

“peace negotiations” be held between the MRTA and the government, à la El Salvador. The next day, former Sandinista President Daniel Ortega, in Lima to attend the Forum confab, offered that he personally serve as the “mediator” in these negotiations!

Instead of capitulating to the terrorists’ strategy of “war for talks,” Peru’s government opted to defeat the terrorists once and for all. It was the decision to put the country on a war footing on April 5, 1992 which the Inter-American Dialogue—two of whose members are also leaders of the São Paulo Forum—would not tolerate.

What about Yeltsin?

The fact that, under conditions of spreading terrorist warfare, the U.S. State Department continues to decry as “undemocratic” any Ibero-American government or military which even simply warns publicly of the existence of the São Paulo Forum’s Narco-Terrorist International, has already created unprecedented hostility to the United States’ “democracy” policy among the officer corps, in particular, of every country in the hemisphere. But the U.S. government’s slavish support for Boris Yeltsin’s bloody assault upon the Russian Parliament Oct. 3 and 4 may soon prove to have been the event which finally buried, whatever credibility still clung to the U.S. administration’s obsessive litany about a new global “democratic” order.

From Guatemala, to Venezuela, to Peru, U.S. support for Yeltsin’s dictatorship has called into question the entirety of U.S. policy towards the region. The comparison between the handling of Peru and Russia has stunned many.

The Peruvian government continues to be treated as a pariah state—with the U.S. State Department now caught twice in fomenting military uprising against it—because President Fujimori shut down a corrupt Congress and judiciary on April 5, 1992 because those institutions had repeatedly refused to allow a war against the terrorism ravaging the nation. But the Russian government was *hailed* for defending “democracy,” after Boris Yeltsin ordered a *military* assault on the Russian Parliament—because the Parliament had repeatedly put up obstacles to the economic austerity program demanded by the International Monetary Fund.

“Boris Yeltsin is praised, and I am called a dictator, when he caused thousands of deaths,” Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori angrily told the Argentine paper *Ambito Financiero*. “I was careful that there was no bloodshed when I dissolved Congress,” he said. “Why has he been accepted as he has, and I have not been pardoned for anything? The judgment made on me is unjust and inexact. Here there is total freedom, much more than in Russia. . . . Here, as you can see, I have the total support of the people.” As an editorial in Venezuela’s *Diario de Caracas* asked bluntly on Oct. 26: “How does one support the U.S. in Haiti and condemn Fujimori, while the U.S.A. unconditionally supports Yeltsin’s actions?”

U.S. Haiti policy at an impasse, but genocide continues

by Cynthia Rush

The same chaos which now characterizes U.S. policy toward Somalia has extended to Haiti, as the Clinton administration and its foreign policy advisers have for the moment backed off from using military force against Haiti’s Armed Forces and have also rejected imposing a complete commercial blockade of the country. This decision has in no way halted the murder of poor Haitians, however, who are dying as a result of the continuing embargo imposed by the United Nations and Organization of American States (OAS).

Despite their poverty and lack of resources, Haiti’s Armed Forces have put the U.S. and the U.N “globaloney” apparatus up against the wall, causing many administration officials to pause over what it would mean for the United States to intervene militarily in that country. As Haitian police officer Pierre Louis told Argentina’s daily *Clarín* in an interview published Oct. 28, “We will do what we will do.” If the U.S. decides to take military action against Haiti, “this won’t be one Somalia, it will be two Somalias . . . because we will throw all the Americans into the sea. We don’t want them. They should get out of here.” Deposed President Jean-Bertrand Aristide he said, “is a terrorist. He has an entire army. He is a criminal and murderer.” As for U.N. envoy Dante Caputo, Louis asked, “where is he? Why isn’t he here? He’s a *maricón*—a queer, a queer.”

U.S. officials say they will now focus on diplomatic efforts to try to bring about a government of “national reconciliation” while they urge Aristide to broaden his cabinet to include opposition political forces. The State Department and the White House have abandoned the Oct. 30 deadline for Aristide’s scheduled return to Haiti, with Secretary of State Warren Christopher’s explanation that “it’s more important to achieve the result of democracy than to fix a particular date.”

Several factors have contributed to the policy morass, not the least of which is the image of a powerful United States taking measures which will ensure death by starvation and disease of 7 million impoverished Haitians. While some members of the administration have said publicly they think a total blockade “would be a good thing,” the existence of a

fight is reflected in the statements of New Jersey Rep. Robert Torricelli (D). Never one to reject austerity for Ibero-America, Torricelli nonetheless said that while tougher sanctions might "succeed in making Haiti more democratic, we are also risking the spread of contagious diseases, deforestation, and total economic collapse."

France is circulating a resolution at the United Nations demanding a total blockade of Haiti, but U.S. Ambassador Madeline Albright stated that "we are not pressing for additional sanctions at this time."

Aristide the psychopath

Brian Latell, a CIA analyst who testified to members of the Senate and House on Aristide's mental health, succeeded in shaking up several legislators, causing them to question why the United States is backing an individual whose history of severe psychological problems and human rights violations places him in the same category as Cambodia's Pol Pot. According to syndicated columnist Robert Novak, in an article in the Oct. 28 *Washington Post*, Latell not only documented Aristide's health problems and reliance on 13 different types of medication, but underscored his use of mob violence and the practice of "necklacing." "He will rule with violence. He will settle scores," Latell warned.

Senators Larry Pressler (R-S.D.) and J. James Exon (D-Neb.) were visibly outraged at what they heard, and even liberal Massachusetts Sen. John Kerry (D) was rattled enough to conclude that "legitimate questions were raised" about U.S. support for Aristide. Columnist Novak commented that "senators of both parties worry why Clinton did not react more like John Kerry."

The one Washington group that is in a flight-forward mode on Haiti is the Inter-American Dialogue, Clinton's chief policymakers for Ibero-America. In a commentary published in the Oct. 28 *Christian Science Monitor*, IAD executive director Peter Hakim demanded that the United States "stay the course," insisting that U.S. "credibility" in promoting democracy is at stake.

Pointing to Haiti as a test case for the insane U.S. hemispheric policy of enforcing bankers' usury and destroying national institutions under the name of "democracy," Hakim warned, "If we do not or cannot act effectively in a poor, weak neighboring country, where can we be counted on to act?" Hakim also emphasized that the United States must continue working through the OAS and the U.N. "This joint action, if successful, will set a precedent for future international initiatives to protect democracy in this hemisphere and beyond." Finally, the "worldwide trade embargo against Haiti must be kept in place until Aristide reassumes power."

U.S. waffling has provoked hysteria among Aristide's backers in Haiti. One U.N. official in Port-au-Prince complained that a statement by North Carolina Sen. Jesse Helms (R), that Aristide was a psychopath, "has been incredibly destructive. It served to undermine everything we had

worked for." Speaking before the U.N. General Assembly on Oct. 28, Aristide shrieked that the U.N. must impose a full commercial blockade on Haiti, as the only way to force the military to leave power and permit his return.

Genocide

There is an impasse in Washington, but in Haiti people are dying. A spokeswoman for the relief agency CARE reported that that agency is now feeding 600,000 people a day, or 10% of the population. "I think if we run out of gas and we can't continue our programs here, then thousands will die. In some of the areas where we work, 20% of the children suffer from acute starvation. The embargo has just made it worse. People are now using every calorie they have just to stay alive. The common cold can be a killer. Five to six percent of the population has AIDS; that is an incredible number." A priest who runs a children's food distribution center north of Port-au-Prince called the sanctions "a slow-death process."

A diplomat in Port-au-Prince appropriately remarked, "I thought after Vietnam we had heard the last of destroying a nation in order to save it. But that is what we are doing here."

"Genocide!" is what U.S. statesman and economist Lyndon H. LaRouche calls it. In an emergency statement issued Oct. 24 and circulated in Washington and other cities, LaRouche declared, "The United States has got to stop committing genocide. And above all, stop committing genocide in the hypocritical name of supporting democracy. We have come to the point that methods like those which Hitler used in Auschwitz or against the Warsaw Ghetto, or against besieged Warsaw in the last phase of World War II, have become accepted methods of diplomatic cabinet warfare operations."

LaRouche warned that "methods such as we abhorred in the case of Operation Phoenix in Vietnam, things which are far worse than that, have now become accepted diplomatic practices of military and other forces. This must come to a halt. There is no respect whatsoever for the sanctity of human life in such practices. And to call such practices the pursuit of democracy is the most appalling hypocrisy which one might imagine, one which would cause perhaps even the ghost of Adolf Hitler to blush a bit with embarrassment on occasion."

The imprisoned statesman also addressed a blunt reality which most of Washington chooses to ignore: "Haiti has been a hell-hole ever since the earlier extended U.S. occupation of the island and looting of it. Haiti has been a playground for the most criminal type of professional psychiatrists and others, and has been a victim of looting by the United States. . . . So if we find that the government and institutions of Haiti otherwise are not of the most admirable quality, we must take a large share of the blame for the long history of racial oppression which the United States has heaped upon that unfortunate country."