendas*, administered by the likes of Pablo Escobar.

The Bush administration's lack of interest in a genuine war on drugs corresponds to the simple fact that the Anglo-American financial system subsists on the basis of the laundering of all sorts of illegal revenues, above all those of the drug trade, which represents \$600 billion a year. The broken finances of the United States, the world's largest debtor, depend on that dirty money flow. The United States is in ruins; its industry, formerly the vanguard of the world, is today third class. Americans themselves prefer to buy Japanese products over their own shoddy goods.

Supposed U.S. aid for the war on drugs is ridiculous. For this year, the Bush government has offered Colombia, Peru and Bolivia combined a total of \$250 million for this purpose. Compare that with the \$1.5 billion a year that Colombia has paid on average in servicing its foreign debt over the past three years; or with the \$1 billion lost to Colombia last year due to the fall in coffee prices resulting from United States' sabotage of the World Coffee Pact. This should give a clear idea of the Bush government's niggardly thinking: a war on drugs that doesn't unbalance the budget!

Since when have wars been waged according to the budget deficit? Wars are fought to be won, and to win a just and necessary war such as the war against drugs, all the money, effort and technical resources available must be unhesitatingly deployed to that end.

Bush's true interest in the matter is to use the pretext of a war on drugs to invade and occupy nations at its whim, in fulfillment of the geopolitical deal his government has struck with Moscow. What interests Bush is using the military strength of his country to collect Ibero-America's debt by force in order to sustain a broken-down empire of usury, speculation and the laundering of filthy, blood-stained money. This is precisely what happened in Panama, where the primary task of the puppet government is to "bring foreign debt payments up to date." All the so-called U.S. aid to Panama is allotted to either debt repayment or to organizing its repayment.

It is, thus, scandalous that Ibero-America's leaders are meeting to discuss a war on drugs with a "narco-tolerant" President representing a "narco-dependent" empire with increasingly less influence on world affairs. There is no greater proof of this narco-tolerance than the fact that the most important anti-drug leader in the United States, Lyndon H. LaRouche, is sitting in jail, a political prisoner of the Bush administration. Back in March of 1985, LaRouche presented

a proposal for fighting the drug trade and narco-terrorism, and described how this war should be waged—jointly and on the basis of respect for national sovereignty.

George Bush represents an empire in decline. Just as in the fairy tale, George Bush is an emperor without clothes. If our nations wish to speak with governments playing a determining role in the world, it would make more sense to sit down with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl or with the Japanese prime minister.

In order to push the war on drugs ahead and to win it, the first thing we must do is stop paying the debt to Anglo-American usurers. With such a move, we would kill two birds with one stone: We would help to sink the money launderers, and we would be releasing for the war on drugs resources far superior to the paltry sums offered by Bush.

We must simultaneously talk with Germany and Japan, nations which still believe in economic development, in industry, in productivity, where there is capital to be invested instead of a desperate need to suck capital, any capital, in. With those governments, we could seriously discuss the great project of a united, prosperous Ibero-America, with a healthy and profitable economy.

There are currently three coexisting worlds: first, the corrupt world of usury and tolerance for drugs, which promises us only looting, narcotics, economic and social destruction, invasions, dissolution of the family and of the nation; second, the communist and socialist world, whose overthrow is already irreversible; and third, the world of industrial development, democracy and well-being which we can see being built with renewed vigor in Germany and Japan.

Free-market capitalism and Marxist collectivism have categorically failed. Only paid agents or incurable madmen like Fidel Castro still cling to them. The only option is the third path of industrial capitalism, formerly known as mercantilism, which fuses freedom, technological progress and social justice.

'From the prison in which the politician's career expires, the influence of the statesman is raised toward the summits of his life's providential course. Since Solon, the Socratic method has become the mark of the great Western statesman. Without the reemergence of that leadership, our imperiled civilization will not survive this century's waning years.'

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

### **In Defense of Common Sense by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.**

Available for \$5 from:

Ben Franklin Booksellers, 27 S. King St., Leesburg, Va.  
22075. Telephone (703) 777-3661.

Postage & Shipping U.S. Mail: \$1.50 + \$.50 each additional book.  
UPS: \$3 + \$1 each additional book.