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From the Associate Editor

We bring you this week the latest in a truly remarkable series of Special Reports, a series initiated by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. following his release from prison in January 1994. As LaRouche intended, these reports have raised the quality of EIR’s intelligence work by an order of magnitude, while providing the “ammunition” to supply a growing mass movement of political organizers, hungry for the truth about how their nations are being destroyed, and how they can be restored.

The first such report, issued April 15, 1994, was “Lord Palmerston’s Multicultural Human Zoo,” proving how the Venetians and the British have manipulated the people of many nations around their petty hatreds and passions. (This report has just been released in Moscow, in Russian translation, and will have an explosive impact there.) Next, on Oct. 28, 1994, was “The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor,” showing how the British oligarchy controls the environmentalist movement—among other things. This was followed on Feb. 17, 1995 by “Phil Gramm’s ‘Conservative Revolution in America,’” which documented the fascist nature of the British free-trade ideology. Then on March 24, 1995 came “London Sets the Stage for a New Triple Entente,” providing a rich historical background to the fight between British oligarchism and the republican forces, concentrating on the period leading up to World War I.

With this week’s report on international terrorism, taking Chiapas, Mexico as a case study, many of the themes of the previous issues are brought together. The report is the product of years of investigation by an international team of researchers, under LaRouche’s direction, and EIR’s competence in this domain is second to none. Reading the excellent strategic introduction by LaRouche, you will understand why.

On other matters, we offer our congratulations to Jacques Cheminade and his supporters in France, who, after arduous efforts, succeeded in filing more than the 500 signatures of elected officials required to qualify as a candidate in the upcoming presidential elections. The enemies of Cheminade and LaRouche are already making it clear that they consider Cheminade a very serious factor in the election campaign.

Susan Welsh
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Derivatives crisis sparks calls for emergency action

by Anthony K. Wikrent

Just how close the world came to financial and monetary disintegration following the collapse of British investment bank Barings PLC on Feb. 24, was intimated in a March 16 speech by U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission chairman Mary L. Schapiro, before the annual meeting of the National Futures Industry Conference in Boca Raton, Florida. "It is important to understand," Schapiro told the conclave of derivatives practitioners, "the truly international character of the problems that Barings' demise created, despite Barings' fairly minimal direct contact with the U.S. markets. . . . The delays encountered in transferring positions and funds had potentially significant systemic risk implications."

Schapiro told of how she and her staff worked, "for five days, virtually 18 hours a day," to get the futures exchanges and regulators of other nations to adopt tested U.S. practices in order to avoid a system-wide freeze of liquidity. "We talked, cajoled, and pressured foreign exchanges and regulators to transfer positions from various Barings accounts," Schapiro said. "Extraordinary efforts were made to design and implement systems ad hoc, to permit the transfer of positions at exchanges that had no rules for such transfers."

But while Schapiro boasted how U.S. regulators and policymakers had successfully crisis-managed the sudden obliter-ation of Barings, prominent voices in Europe and elsewhere were beginning to hint that the international financial and economic crises required emergency action. At the United Nations Social Development Summit, in Copenhagen during March 6-12, the idea of a 0.05% tax on short-term foreign exchange transactions was proposed and widely discussed, as a means of redressing the budgetary difficulties of the U.N. Though this, by itself, may not appear to be a response to the turmoil in the financial markets, the fact that International Monetary Fund Managing Director Michel Camdessus declared himself open to such a proposal, suggests that a significant shift in thinking at the highest levels of international banking and finance has occurred, since U.S. physical economist Lyndon LaRouche proposed a 0.1% tax on all financial derivatives transactions in Spring 1993.

Feeble proposals

In fact, for the paranoid derivatives dealers, it may have sounded, by the second week of March, as though almost everyone were demanding a take of their casino's profits. President François Mitterrand and French Socialist presidential candidate Lionel Jospin expressed support for controlling derivatives speculation through a similar international tax, during the U.N. conference.

In a front-page article in the March 10 issue of the weekly Die Zeit, entitled "Wild Bet at Any Price," former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt charged that derivatives "have spread more rapidly over the world in the last years than any epidemic," and outlined three "necessary steps." First, said Schmidt, national legislatures, including the Bundestag (parliament), must hold special open public hearings on derivatives. Second, "Banking control authorities must intervene in every individual case, in which it seems to them that the internal control system of a bank [with respect to derivatives] is inadequate." Third, "To all non-banks, the participation in abstract financial derivatives deals is to be legally forbidden."

The Germans appear to be the most serious in addressing the issue at the moment. On March 20, the Social Democrats
presented a “Grand Motion” in the Bundestag, signed by Rudolf Scharping, the national party chairman and opposition leader, declaring that, in light of the billions of deutschmarks in derivatives losses suffered by the Metallgesellschaft group and the Balsam group last year, the assurances of German Finance Minister Theodore Waigel that derivatives pose no fundamental threat to the economy, must be called into question. The motion included 20 questions concerning government plans for monitoring derivatives, and for forcing banks, companies, and municipalities to report how much “money at risk” they have in derivatives activities. A parliamentary debate on the Grand Motion is expected to occur within the next three or four weeks.

Even the stoical German Bundesbank (central bank) could not escape the issue. In an interview with the German weekly Wirtschaftswoche on March 19, Edgar Meister, a Bundesbank director, was asked for his opinion about imposing a “punishing tax” against financial speculation. While Meister hastened to reassure everyone that there was no threat of a systemic collapse, he did say that “any proposal to restrict purely speculative transactions should be studied seriously.”

On March 14, Canadian Foreign Minister André Ouellet revealed that officials assigned the task of preparing the agenda for the Group of Seven meeting in June in Halifax, Nova Scotia, had been informally discussing the idea of imposing a tax on currency transactions as a means of discouraging speculation. “The information I have received is that there is genuine interest on the part of many to discuss this,” Ouellet told the External Affairs Committee of Canada’s Parliament. “The very fact that it would be on the agenda and that it would be discussed in Halifax [is] an immense step forward.” The next day, no doubt reflecting the concern by the international banks that the issue is even being discussed, a spokesman for the Canadian Foreign Ministry insisted that the issue be discussed in the context of an upcoming review of the 50th anniversary of the Bretton Woods system, mandated at the Group of Seven (G-7) meeting in 1994 in Naples, whether or not the financial markets are in turmoil.

On March 16, Hans Georg Fabritius, vice president of the central bank of the German state of Hesse, told the Hesse Banking Association that current German regulations on “high-risk instruments,” such as derivatives, were insufficient. Fabritius attacked the dangerous tendency of many to dismiss the Barings collapse by asserting that it was “only an isolated case” that “cannot happen here,” or that the demise of Barings was “not caused by derivatives per se.” The “real emergency” lies in the near future, Fabritius declared, and warned that an even worse derivatives failure is inevitable, and will be much more devastating than what hit Barings.

**Panic in Italy**

Fabritius’s warning was amply proven within days, in Italy. On March 16, the Italian Parliament approved a major austerity package, aimed at reassuring financial markets about the stability and soundness of Italy’s economy and currency. But on March 18, in “30 minutes of panic,” as one source at the Banca d’Italia called it, the lira collapsed 5% against all other currencies, reaching a historic low of 1,280 to the deutschmark, while the Milan stock market plunged by 3.41%. The panic defies monetarists’ arguments for “stabilizing measures,” since it occurred within days of the legislative enactment of exactly such “stabilizing measures.”

“Whence do the massive sale orders come?” the Italian newspaper La Repubblica asked on March 18. “It is primarily the result of derivatives, those strange financial products that have brought Barings Bank to its knees.”

It was no surprise, therefore, that the instability of the world’s financial markets was the major topic of discussion during the meeting of European Commission foreign ministers in Carcassonne, France over the March 19-20 weekend. Commission President Jacques Santer, former prime minister of Luxembourg, called on the G-7 to take action to restore stability to the world’s currency markets, by reviving the international cooperation typified by the Plaza and Louvre accords of the mid-1980s. The London Financial Times fretted that Santer “told Commission colleagues at their regular weekly meeting that he would dearly like to teach speculators a once-and-for-all lesson.”

French Foreign Minister Alain Juppé, who presided over the March 19-20 meeting, declared that a reform of the world’s currency system is indispensable. Otherwise, he warned, every country in the world will be exposed to foreign exchange turbulence, with all its dangerous consequences for economy and society.

**Underlying causes ignored**

But such instability is an effect, not a cause. The underlying problem that has yet to be addressed is that the world’s physical economy has been decimated by the past three decades’ policies of post-industrialism, financial deregulation, environmentalism, and population reduction. Until it is admitted that the past three decades’ experiment in “free markets,” allowing money to seek the highest return, has been an utter failure, there is nothing in store for the world but more financial turmoil, and the new Dark Ages of the worst economic collapse in history. Simply moving customers’ accounts from one bankrupt derivatives player to another—the desperate gambit used by U.S. CFTC chairman Schapiro to contain the collateral damage from the implosion of Barings—merely postpones the inevitable day of reckoning.

What is needed is a return to real economic activity: building the water, transportation, education, and other systems human beings need. That means that governments need to stop worrying about balancing budgets, and reassert sovereign control over money, seizing control of credit flows from the stupid financiers and bankers, who, as the smoking crater that once was Barings PLC attests, are only killing themselves—and everyone else—anyway.
China draws lessons of Barings collapse

by Mary Burdman

The debacle of Barings Bank has become the byword in China for the disasters of derivatives speculation. When the $1.2 billion Barings bankruptcy hit on Feb. 26-27, the Shanghai stock exchange was reeling from a near-meltdown on Feb. 23. Speculation in treasury bond futures by Shanghai International Securities, China’s biggest securities firm, sent prices skyrocketing. SIS began mass dumping to try to force down the market, 10 minutes before closing time. To prevent chaos, the exchange was shut down completely for six days, and officials demanded that traders “unwind” their positions through negotiations.

The reaction at the highest levels of government has been hard and fast. Just after the National People’s Congress opened its yearly session in Beijing on March 5, Executive Vice Premier Zhu Rongji held a meeting with China’s top economists and government officials to tell them to study the case of Barings and the Shanghai scandal, to learn lessons in financial management, according to European Chinese-language press reports.

The same day, the official China Daily Business Weekly published a front-page interview with Li Jiange, vice chairman of the China Securities Regulatory Commission. Li, described by Business Weekly as “one of the leading figures in domestic economic circles,” announced that China is planning a three-pronged program of “bold measures” to tighten control on the futures markets. This will include new regulations, legislation, and measures for international cooperation.

The chaos on the Shanghai market “presents the best example of how dangerous the futures market can be without strict supervision,” Li stated. “The disruption of treasury bond futures trading in Shanghai highlighted the need for strict controls on the market, which carries high risks.”

At the same time, domestic Chinese enterprises will be prohibited from speculating in financial derivatives, Li announced: “The collapse of Britain’s oldest investment bank, Barings, illustrates the need to strengthen control in this field.” Derivatives trading can carry very high risks, he said, and Chinese enterprises have “suffered dearly” on overseas markets. “Many Chinese investors suffered losses because they did not understand the market, and many reported that they were defrauded,” Business Weekly reported. Now, the government will only allow trading for the purpose of hedging, under strict supervision.

The central government had not taken note of the development of futures markets until 1993, when many companies were already trading on overseas futures exchanges, leading to a “massive outflow of foreign exchange and state assets,” Business Weekly wrote. In 1994, Beijing began to take strict measures, ending trading overseas and cutting the number of Chinese futures exchanges from 50 to 15. Now, Li Jiange announced, the number of treasury bond futures exchanges will be cut from 10 to 5-6; the remaining 15 futures exchanges will also be put through another inspection.

While China’s Securities Regulation Commission will seek closer cooperation with the United States, Japan, and the United Kingdom on dealing with derivatives, there is no chance of China opening its futures markets to international investors at this time, Li announced: “It is impossible for China to open up the futures market, or the A-share market, before the renminbi [the currency] becomes freely convertible.” This is not something likely to happen soon, as Prime Minister Li Peng made clear last November when he warned of the danger that a new “Black Friday” crash in the United States would pose to China. Although there will be a “gradual opening,” China’s futures market is not ready to deal with a possible huge inflow of foreign exchange, Li Jiange said.

It was also reported in early March that Beijing is replacing the head of the Securities Regulatory Commission, Liu Hongru, who was already disciplined publicly in June 1994 for colluding with Goldman Sachs, Merrill Lynch, and Morgan Stanley to list the most profitable Chinese companies on Hongkong and New York stock markets. Liu Hongru was also an advocate of early moves to make China’s currency convertible.

China will not forget

The international financial chaos is bringing up profound historical memories in China: “We should not forget this piece of history. We paid a high price,” the representative of the China International Trade and Investment Corp. (CITIC) told the London Financial Times in an interview on March 15. Prof. Xu Shiwei was speaking after negotiations with representatives of the London Metals Exchange on some $40 million in debts claimed by LME brokers for speculative losses by traders from CITIC’s Shanghai branch.

China will not forget. They have never forgotten the British Empire’s Opium Wars; nor the British seizure of the colony of Hongkong. London will also take note. When George Bush’s secretary of state, James Baker, once barged into Beijing in the early 1990s, in an attempt to bully China into trade concessions, and got nowhere, the British press reacted with glee. Headlines remembered Britain’s hapless 18th-century envoy Lord MacCartney, who was sent packing by the Chinese emperor for refusing to kowtow.
**Suing Wall Street**

Meanwhile, despite the fact that CITIC has negotiated a settlement of some $15 million in speculative debts to Wall Street's Lehman Brothers and Merrill Lynch, the state-owned International Nonferrous Metals Trading Company (Minmetals) went ahead on March 9 with its countersuit against Lehman Brothers in U.S. District Court in Manhattan (see EIR, Jan. 6, 1995). Minmetals is suing on the grounds that Lehman Brothers induced one of its traders to make "more than $35 billion in unauthorized derivatives trades unrelated to its business." Minmetals is seeking $128 million in damages. Lehman Brothers had sued Minmetals last November, when the Chinese company refused to pay Lehman Brothers' claimed $53.5 million in debts and unpaid margin calls.

The Minmetals suit states that Lehman executives seduced a trader, Hu Xiangong, into making "incredibly complicated derivatives transactions that were impossible for him to understand." A lawyer representing Minmetals said: "This is a classic case of a global investment bank putting profits before prudence, and grossly and negligently disregarding the interests of its client." The Chinese trader was not authorized to make any of the trades, the lawyer said, and Lehman Brothers did not disclose the full risks of trading.

At the same time, although Lehman Brothers professed itself happy about its $7 million from CITIC (the same week, Lehman announced that it had to lay off top traders to save hundreds of millions), the Financial Times was not impressed. An editorial on March 2 stated: "It would be rash to conclude that [China] is setting a new pattern for its handling of commercial affairs... China has yet fully to acknowledge... the importance of mutual confidence in international market dealings."

In London on March 15, CITIC representative Xu Shiwei admitted that "there have been some compromises." But he also said that the view being presented in the West, that China is "failing" to pay its debts to western banks, is a campaign to smear China and CITIC. He insisted that this did not have the effect intended, of getting the government to pressure CITIC to pay up. He also maintains that CITIC Shanghai is a subsidiary and not a branch of the parent company, and is therefore responsible for its own debts. The Shanghai traders are now in jail for violating Chinese law. Xu said that while "ego and greed were at work" at CITIC Shanghai, at the same time, "some LME brokers intentionally or unintentionally encouraged CITIC Shanghai to overtrade." Also, some LME brokers used "historic price carries," an esoteric method of rolling over futures contracts, "to help the detainees [the imprisoned Chinese traders] hide the losses."

Heads continue to roll. On March 15, CITIC Chairman Wei Minguy resigned. While Beijing said that the resignation was not "directly" related to the $40 million in losses CITIC Shanghai made on the London Metals Exchange, it is very likely that the entire leadership of CITIC will be reviewed.

---

**Currency Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dollar in deutschmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York late afternoon fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dollar in yen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York late afternoon fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The British pound in dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York late afternoon fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The dollar in Swiss francs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York late afternoon fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Business Briefs**

**Mining**

**Zambia invites in Anglo American Corp.**

Zambian President Frederick Chiluba, who has readily obeyed the dictates of the International Monetary Fund, has asked South Africa's Anglo American Corp. to help restructure the financially crippled Zambia Consolidated Copper Mines (ZCCM), Reuters reported on March 14.

Chiluba, at a meeting with Anglo chairman Julian Ogilvie Thompson on March 10, restated Zambia's commitment to the quick privatization of ZCCM through the injection of fresh equity and efficient management. "My government is in a hurry... We are keen to privatize ZCCM and have given ourselves 24 months to get technical information out. We want to move forward with the resources we have and your partnership, because once ZCCM is privatized, it will become necessary to develop Konkola," he said, referring to the deep mine project in which he wants Anglo to become a major player.

Chiluba is not deviating from the prescription laid out by Britain's Overseas Development Minister Lynda Chalker. During a visit to the former British colony in February, she said, "It is quite clear that the reform of ZCCM must be accomplished together with the Konkola project. They are not alternatives. They are both necessary."

**Industry**

**French corruption cases tied to trade war**

Pierre Suard is still serving as president of the French company Alcatel-Alsthom, despite a ruling by Judge Jean Marie d'Huy forbidding him from holding any responsibility in the company. The case is the latest of the so-called anti-corruption scandals hitting French companies, and comes in the context of intense competition for markets among advanced western nations. All of the top infrastructure companies in France are now under investigation, threatening the potential for a Eurasian infrastructure-building program.

Alcatel-Alsthom is the producer of the French TGV high-speed rail system, and one of the world's giants in telecommunications. In the latter area, competition is intense to determine who will dominate in the age of "information highways."

Alcatel-Alsthom has been accused of overbilling France Telecom, the state-owned telephone company. But this is a widespread practice which the French government allows in order to support companies in the public or semi-public sector. In this case, however, Suard and Alcatel-Alsthom are being accused of corruption and embezzlement.

According to the new director general of Alcatel, Francois de Laage de Meux, the firm received last November a letter from a British "consultancy group" claiming that Alcatel was the victim of an industrial espionage and destabilization campaign. Indeed, the legal attacks on Suard and the company were followed by massive sales of company stock by Anglo-Saxon investors, leading to drops in stock price. The March 13 Le Figaro Economy quoted some top Anglo-Saxon financial houses—Smith and Court of London, Andrew Cleafield of the United States, CREF fund, and M&G—all demanding the head of Suard before resuming trading in Alcatel instruments.

**Hungary**

**IMF imposes draconian austerity program**

Under pressure from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the socialist government of Prime Minister Gyula Horn announced a 9% devaluation of the Hungarian currency, the forint, on March 12. The size of the devaluation "took observers in Hungary by surprise," the British Broadcasting Corp. reported. Radical budget cuts, affecting welfare expenditures and other vital areas, were also imposed.

The measures increased the risk of a social explosion. In a meeting on the program, Hungary's minister of welfare reportedly bolted out of the room in anger. After the measures were announced, the minister of internal security expressed his opposition. Some weeks back, then-Finance Minister Laszlo Bekesi, who resigned on March 1, warned that "Hungary will be the next Mexico."

The IMF says that Hungary is "living beyond its means," and has demanded sharp cuts in the state deficit. Horn et al. are determined to present an "acceptable face" to the IMF, the BBC said. An IMF team arrived in Hungary in mid-March.

**Employment**

**700,000 U.S. layoffs predicted in defense**

Labor Department and defense analysts predict that continuing U.S. defense cuts will produce 700,000 more layoffs, the March 14 Wall Street Journal reported. Excluding DOD employees and civilians working for the Pentagon, there has already been a 29% drop in defense-related jobs since 1987.

C. Michael Armstrong of Hughes Aircraft is reported to have warned Defense Secretary William Perry that the specter of "hollow industry" is just as real as the danger of a hollow military. Many analysts are beginning to fear that the precipitous rate of cuts is destroying the design and engineering capabilities of the industry.

**Italy**

**Bailout planned for the Bank of Naples**

The Bank of Naples, Italy's sixth largest, announced losses of $589 million, 30% of which are due to losses in financial transactions and 70% to bad loans, reflecting the collapse of the economy of the Mezzogiorno region in southern Italy. The government, which, through the treasury, owns 13% of the bank, intervened by transferring several properties to the bank in order to increase its assets. The overwhelming majority of the bank's bad loans are small loans, which means that the bank is suffering from the collapse of a large number of small companies.

Meanwhile, the financial meltdown is hitting the core of the Italian financial oligarchy.
Stocks of the corporate holding Gemina, owned by the heart of Italy's financial elite (Agnellis, Pirelli, Mediobanca, Generali) collapsed 14% on March 13 after it was announced that Mediobanca was organizing a capital increase. Another blue-chip insurance company, Fondiaria, collapsed 7% on March 14. Fertin, the financial holding previously belonging to the Ferruzzi family which was "rescued" by Mediobanca, also dropped 5%.

Russia

Hedge funds waiting for Moscow's green light

In the wake of the collapse of Barings Bank, derivatives-based financial speculators, who hoped to loot the so-called emerging markets, are increasingly worried that the Russian government may exercise its power to stop such speculative transactions. Over the last six months, western financial journals have been salivating over the cheap price of stock shares of Russia's semi-privatized large energy and industrial companies. The problem for the pack of George Soros-led hedge funds, is that they can't really get at them. Although Crédit Suisse-First Boston is positioned as the largest brokerage in Moscow, most shares are not traded on the Moscow exchange, but in back rooms and the hinterlands.

Before the ruble collapsed last fall, funds had put $2.2 billion into Russian shares: George Rohr's Bermuda-based New Century Holdings, $200 million; George Soros, just under $200 million; Michael Steinhardt, $100 million; San Antonio Capital, $50 million. Purchase-sale contracts on stocks, denominated or indexed in dollars, are signed in New York, the money wired to the Cayman Islands branch of a Russian bank, after which a broker makes the buy and tries to register the ownership with the registry, usually based in the city where the company is based.

In 1994, the Krasnoyarsk Aluminum smelting giant sent a representative to the local registry and erased the name of David Ruben, head of London metal trader Transworld, from the listing of shareholders. Ruben, probably acting on behalf of Marc Rich, almost became majority shareholder in the biggest aluminum smelters in the world. He bribed management, financed raw materials for processing, and rented the factory. He then took "his" aluminum onto the world market with a hefty markup over the $500 per ton (a price below the cost of production) that he paid the Krasnoyarsk and Bratsk smelters. After a couple of murders and such things, the management changed—along with Ruben's name at the register, the only legal record of his ownership. This issue is now in the hands of the Russian government, in particular, former privatization czar, now deputy minister, Anatoly Chubais. London Metals says this is the test case for Russia's "emerging market."

Banking

French government bails out Crédit Lyonnais

The French government has undertaken another emergency rescue of Crédit Lyonnais, the bank which suffered losses of 12 billion francs (roughly $2.1 billion) in 1994, against accumulated uncovered liabilities from real estate and corporate takeover deals calculated to be as high as FF 50 billion. The government will sell the bank's assets with a current value of FF 120-135 billion through a special structure called the Consortium of Realization (CDR). It hopes to cover old losses over the next four years and to save the restructured bank.

The management of the bank has committed itself to repaying the debt over the next 20 years—which most experts doubt will be possible. The last-minute effort to prevent an outright collapse of the bank, the biggest state-owned bank in Europe, was designed to prevent a chain reaction that could have shaken all Europe.

Alain Madelin, adviser to French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur and a monetarist, told the press that, compared to the threatened collapse of Crédit Lyonnais, the crisis that Barings Bank went through was "mere child's play."

In an attempt to deflect protests against the bailout, Balladur on March 13 asked Economics and Finance Minister Edmond Alphandery to open an official inquiry "to locate those responsible for causing the degradation" of the bank.

Briefly

- PAKISTAN hosted the 10-nation Economic Cooperation Organization on March 14-15; the meeting focused on building infrastructure for economic cooperation. "Markets have replaced missiles as the measure of might," Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto said. "Our natural resources potential can only be realized when we work together to develop economic competitiveness."

- THE CROATIAN national oil company, INA, and its Indonesian counterpart, Pertamina, on March 12 signed a memo on the possible export of Indonesian liquefied gas to Croatia for domestic use or re-distribution to Europe.

- ISRAELI Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and Jordan's Crown Prince Hassan met in Amman on March 12 to finalize plans for water projects for which they are seeking $400 million in aid from Germany. They presented the package, which involves storage, desalination, and water conveyance systems, to Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Bonn on March 15.

- TURKEY will increase its share in a $7.4 billion Azeri project to develop three Caspian Sea oil fields to 6.75%, up from 1.75%, Azerbaijani President Haidar Aliyev said after meeting Turkish President Suleyman Demirel in Copenhagen on March 12. He added that a planned oil pipeline will go through Turkey.

- CALIFORNIA has suffered over $2 billion in damage from flooding, according to preliminary estimates. The floods are now the costliest winter storms in the state's history, and are expected to cause significant rises in vegetable prices in the United States.

- JAPAN'S H2 rocket launched two satellites, Reuters reported on March 18. The payload, which included the four-ton scientific satellite known as the Space Flyer Unit, is the largest ever launched and is a milestone in its space program.
Most ‘terrorist experts’ spout fairy-tales

by Lyndon LaRouche, Jr.

The incompetence of most “terrorism experts” ought to remind one of the common flaws characteristic of the popular mass media’s so-called “news analysis” in general. The common error in both types of cases can be described fairly as “the substitution of the idea of ‘current events’ for the idea of ‘current history,’ ” Indeed, it is a popular delusion, that following the U.S. mass news media will make one “well informed,” which makes many Americans “all-day suckers” for the “terrorism expert’s” pompous double-talking.

That case may be argued as follows.

During the past quarter-century, since the days of our investigation of the Weathermen terrorist group, from 1969 on, the writer and his associates have had a number of notable journalistic and other successes in dealing with some major cases of international terrorism in various parts of the world. Our studies emphasize the Americas and European terrorist groups such as the “second generation” of the so-called Baader-Meinhof Gang.

For example, during 1973, the writer and some of his associates were direct targets of a terrorist operation which was directed by the New York office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which, according to the relevant official document, was acting always under the supervision and control of the Washington, D.C. FBI headquarters. According to that subsequently released FBI document, the New York FBI was orchestrating the policies of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to cause the Communists to perceive that the “elimination” of this writer would solve a major political problem confronting the Communists at that time. That intended assassination was detected, and aborted before it could succeed; but, the case typifies elements commonly occurring in the off-stage management of the kinds of events which have been classed as “terrorism” during this past quarter-century.

For example, that case, in which the FBI was, by its own admission, orchestrating a “third party” interest in “eliminating” me, was not merely an operation of
the FBI and Communist Party, U.S.A. British MI-5 personnel were caught red-handed in part of the same 1973 operation; photographic evidence also corroborated the key role of an identified section of the East Germany Interior Ministry's intelligence services.

In the intelligence trade, that involvement of Communist agencies of two or more nations, the U.S. FBI, and the FBI Division V's British "mother," MI-5, typifies a common kind of "mothering" of international terrorist operations; this type of coordinated steering of violent action by a third-party person or group, is known as "a derivative operation." The political connection of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), from inside the U.S.A., to the October 1984 assassination of India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, is typical of the sometimes numerous and varied sponsorships which turn up in famous assassinations or other terrorist actions.

More recently, since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, it has been discovered that the East German Interior Ministry's Abteilung 10 ("special operations") was coordinating the March 1986 efforts, involving the Anti-Defamation League, NBC-TV News division, Reuters international news agency, and the daily Washington Post, in the effort to lay the blame on me personally for the Feb. 28, 1986 assassination of Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme. During March 1986 and later, not only much of the world's major news services, but also the Swedish government and elements of the U.S. Department of Justice, including the ADL-linked Assistant U.S. Attorney Mark Rasch, first in Boston and later in Alexandria, Virginia, were complicit in continuing to promote that East German intelligence-services operation against me. According to a published statement by the East German official coordinating that false propaganda campaign against me, the orders for the East German "special operations" deployment against me came "from a very high level" in the Soviet bloc. In the United States, that operation became one of the motivating pretexts for what a member of the U.S. Justice Department prosecution team stated was the team's intent to murder me on or about Oct. 6, 1986.

The preponderance of presently known evidence in the Palme case now known points to the virtually certain conclusion that this operation against me was already in place prior to Palme's assassination. That evidence suggests that some among those involved in this operation against me after the fact had also been complicit in Palme's assassination, in one way or another, before the fact.

One of the key agencies involved in this aspect of the Palme assassination is Lt. Col. Oliver North's Bush-league of international weapons- and drug-trafficking. Our extensive knowledge of North's links to the John Train salon's relevant global operations against me, was corroborated by a government-released document, taken from North's White House office safe, presented in a Boston, Massachusetts U.S. federal court. During that period North was operating under Vice President George Bush's direction, Prime Minister Palme's threats to shut down a major component of the weapons-trafficking being run by North and his East German part-
ners, gave these weapons-traffickers the highest possible motive for wishing Palme "terminated." Schleswig-Holstein's former Minister-President Uwe Barschel was later murdered in a Geneva gun-runner's hotel room when his continued existence became inconvenient to those same international weapons-traffickers.

Those cases are a sampling of a quarter-century of combined first-hand experience and other investigations of those phenomena which the pages of the popular news media internationally call "international terrorism." This list is typified by the Weathermen underground, through the Symbionese Liberation Army, Jonathan Jackson Brigade, terrorist Wilfred Böse's predicted role in a famous airline hijacking, the "second generation" of the Baader-Meinhof Gang, and so on. When the term "international terrorism" is applied to case of that type, we are speaking of a "covert intelligence operation" by agencies of one or more governments.

In these operations, the individuals or groups actually deployed to deliver the "terrorist" effect are like sheets of toilet-paper from a roll, expendables which are flushed away once they are used up, expendables which never saw the face, nor knew the motives of the agencies which used them. To focus upon topics such as the motivation, the belief-structure, and other sociology of those mere dupes, the "terrorist group" members, is virtual obstruction of justice: a way of distracting attention away from the crucial evidence in the case.

Take as an example, the way in which the international news media have reacted to the recent gassing incident in the Tokyo subway.

No one should contend that it is not relevant to discover whether any particular group had been used as dupes for the deployment of the gas; however, to propose that such a group is behind the terrorist-style operation, is sufficient grounds for suspecting either stupidity or some less innocent motivation on the part of the investigator who attempts to limit the investigation to focus upon a group of low-level suspects. Such emphasis upon a "sociological phenomenon" by the agents of any major institution must be regarded always as probably a deliberate attempt to divert attention away from the relevant evidence of the case in chief. Were any important agency to attempt to explain the incident by speculating on the motivation or belief-structure of a group of persons suspected of performing that errand-boy role, that would prompt the hairs to stand up on the nape of the neck of a seasoned investigator.

Three illustrations of this point

Most of the important terrorist operations we have studied are "derivative operations," involving the complicity of intelligence services, or networks within such services, of several governments. Three important examples from our case-book illustrate the point.

In the 1984 assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the principal sponsorship was British, but, the involvement of the IRS- and FBI-linked ADL's Rabbi Morton Rosenthal illustrates the complicity of sections of the U.S. intelligence services. To similar effect, as I had warned my friends in Delhi, in Summer 1983 there were already clear signs of an assassination-potential building up against Mrs. Gandhi from British and related quarters, with some degree of complicity indicated from the Soviet side as well.

We were familiar with many of these connections. For example, from Spring 1983 onward, we were monitoring the operations being run against me personally by a New York salon headed by London-connected intelligence agent and banker John Train, the head of a coordinating agency including the ADL, NBC-TV News division, sundry U.S. intelligence elements connected to Vice President George Bush, and others. That salon's connections and activities were among the jigsaw pieces which aided us, during early Summer 1983, in forecasting the London-centered threat building up against Mrs. Gandhi.

The role of Vice President George Bush, Oliver North, et al., in Bush's collaboration with Margaret Thatcher's Britain, with Moscow, with East Germany, with Israel's right-wingers, with the Colombia drug cartels, and others, in international weapons- and drug-trafficking, during the 1983-86 interval (and beyond), is also typical of the kinds of multinational, official and other elements brought together as collections, to sponsor international-terrorist operations.

Take the case of our tracking of the 1977 Baader-Meinhof assassination of Dresdner Bank's Jürgen Ponto and later kidnapping-murder of Daimler-Benz's Hanns Martin Schleyer. We had been tracking the background of the "second generation" of the Baader-Meinhof Gang since 1974. It began as an outgrowth of our investigation of British intelligence's flagship psychological-warfare institution, the London Tavistock Clinic of Brigadier Dr. John Rawlings Rees, Eric Trist, and the Huxley brothers, and its London Tavistock Institute offshoot. This investigation of Tavistock "outlets" in Germany brought to our attention a nasty project known as "the Heidelberg [mental] Patients' Collective," which became the recruiting-ground for keystone elements of the Baader-Meinhof Gang's second generation."

On another track, during Spring 1977, we were continuing a study of what proved later to be the Paris connection to the terrorist operations against Ponto and Schleyer. We penetrated pre-planning and planning events conducted under the auspices of "highly respectable" financier-connected institutions in Paris, and tracked the results of that investigation into Germany. The theme for "anti-nuclear" violence in France and Germany, both coming out of those Paris pre-planning sessions, was the July 1977 broadcast of the irrationalist slogan "nuclear energy is fascism." It was under the auspices of that campaign that the Baader-Meinhof targeting of Ponto, Schleyer, and others occurred.

During the Summer of 1977, we watched these two dis-
Distinct tracks of ongoing investigations converge into the international-terrorist assassinations of Ponto and Schleyer.

In each of the celebrated cases of terrorism of which we have expert knowledge, the mass news media, and most of the experts quoted by those media, were babbling disinformation, insisting that “terrorism is a sociological phenomenon.”

One must understand, that, in many instances, these were actually qualified experts from British or other intelligence services, who were saturating the media, as much as they could, with false, or otherwise deliberately misleading stories. Prominent examples of this kind of disinformation are found in the case of the assassination of Italy’s former Prime Minister Aldo Moro, who had been targetted personally, and savagely by Henry A. Kissinger and other sundry sometime visitors to Monte Carlo. In that case, the principal problem was that those leaking the influential disinformation were connected to Moro’s London and related enemies. More often, in our experience, the knowledgeable experts who peddled the “sociological phenomenon” hogwash were covering up not so much to protect the agencies behind the particular case of terrorism being discussed. Rather, their concern was “to protect the public” from discovering that most governments, including their own, will run a terrorist operation or two from time to time: like the FBI’s documented 1973 effort to arrange my “elimination.”

Outside the ranks of qualified intelligence specialists, the more numerous sort of pretended expert is the popular news media’s hyper-inflated journalist, a silly nuisance who sincerely does not know what he or she is talking about.

Terrorism in modern history

To investigate competently any suspected incident of “international terrorism,” one must be grounded in the following key highlights from the history of modern terrorism.

The first major development in the unfolding history of modern international terrorism is “The Reign of Terror” in Jacobin France. This terror, under Maximilian Robespierre, was directed from London, under the control of the head of the British foreign service, Jeremy Bentham. The key Bentham-trained agents deployed to orchestrate the Terror were George Danton and the Swiss Jean-Paul Marat. London’s motive, in promoting that terrorism against the faction in France which had supported the 1776-83 U.S. War of Independence, was “geopolitical.”

The next major stage of development leading toward present-day international terrorism, was the mid-nineteenth-century terror organized under Britain’s Jeremy Bentham-groomed Lord Palmerston. Palmerston’s key agent for these operations was the London resident, and nominal coordinator of mid-nineteenth-century terrorism throughout continental Europe and the United States, Giuseppe Mazzini. Palmerston’s Mazzini-led international terrorist organizations were known as “Young Europe” and “Young America,” respectively.

Mazzini’s terrorist organization included such branches as the “Young Germany” which recruited Karl Marx, the “Young France” which helped to bring Palmerston’s personal asset Louis Napoleon to power as Napoleon III in France, the “Young Italy” of Garibaldi et al., the “Young Russia” of Bakunin and “People’s Will,” London’s stooges of the
Britain’s Lord Palmerston (1784-1865) organized mid-nineteenth-century terrorism, through his agent Giuseppe Mazzini.

terrorist serbian “Black Hand” organization, and so on. “Young Europe” was the instrument which Palmerston deployed as the revolutions of 1848-49, to break the back of Palmerston’s chief “geopolitical” competitor, Clement Prince Metternich of the “Holy Alliance.” “Young America” was the British intelligence organization deployed, with assistance of Palmerston agents Judah Benjamin and August Belmont, to attempt to destroy, dismember, and reconquer the United States, through treasonous cooperation from the circles around Presidents Pierce and Buchanan, and the pro-slavery Confederate conspiracy generally.

The practice of terrorist methods by radical political movements and governments shows its roots in the fact that, since the 1860s, the development of revolutionary socialism, and of varieties of populism including modern fascism and its precursors, was a direct outgrowth of the Mazzini “Young Europe” fermentation from the earlier, Mazzini phase of influence of Romanticism and radical empiricism (such as French and Austro-Hungarian positivism). The use of terrorist political methods by such movements reflects the Palmerston-Mazzini tradition embedded genetically in those movements.

The roots of the special qualities of present-day Middle East forms of terrorism, are to be found in practices which were developed by the British Colonial Office, and its India Office and Arab Bureau offshoots, under Prince of Wales Albert Edward (later King Edward VII), during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The development of these exotic forms of international terrorism are found in London intelligence operations in the Balkans, the Ottoman Empire, and the underbelly of imperial Russia, up into World War I. Notable, in this connection, is the number of progeny of the old India Office-Arab Bureau families, like London “triple agent” Harold “Kim” Philby, or Burgess, Maclean, Blunt, et al., who turned up as putative Soviet assets during the 1946-63 interval. Apart from nominal Soviet assets such as those, the entire tribal collection of such families, in their sundry anthropologist and other disguises, down through the fourth generation, is of leading U.S. counter-intelligence interest in addressing today’s London-orchestrated threats to Middle East peace and other vital United States interests.

Today’s use of international terrorism as an instrument of policy by governments is rooted in those earlier precedents, but has a number of distinct characteristics of its own. Although some of the relative novelties of present-day practices reflect developments in progress between the two World Wars of this century, present-day international terrorism is inseparable from the age of nuclear weapons. It is fairly defined as a form of surrogate warfare conducted among states in the age of nuclear arsenals.

To begin to understand the crucial distinctions of present-day international terrorism, one must think of it as a branch of what the late Prof. Friedrich Freiherr von der Heydte defined in 1972 as Der Moderne Kleinkrieg (1972), a book which was translated into English, in 1986, as Modern Irregular Warfare.1 As Professor von der Heydte noted, his book may be read in conjunction with British Brigadier Frank Kitson’s technical manual, Low-Intensity Warfare.2 To situate Professor von der Heydte’s (and, also, implicitly, Kitson’s) observations on modern irregular warfare generally, the following implications of the term “nuclear-weapons age” must be identified and emphasized. Without considering that, none of the crucial implications of today’s international terrorist incidents can be competently assessed.

‘Traditionalists versus Utopians’

Even before Bertrand Russell’s key 1939-45 role in prompting the United States to develop and drop two atomic bombs upon Japan, he and his crony, the former head of British foreign intelligence, Herbert George Wells, had conceived of nuclear weapons as a trick—the weapon to make general war “unthinkable”—for eliminating the modern na-
tion-state, and establishing one-world government. He elaborated this policy most clearly in his contribution to the September 1946 edition of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*; in that and numerous other postwar locations, he proposed, argued, and defended his thesis, that the Anglo-American powers must prepare for preemptive nuclear attack upon the Soviet Union, should Moscow refuse to submit to Russell's demands for its submission to establishment of "true world government."

In 1955, Nikita Khrushchov sent four representatives to a London meeting of Russell's World Parliamentarians for World Government; these delegates praised Russell, and imparted Khrushchov's desire to embrace Russell's proposal. Out of this came the founding of the Pugwash Conference organization, and the adoption of the Russell-Szilard "balance of nuclear terror" proposal at the second Quebec Pugwash Conference of 1958. However, the ensuing, temporary "Spirit of Camp David" collapsed during the interval between Gary Powers's U-2 incident and the 1962 "Cuban Missile Crisis." Negotiations between Moscow and Washington, as mediated by Bertrand Russell in London, reestablished what became known in Washington as the Russell-Szilard-Bundy-Kissinger-McNamara doctrine of "mutual and assured thermonuclear destruction," or, simply "MAD."

The battle over this Russell-Kissinger-McNamara, or "Pugwash" doctrine, became known during the late 1950s and early 1960s, as the war between the military "traditionalists," who took the modern nation-state as the keystone of their loyalties and strategy, and the much less than patriotic, Kissinger-McNamara "utopians" dedicated to "step-by-step" attainment of world government. The assassination of President Kennedy, the U.S. war in Vietnam, and the eruption of the phenomenon of modern international terrorism, are among the prominent reflections of the fact that the utopians won that 1960s battle over strategic policy, at least for the duration of the past 30-odd years.

The utopian policy was unleashed during the post-Kennedy 1960s, but pilot models had been developed and deployed earlier.

One such pilot model was the Kenyan Mau Mau operation, in which Kitson was involved during the 1950s; take it from the top down. In short, just as Britain had unleashed the ethnic-chinese Communists of Malaysia at the close of World War II, and had then contained and defeated them, so London made a re-run of that experiment in Kenya. London created the Mau Mau, and then systematically destroyed them; Kitson describes the way London systematically destroyed the Mau Mau, but omits the fact that London had created them, for such "target-practice" uses, in the first place.

The famous British Tavistock LSD-25 operation run into the United States from Britain and Canada via Aldous Huxley and Allen Dulles's co-sponsorship of the MK-Ultra project, is another of the pilot-models introduced during the pre-Missile Crisis postwar years.

The London Tavistock Institute and its original kernel, the London Tavistock Clinic of Rees, Trist, et al., played a leading role in these controlled experiments and operations, through and beyond the case of the Heidelberg [mental] Patients' Collective. Rees's and Trist's Tavistock, had taken over Sigmund Freud and the International Psychoanalytical Association; it also controlled the World Federation of Mental Health and other elements of the U.N.O. under the guidance of Rees, Julian Huxley, et al.; it controlled a growing, international network of psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, "science fiction" writers, and related sorts of utopians. These Tavistock assets, whether directly controlled or merely influenced, represented what Brigadier Rees had called his "shock troops" for imposing mass mind-control over manipulated populations. The Tavistock link to international-terrorist operations was key at the beginning of this new form of nuclear-age terrorism, and continues to be a crucial, "utopian" element in most terrorist operations. It is relevant in attempted assassinations of prominent political and economic figures such as Dresdner Bank's Jürgen Ponto (1977), Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen (1989), and others, from the Rev. Martin Luther King and U.S. presidential pre-candidate Bobby Kennedy, in 1968, to the present date.

Strictly speaking, the 1963 targeting of President John F. Kennedy and President Charles de Gaulle for assassination, by the Montreal-based Permindex organization of British intelligence's (and the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's) Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield (ret.), marks the definitive opening of the "utopian" age, and the age of modern international terrorist assassinations.

To understand the determining characteristics of the kind of "international terrorism" which has emerged during the recent quarter-century, one must study the transition from the preceding centuries' traditional forms of "guerrilla warfare," to the "limited wars" doctrine first seen in the post-Douglas MacArthur, United Nations' conduct of the Korean War, and in the U.S. war in Indo-China. The relevant historians and military specialists would recognize in the nuclear age's post-1950 "limited war" doctrines, a parody of eighteenth-century "cabinet warfare" dogma, or of kindred pre­c­edents from the history of feudalism.

On this point, were he still living today, Professor von der Heydte might refer the reader to his path-breaking 1950 dissertation on the birth of the modern sovereign state; the


President John F. Kennedy (left) with German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in Bonn, 1963. The targeting of Kennedy and France’s Charles de Gaulle for assassination marks the opening of the age of modern international terrorist assassinations.

present author’s congruent thesis on the supersession of feudal imperialism by the modern nation-state is summarized in sundry published locations, including his contributions to the EIR Special Report, “The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor.” The modern European form of sovereign nation-state, first appearing as the French commonwealth under King Louis XI, and best typified by the combined Declaration of Independence, Federal Constitution, and Hamiltonian “American System of political-economy” of the United States, is a unique phenomenon in world history as an entirety, a unique feature of the approximately five centuries, from the 1461 accession of Louis XI through the pre-1964-72 cultural downturn into “post-industrial” utopianism.

Modern international terrorism reflects the deep-going break in morality and principles of law which separates today’s utopianism from the civilized form of morality and law introduced by the upward development of the modern constitutional form of nation-state. As I am certain Professor von der Heydte would have concurred, one can understand many of the special features of the recent quarter-century by thinking of utopianism as a morbid attempt to reverse that fifteenth-century Renaissance’s upward transition of European society out of feudalism, that revolution which brought forth the modern, civilized form of perfectly sovereign nation-state republic, such as the United States of March 1789.

Mrs. Thatcher’s continuing Balkan war

We have a precise demonstration of how “limited war” and international terrorism are played under the rules of this utopian new age, in the monstrous immorality of the British, French, and U.N.O. governments in fostering Serbian fascists’ genocide during the ongoing Balkan wars. For these culpable governments, right and wrong do not exist: If it is convenient for the U.N.O. to placate London’s traditional Balkan assets, the Serbian war-criminals, the raped will be subject to U.N.O.-prescribed sanctions, if she does not submit promptly and enthusiastically to the rapist.

If developing nations which British and other utopians consider over-populated, insist on using insecticides and fertilizers, the population-control faction will orchestrate chemical-warfare incidents, and inform the terror-stricken populations around the world of the logic of “dual-use technology.” Those behind the deployment of the terrorists will say, that insecticides are a base for nerve gas, and that fertilizers are a base for powerful explosives. Those behind the deployment of those terrorists will argue, that to protect us all against terrorism, those “dual-use” chemicals must be banned!

Similarly, lest a people might otherwise acquire the power to sustain their population in a decent standard of living, a terrorist nuclear incident, or even the threat of its possibility, can terrify a population into accepting a ban on all access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy—for which there is no reasonable alternative available in most parts of the world today.7

Similarly, those in the British monarchy, and elsewhere, who wish to prevent Middle East peace, will resort to sponsoring “terrorist incidents” (plus, insisting upon World Bank sabotage of economic development) to mutilate the climate for peace.

The list of examples taken from real-life incidents runs on and on. The crucial point is, that today’s forms of international terrorism are deployed on the basis of appealing to the new forms of cabinet-warfare diplomacy, new forms belonging to a time when the sovereignty of the nation-state is being rapidly undermined by the role of the U.N.O. and other


7. Since the work on thermodynamics by the Monge-Legendre Ecole Polytechnique’s Lazare Carnot, it is understood that the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of power-generation decrease rapidly with a lowering of what we today name the “energy-flux density” of the mode of power-generation. Solar energy is among the least economical and efficient forms; nuclear the most efficient and economical yet in existence.
unelected institutions of supranational government. Instead of permitting the political processes of nation-state’s representative self-government to deliberate policy in a rational way, the sponsors of today’s international terrorism “unelected” political leaders they dislike by bloody assassinations, should the alternative, political assassination provided by orchestrated press scandals and corruption of prosecutors and courts, not succeed. Instead of reasoning, methods such as terrorism, and “limited warfare” against developing nations targeted for “hits” by the U.N.O.’s non-governmental organizations (NGO) “mafia,” are used to orchestrate the diplomacy among the new, ever more insolent institutions of unelected, supranational government.

Such illustrations show why we ought to divide our study of post-1963 international terrorism into two general types: pre-1990, and post-1989.

In the first, 1968-89 period, that of the Weathermen, Baader-Meinhof, Red Brigades, and so on, the use of terrorism as a form of “limited war” in a utopian age was defined chiefly by the continuing state of potential thermonuclear conflict between the two superpower blocs. During that initial period, international terrorism prepared the way for making the U.N.O. and its NGOs a form of world-government, through playing off the institutions which sought to maintain the delicate balance of nuclear terror among the principal power-blocs.

After 1989 and “Desert Storm,” and the elimination of one of the partners for rule of the planet by the forces of thermonuclear détente, international terrorist operations pivot on the emerging form of world-government centered around the U.N.O. sow and its litter of supranational NGO and other piglets. Today, international regulatory agencies, spu: off from treaty agreements, but no longer under the control of the governments which sponsored them, are the vehicle—the sow and her piglets—to which manipulations of the planet through international terrorism are referenced by design.

The primary function and effect of international terrorism today, is to orchestrate the role of increased global, oligarchical dictatorship exerted by that sow and her piglets.

‘Current events’ is for dummies

Back in the 1930s, when I attended secondary school, the study of geometry and of history were supplied to students who were expected to succeed in adult life. The teaching of “current events,” instead of history, was designed for those other students considered pre-destined for the poorer chances in later life. Today, “informed people” are those who base their understanding of the world on “following current events.”

Every political candidate knows how bad things have become. Dear reader: Think back to when you were a child, “Did you ever shudder, and not just because of the wintry cold of the afternoon walk back from school, when the uncurtained windows of a deserted house seemed to be glaring at you?" With that thought in mind, think of the political candidate looking into the empty eyes of the citizen asking: “Where do you stand on the issues?” The memory of that empty house from school-days comes back to haunt you: This time, it spoke.

Consider the popular news media’s coverage of terrorist incidents, such as the recent subway-gassing in Tokyo, against those background thoughts about “current events” and “the issues of this-here campaign.” Do you actually believe that the popular news media “report the facts”? “Just the facts, ma’am,” TV’s fictional sergeant on “Dragnet’s” TV Los Angeles Police Department used to say. In recent days, those “facts” have been carefully selected to mislead the credulous sort of TV viewer into speculating about the motives of those indicated suspects who may, or may not have had something to do with causing the incident. For the dupe of such “current events” reporting, to “crack the case” would be to force the leader of the suspect group into explaining why he did it.

“What if they didn’t do it?”

The man squatting in virtual reality before his TV set snaps back his querulous, “Stick to the issues, stupid!”

How pathetic he is. That cable-fettered “couch potato,” that paragon of what is called “public opinion,” typifies the popular intellectual stupor upon which the political successes of today’s international terrorism depend. This is the same poor dupe who complains so cholERICallY that someone is taking advantage of him; in the large, he is doing it to himself through his foolish faith in being “well-informed on current events and issues.”

Unlike any animal, mankind is a species which exists through the incorporation of revolutionary advances in scientific and other knowledge, by means of those creative powers of human reason whose existence the empiricists, such as romanticist Immanuel Kant, deny. The accumulation of those revolutionary creative discoveries, in science, in the development of language as a classical art-form, and in the evolution of private and public social institutions, is culture. The development of that transmitted culture is history.

Men, women, and nations act according to the influence of that culture, those institutions, which history has delivered into the present. Men, women, and nations act upon current history by defending and improving, or injuring that culture, those institutions. The meaning of those changes is what present history transmits to future history. The understanding of any particular occurrence of importance from this standpoint, is called Reason.

If you love your child, if you love your nation, if you love mankind, force our schools to teach all pupils the foundations of classical geometry and of history once more. Then, those pupils are not likely to become dupes for those liars and fools which the popular news media have lately represented as “terrorist experts.”
Chronicle of a Zapatista conspiracy

by Marivilia Carrasco and Hugo López Ochoa

From the first moments of the “war” declared against the Mexican Army by the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) on Jan. 1, 1994, two separate views of what was going on in Chiapas emerged. One offered the image of the EZLN insurrection as a legitimate movement of romantic guerrilla fighters ready to die for the rights of the Indian. The EZLN was painted as the vanguard of a “rebellion of Mayan Indians.” This view was widely disseminated, both nationally and internationally, and primarily by the U.N.-affiliated non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and by the networks of the Theology of Liberation linked to Bishop (“Commander”) Samuel Ruiz, of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas.

The other view, presented in an EIR Special Report entitled Shining Path North Surfaces in Chiapas and published on Jan. 19, 1994, posed precisely the opposite: first, that the EZLN is part of a criminal narco-guerrilla army assembled in the Sao Paulo Forum; second, that the operation is controlled from outside Mexico.

EIR documented how the developments in Chiapas had nothing whatever to do with the Indians, except that they were intended as cannon fodder in a terrorist operation of British intelligence, the seeds of which were first sowed in Chiapas nearly three decades ago.

The “arms” of the operation include:

a) “Action Anthropology,” whose birthplace is the Sorbonne in Paris, and which was jointly deployed with Harvard University and its “Chiapas Project” to carry out the most ambitious anthropological project known. The indigenous of Chiapas were extensively profiled, until a non-human identity could be superimposed.

b) The systematic deployment of activists of the Theology of Liberation under the command of the schismatic Bishop Samuel Ruiz.

c) The tentacles of the narco-terrorist Sao Paulo Forum, and its protectors in the bankers’ lobby, the Inter-American Dialogue.

d) The massive intervention of non-governmental organizations of every sort, in particular of the “defenders” of human rights.

e) The supranational apparatus of the United Nations whose primary mission is to fragment the nation-state into fratricidal ethnic gangs. London’s Tavistock Institute plays a decisive role in this.

f) More recently, EIR has uncovered the involvement of British Prince Philip’s World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) in the conflict.

EIR has maintained since the beginning that this global operation of British intelligence is designed to cause the political and territorial disintegration of Mexico, imposing separatist “autonomous Indian regions” as part of the plot to annihilate the armed forces and nations of Ibero-America. This was confirmed in October 1994, when the EZLN and its electoral arm, the PRD, began to declare entire regions of Chiapas “autonomous.”

President Ernesto Zedillo’s decision on Feb. 9 of this year to unmask the heads of the so-called EZLN by issuing arrest warrants for Rafael Sebastián Guillén Vicente (a.k.a. “Marcos”) as well as for the lesser known but equally important Fernando Yañez Muñoz (a.k.a. “Commander Germán”), and 14 other guerrilla leaders, plus the arrest of three subcommanders of the terrorist group, overthrow the carefully cultivated image of the “romantic guerrilla” and the “Mayan Indians.”

It also confirmed what EIR had published. The Mexican President stated that the EZLN’s “origin, composition of leadership, and goals are neither popular, nor indigenist nor Chiapan.”

At the same time, the investigations of the Mexican Attorney General’s office and the confessions of those arrested leave no doubt that EIR was right all along, and that the EZLN is nothing but a foreign aggression against Mexico. Among the new evidence uncovered is:

1) Rafael Sebastián Guillén Vicente, “Subcommander Marcos,” is a graduate in philosophy from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), a partisan of the deconstructionist current of Althusser, Foucault, Derrida, etc. He was granted a scholarship to study at the Sorbonne in Paris, in the same classrooms from which the butcher of Cambodia, Pol Pot, and other genocidalists emerged (see p. 27).

It is currently being investigated whether “Marcos” was in Peru for several months in 1993, undergoing military training with the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA), which in its time trained in North Korea and which is, like the EZLN, a member of the Sao Paulo Forum.

2) Faced with the advance of the Mexican Armed Forces, the Zapatistas withdrew to “Montes Azules,” the Biosphere Reserve which is also home to various organizations financed by the World Wide Fund for Nature. “Montes Azules” was identified in an EIR Special Report published on Oct. 28, 1994, as a training center of the EZLN (see map, p. 22).

3) On Feb. 8, the Attorney General’s office discovered two clandestine safehouses of the EZLN (one in the Federal District and another in Veracruz), with an arsenal of high-powered weapons, hand grenades, mortar shells, and explosives. According to those arrested at the scene, Fernando...
Yañez Muñoz ("Commander Germán"), fugitive, is responsible for raising money and purchasing weapons. The EZLN’s weapons, coming from the United States, would arrive in Mexico City, be stored in Toluca, in the state of Mexico, and would then be brought to Yanga, Veracruz (known as "Almendros Base"), from which they were transferred directly to Chiapas.

Others, like the magazine *Siempre!* have traced the southern route by which weapons from Nicaragua and Guatemala are moving directly into Chiapas.

4) From the confessions, it was learned that the rebel group has several bank accounts to finance itself and receives support from civil and labor organizations in Mexico, such as Independent Proletarian Movement (MPI), Route 11 Union, Desmi, and Canac-Un. MPI and the Route 100 union were mentioned in *EIR’s Special Report* as part of the support networks of "Shining Path North," that is, of the EZLN.

Route 100’s apparent support for the EZLN became manifest when the preponderant influence over the union was exercised by then-Mexico City Mayor Manuel Camacho Solís. Camacho later gloried in his backing for the EZLN when, as President Salinas’s official commissioner for negotiating with the Zapatistas in the first half of 1994, he legitimized the insurgency and defended each of the EZLN’s key demands (see profile, p. 52).

It is admitted that part of the Zapatistas’ resources come from abroad, primarily from so-called philanthropic organizations in Germany (such as the Catholic charity Misereor, which admitted to doling out some $7.5 million to Chiapas projects—see p. 31) and the United States, but income from kidnappings and bank robberies is also a possibility under investigation.

5) The origin of the EZLN is the remains of a terrorist group called “National Liberation Forces,” which operated in Mexico starting in 1969. In the late 1970s, it participated in logistical supply operations for the Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, and Guatemalan guerrilla movements, and spawned a variety of guerrilla organizations itself which were trained in socialist countries, especially in North Korea. In Mexico, it formed the Revolutionary Armed Movement (MAR), the Revolutionary Armed Forces (FAR), and several divisions of the September 23 Communist League, which operated in Mexico in the late 1960s and throughout the ’70s.

Several found refuge in academic institutions. “Subcommander Marcos,” for example, is linked to the Maoist terror group Procup through his girlfriend Silvia Fernández, (a.k.a. “Soñía” or “Gabriela”) who is active in various Procup fronts and is involved in coordination of the network of EZLN support groups internationally.

6) Samuel Ruiz, the schismatic bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas (identified in the *EIR* report as “Commander” Samuel Ruiz) called himself the “Mayan Prince”; he maintained contact with the EZLN through his catechists since 1985, and knew of the plans for the uprising at least six months in advance.

Furthermore, the guerrillas held direct talks with the bishop in order to resolve “conflicts” between the catechists and the already structured EZLN.

On March 3, the Attorney General confirmed that the role of Samuel Ruiz in the conflict was being investigated, even if no arrest warrant against him existed.

7) The Mexican prosecutor’s office is investigating a
“Nicaraguan connection,” as already mentioned in EIR’s Special Report.

Sources point to Lenín Cerna—inspector general of the Nicaraguan Army, former chief of the Sandinistas political police, and head of the Sao Paulo Forum’s continental narcotics apparatus run by Cuba—as the link in the training of the EZLN in Nicaragua. The Sandinista daily Barricada confirmed, in a Feb. 10 article, that “Subcommander Marcos” lived in Nicaragua during the 1980s, where he was involved in military training and in organizing peasants in the rural areas of northern Nicaragua. Interviewed on this by the Mexican press, Lenín Cerna refused to comment, while Tomás Borge (Carlos Salinas de Gortari’s official biographer) and Nicaraguan former President Daniel Ortega rushed to deny any links.

Nonetheless, Edén Pastora, Nicaragua’s famous “Commander Cero,” told the Mexican magazine Siempre! that “Marcos” reminded him of “El Mexicano,” or Marcos Rojas, a Mexican guerrilla in the town of Ocotal who participated in the Sandinista army, then “took his leave and said he was going to fight on his own.”

8) The Spanish daily El País reported on Feb. 10 that “the Spanish government is aware that the separatist Basque organization ETA gave money to the Chiapas guerrillas.” Citing Spanish anti-terrorist authorities, the newspaper adds that the large ETA colony in Mexico “contributes with money, as well as with indoctrination and ideological support, to the EZLN. Nearly 200 people linked to the ETA live in Mexico, primarily in cities in Mexico state, Querétaro, and Guanajuato, of which 50 are considered active members.”

The counterattack

To prevent the Mexican President’s order from being carried out, the EZLN support networks launched rallies, demonstrations, declarations, threats, and dozens of articles against the government, for the purpose of internationalizing the conflict, the EZLN’s goal from the beginning.

The National Mediation Commission (CONAI) created by Bishop Samuel Ruiz, asked that the “free zones” in Chiapas be restored, and that the International Red Cross “vouch for” the security of the Zapatistas.

Amnesty International mobilized in defense of those arrested and the CONAI called on the Organization of American States and others to denounce the Army’s so-called violations of human rights. Spain’s foreign minister, on a late February visit to Mexico, did not talk about the ETA’s financing of the Mexican guerrillas, but rather he proposed that peace talks between the Mexican government and the EZLN “be held in Spain.”

The press of the international financial oligarchy did its part as well. The Wall Street Journal said that “the attempt to destroy the Chiapas insurrection is a great risk . . . because the Zapatista movement still inspires sympathy. . . . Investors could get frightened and withdraw their money.” The Los Angeles Times put pressure on the human rights front, stating that “a military victory would bear a high political and diplomatic cost.”

The EZLN directly intensified its connections, using “Internet” to mobilize its international support network and issue slanders against the Mexican Army, charging it with “killing children, and beating and raping women.” They called for “stopping this genocidal war,” a “dirty war of bombings, shootings, rapes, beatings, lies and deaths.” Dozens of journalists and human rights activists tried to confirm the Zapatistas’ propaganda, but no one found evidence of bombings, or was able to prove these supposed violations of human rights. One military officer described the situation as genuine psychological warfare.

Within the country, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas’s Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD), and other political fronts of the Zapatistas like the National Democratic Convention (CND), mobilized to stop the military actions. The CND includes prominent individuals, such as:

A Zapatista network in the U.S. military?

A network of so-called “democratizers” within the U.S. national security community has taken up the Zapatista cause, arguing that 1) the EZLN does not represent any security threat to the United States, and 2) that the United States should use the Zapatista uprising as an instrument to force through radical “democratic” reforms in Mexico’s political structure.

A 33-page study, published by the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) of the U.S. Army War College on Dec. 30, 1994, exemplifies the propaganda being circulated by this crowd. “The Awakening: The Zapatista Revolt and Its Implications for Civil-Military Relations and the Future of Mexico,” was co-authored by Lt. Col. Stephen J. Wager, a professor at the U.S. Military Academy, and Donald E. Schultz, professor of National Security Affairs at the War College. Senior Army War College professor Gabriel Marcella advised the study.

In March 1994, the SSI had published another study, co-authored by Shultz and Marcella. In Reconciling the Irreconcilable: The Troubled Outlook for U.S. Policy toward Haiti, the duo argued that the United States should restore Sao Paulo Forum leader Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power in Haiti, as the way to break the “Haitian power elite.” They also complained that Haitian independence 200 years ago destroyed Haiti’s role as “perhaps the most profitable colony in the western world”—because it ended slavery.
The two SSI studies represent the thinking of a specific current within the U.S. national security community, associated with senior State Department adviser Luigi Einaudi, for over 20 years the leading theoretician for the demilitarization of Ibero-America within that community, and widely referred to as “Kissinger’s Kissinger for Ibero-America.” Marcella and Shultz work closely with Einaudi, and Einaudi advised their Haiti study.

On Dec. 5, 1994, the Miami Herald published a lengthy article reporting that, “from Guatemala to Brazil,” military officers are listening to Lyndon LaRouche, buying “like hot cakes” EIR’s book, The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and Nations of Ibero-America. In the article, Marcella complains: “When Lyndon LaRouche has more credibility in Latin America than the Pentagon, that’s troubling.”

Studies such as the one the SSI produced on the Zapatistas, exemplify why LaRouche has gained that credibility—and why the Pentagon has lost it. The study makes no pretense at serious evaluation of Mexico’s crisis, but reads like a propaganda tract for the Zapatistas. One would think the U.S. Army War College could do better than publish a study which holds that, under the black ski mask of Subcommander Marcos, Mexico’s would-be Abimael Guzmán (the leader of the terrorist Shining Path in Peru), “one could detect his handsome features, captivating green eyes, and light complexion.”

In this study, Schultz and Wager:
1) praise the Zapatistas for having “done more to accelerate the process of Mexican democratization than the previous five years of dramatic economic reform under the Salinas administration. . . . At a critical moment in Mexican history they forced reform on a reluctant President and an even more reluctant political system”;
2) argue that the EZLN is “unlike most traditional guerrilla movements,” and does “not seek to destroy the state or take power itself.” Rather, it is painted as a legitimate armed response to oppression, representing a “catharsis of collective anger” by Indians against “white domination.” Included as an example of such oppression of the Indians, is the 1970s introduction of “modern farming methods, including fertilizers and herbicides,” which, the authors allege, “had destructive side effects”;
3) reject Mexican government charges that external actors, including either Central American guerrillas or the drug trade, are involved in the uprising, and praise the role of “the non-governmental organization network” in the region for allowing “the movement to gain extensive national and international attention”;
4) dismiss as speculation reports that a national terrorist infrastructure exists in Mexico, which could be activated to create “other Chiapas.” They write: “One can only speculate. . . . The numbers and viability of these groups remain very much in doubt. Where they exist at all—and some of them are probably nothing more than rumor—they appear to be small, based on local land disputes, and lacking a national political agenda.”

From these allegations, the authors conclude that the Mexican government should adopt a strategy that will “bring the Zapatistas in from the cold,” and “coopt” them by acceding to the political and economic reforms they demand.

- the former dean of UNAM Pablo González Casanova, who is a member of the editorial board of América Libre, magazine of the São Paulo Forum;
- Mariclaire Acosta Urquidi, member of the Inter-American Dialogue who orchestrated the national network of human rights organizations in defense of the EZLN; and
- Gustavo Esteva, British ecologist Ted Goldsmith’s “man in Mexico.” Esteva’s book, Fin de una época (End of an Era), is an apology for the indigenist separatist project of the EZLN.

Six days after the operation against the EZLN was launched, President Ernesto Zedillo ordered the Army and the Attorney General’s office to avoid any kind of confrontation with elements of the EZLN, virtually suspended the legal operation, and offered a new amnesty law whose terms would be submitted to the Congress in search of a “political solution.” Zedillo was forced to retreat by the formidable blackmail campaign both at home and abroad, as had happened one year earlier with the Salinas de Gortari government. Only this time, the territory that the Armed Forces had successfully reintegrated under national sovereignty was not handed over to the guerrillas again. On Feb. 19, President Zedillo confirmed that “for no reason can the government, much less the President of the Republic, abdicate its responsibility to preserve the sovereignty over all the national territory.”

How British intelligence created the Zapatistas

The obvious way in which the British oligarchy has put in place, one by one, all the pieces of this separatist operation against Mexico might surprise some, but they are the same forces identified since the beginning by the EIR Special Report.

In a certain sense, British intelligence’s “Chiapas operation” began a century and a half ago. In 1821, all of Central America (which then included the area now known as Chiapas) formally joined the Mexican Republic. Two years later, Central America declared itself independent of Mexico, but Chiapas decided to stay on as part of Mexico.
Beginning in 1847, the British promoted and armed (via British Honduras, today’s Belize) an indigenist separatist movement in Mexico’s Yucatán Peninsula, which led to the 50-year-long War of the Castes which nearly succeeded in fracturing Mexico. Spinoff separatism was promoted in the nearby Soconusco region of Chiapas.

The British also operated through their allies in the U.S. Confederacy, including the deployment of Texan masonic agents to promote Yucatán separatism.

The same policy continued into the twentieth century. In the 1920s and 1930s, French “action anthropologists” Paul Rivet and Jacques Soustelle used the Société des Américanistes (Americanist Society) and the Sorbonne in Paris to spread their ethnic separatist poison, such as the relativist view that the human sacrifices of the Aztecs, also practiced by the Mayans, are comparable to the image of the sacrifice of Christ. In 1957, Harvard University set up its “Chiapas Project,” and over the course of the next decades, hundreds of foreign anthropologists, trained in the school of British “radical anthropology” of David Maybury Lewis and others, were sent into Chiapas. Their task was to profile different Indian communities, and promote ethnic separatism. By 1977, they had produced 27 books, 21 doctoral dissertations, 33 undergraduate theses, two novels, and a film on the region.

During this same time period, the Theology of Liberation deployed into Chiapas. According to the confessions of the late Red Bishop of Cuernavaca Sergio Méndez Arceo to the magazine Proceso (Jan. 11, 1988), Theology of Liberation arrived in Mexico with Gregorio Lemercier, a Benedictine priest from the University of Louvain in Belgium. Lemercier arrived in Mexico in 1944, and by 1959 had already promoted psychoanalytical group therapy for nuns with doubts about their sex. Lemercier submitted himself to that therapy in 1961, under the direction of Santiago Ramírez and Gustavo Quevedo, promoters of the psychoanalytic “sexual liberation” theories of the Frankfurt School in Mexico, over which Lemercier entered into conflict with the Vatican.

A theological adviser to Sergio Méndez Arceo since 1962, Lemercier founded the Emaus Psychoanalytic Center in 1966, which was a nest of homosexuals, lesbians, and zombie products of the “New Age” narco-terrorist counterculture. In 1967, the Vatican admonished Lemercier and ordered him to shut down his center, at which point Lemercier resigned from the church.

The Emaus Center worked together with Ivan Illich’s CIDOC (Center of Information and Documentation). Illich, another liberation theologian, deployed to Mexico in 1961 directly through Erich Fromm, a psychiatrist of the Frankfurt School who lived many years in Mexico, publishing various books profiling the peasant-macho culture of the Mexicans for his British controllers at Tavistock and the World Federation of Mental Health.

By the mid-1960s, the Lemercier-Méndez Arceo-Illich troika had already constructed a national network of existentialist priests who distributed the radical literature of the Peru-
vian Gustavo Gutiérrez, Leonardo Boff, Reichel-Dolmatoff, etc. Samuel Ruiz García could already be found among these networks.

The environment for ethnic separatism already created, all that was lacking were the narco-guerrillas.

The Torreón Group

In 1974, President Luis Echeverría’s policy of “democratic opening” was in full swing. That “opening” encompassed within the PRI a whole network of Maoist “intellectuals,” professionals in recruiting to terrorism with the theories of Louis Althusser and Michel Foucault, among whom stand out Adolfo Orive Benguier, Hugo Andrés Araujo, and the brothers Raúl and Carlos Salinas de Gortari.

Orive Benguier (a graduate of the Sorbonne), and the Maoist leader Hugo Andrés Araujo built a network of “people’s colonies,” poor neighborhoods inhabited by urban squatters, in Durango, Nuevo León, Coahuila, Chihuahua and other states of the country which also served as safehouses for narco-terrorist groups like the September 23 Communist League.

Orive Benguier and Hugo Andrés Araujo formed part of the so-called Torreón Group, based in the city of Torreón, Coahuila, which has been the general headquarters of Jesuit operations in the north of the country for a long time. Their strategy was named “People’s Politics,” “Proletarian Line,” or “Mass Line,” and they were known as “the Pepes.”

As is documented in EIR’s January 1994 Special Report, “Shining Path North Emerges in Chiapas,” it was the Torreón Group which, starting in 1974, created in Chiapas the various peasant organizations, such as OPEZ, Anciez, and Peasant Torch, which served to incubate the EZLN. There we documented that:

- Hugo Andrés Araujo oversaw the radical Maoist group Peasant Torch which, despite its Marxist-Leninist origins, was brought into the ruling PRI party in 1985. As El Financiero reported in February 1990, “with the appointment of Raúl Salinas de Gortari, the President’s brother, as technical secretary of Pronasol . . . the Peasant Torch members have undertaken more daring actions.” With Raúl Salinas’s protection, Oribe Alva was named director of Pronasol, as the National Solidarity program is known.
- An October 1990 article in Contenido magazine named Raúl Salinas as one of the government officials supporting Peasant Torch, whose crimes include assassination of its political opponents, land invasions, kidnapping, and mobilization of Jacobin mobs in poor neighborhoods.

Hugo Andrés Araujo was national leader of the National Peasant Federation (CNC) of the PRI during the government of Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and was forced to resign in February 1995 as a result of the scandal caused by the arrest of Raúl Salinas de Gortari as intellectual author of the assassination of PRI General Secretary José Francisco Ruiz Massieu in September 1994.

Britain’s ‘Chiapas International’

by Joseph Brewda

What follows is a key to the flow chart on p. 24 of the network which created and sustains the Chiapas rebellion.

1) Sorbonne. See p. 27.
2) Harvard Anthropology Department. See p. 36.
3) Cultural Survival. Founded in 1972 as a Harvard Anthropology special operation, Cultural Survival is the main British “action anthropology” mouthpiece in the United States. Its founder and director, Prof. David Maybury-Lewis, is a British national and former chairman of the Harvard department. The group funds “indigenous projects” worldwide, and publishes a quarterly dedicated to “large victories for smaller societies.” Her Majesty Queen Margrethe of Denmark, cousin of Britain’s Prince Philip, is an honorary member. She is also a patron of the affiliated, German-based, Society for Endangered Peoples.

Cultural Survival was formed in part to aid Harvard’s “Chiapas project”; Prof. Evon Vogt, Jr., the head of the university’s project, is a member of the group’s board. In 1994, it published a special report defending the insurrection (see article, p. 36). Philippa Pellizzi, a Schlumberger/de Menil family heiress, is another top board member and patron. Her family had sponsored Jacques Soustelle, the founder of the postwar Sorbonne “action anthropology” networks. The group is also active in Brazil, Botswana, and among the Kurds of Turkey, Iran, and Iraq.

4) Survival International. Founded in London in 1969 as the Primitive People’s Fund, Survival International is dedicated to “help tribal peoples protect their lands, environment, and way of life from destructive outside interference,” i.e., industrial development. It has been chaired from its inception by Sir Robin Hanbury-Tenison, the youngest son of a British landed family. The group was formed by Sir Peter Scott, a founding chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, and it remains a key WWF hit-squad. By 1989 it bragged that it held 28 governments under siege for attempting to integrate 54 isolated peoples into national life. It is closely affiliated with the Quakers’ Anti-Slavery Society, a family organ of WWF Vice President Lord Buxton, a former equerry to Prince Philip.

The group has been active among the Indians of Chiapas, Colombia, and Brazil. Ibero-America has been one of its primary targets; it has also been active in Africa, and has aided tribal insurgencies in India and Indonesia.

5) Misereor: See p. 31.
6) **Pax Christi.** Formed in 1944, and run out of Brussels, Belgium by Cardinal Godfried Danneels, Pax Christi has served as an international base for networks espousing “Liberation Theology” (see p. 31). In addition to supporting such groups in the Americas, Pax Christi has also been similarly active in the Philippines and Indonesia.

Pax Christi is one of the main support groups in the U.S. for Bishop Samuel Ruiz, and has organized numerous delegations to Mexico on his behalf in close association with the Quakers. In 1992, Pax Christi joined other NGOs in publishing a book, *State Terrorism in Colombia*, which listed the names, photographs, and *curricula vitae* of Colombian military officials targeted by the international human rights lobby. Pax Christi U.S. Director Michael Affleck is a former leader of Greenpeace, the WWF-spawned ecologist group which also supports the Chiapas rebellion.

7) **Fellowship of Reconciliation.** Formed by the British Quakers in 1914 in a professed effort to stop the impending war, FOR has played a central role in the British-steered anti-war and labor movements ever since. Its self-proclaimed role in overthrowing Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos in 1986, through organizing the “people’s power” movement, typifies its operations.

Closely affiliated with the Quakers’ U.S. action-arm, the American Friends Service Committee, FOR has played a major role in orchestrating external support for Bishop Ruiz, and has sent delegations to Chiapas on several occasions since the outbreak of the insurrection.

8) **Amnesty International.** Amnesty International was formed in 1961 as a special British intelligence arm assigned to smear former colonial sector leaders over alleged judicial and human rights abuses. Its founders included David Astor, longtime editor of the *Observer*; former British intelligence Thailand specialist Robert Swann; and Quaker activist Eric Baker. Its first major targets included President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Britain’s most feared African opponent; and the Portuguese government of João Salazar, whose overseas empire Britain aspired to reorganize. The group spread rapidly throughout Europe, but was reorganized in 1966 after some of its leadership resigned following public exposure of its patronage by the British Foreign Office. It currently maintains 70 chapters throughout the world.

Working closely with the media, Amnesty International selectively targets Third World nations on the British hit-
list, usually following high-profile "fact-finding tours" to the nations concerned. For example, it geared up its attacks against Iraq prior to the 1991 U.N. war. Amnesty has repeatedly denounced the Mexican government's efforts to quell the Chiapas insurgency, claiming the government is guilty of the "widespread use of torture" and violating "indigenous peoples' rights." It says the same against Peruvian efforts to crush Shining Path.

9) **Human Rights Watch.** Founded in 1975 by Random House Chairman Robert L. Bernstein, HRW was ostensibly created to monitor human rights abuses in the Soviet Union in the wake of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation (CSCE) that year. It was originally named Helsinki Watch. In 1981, Americas Watch was created, and in the late 1980s, Africa Watch and Middle East Watch. The parent organization of HRW is the Fund for Free Expression. The main funders of HRW and the fund are the J.M. Kaplan Fund and the Ford Foundation, both of which have funded left- and right-wing terrorist and intelligence networks for decades. International speculator George Soros is also a prominent contributor and board member.

Under the pretext of monitoring human rights abuses, HRW is involved in extensive destabilizations of selected countries, often in close cooperation with Amnesty International. In 1993, the government of Thailand accused HRW and Amnesty of coordinating the 1992 riots on behalf of western intelligence agencies. It has played a particularly active role against Turkey in the aftermath of the fall of the Soviet Union, and has morally equated the aggressor Serbia with Croatia and Bosnia, claiming that all three states are guilty of human rights abuses.

Americas Watch has always supported indigenous terrorism throughout Ibero-America. In 1984, Americas Watch executive Juan Méndez denounced the Peruvian government for carrying out a "dirty war" against Shining Path; in 1990, the group denounced Peru before the U.S. Congress and called for its "isolation" for the same reason.

10) **Oxfam (Oxford Famine).** Formed in 1941, Oxford Famine is a highly secretive British intelligence organization which specializes in fostering insurgencies under the cover of providing food relief. Its operations in southern Sudan, where it has aided rebels sponsored by the British government, and in Brazil, where it supports the Workers Party against the government, are illustrative. Oxfam has been active in Chiapas and the Mexico/Guatemala border region since the mid-1980s. One of the top EZLN officials arrested during the February 1995 government offensive, Jorge Santiago, reported that his operations were financed by Oxfam.


ICHR receives public government funding for overtly supporting "liberation struggles" in Burma and Indonesia; it also supports the São Paulo Forum's Workers Party of Brazil. The group has been active in Rwanda, where it supported the genocidal, Ugandan-based Tutsi group which recently invaded and took over the country. It acts as a controlling organization over the so-called World Assembly of First Nations. In January 1994, the group deployed a team to Chiapas to "monitor" Army efforts to suppress the rebellion that began that month. It claims that the Army "created a climate of terror," and that the rebellion was caused by "discriminatory sanctions against aboriginal people."

12) **United Nations Development Program (UNDP).** Formed in 1966, the UNDP is one of main U.N. funding agencies. It claims that population growth and industrialization are contrary to development, under the doctrine of "sustainable development" concocted by the Sussex University Institute for Development Studies in Britain. To that end, it extensively funds indigenous and ecological programs that subvert national governments. In 1991, the UNDP began publishing its "Human Development Index," which classifies and targets nations under the Sussex criteria. In its 1994 report, it called for creating a one-world dictatorship, with the primary aim being the reduction of the populations of the developing sector. It also demands that the developing countries surrender all rights of national sovereignty, disarm and demobilize their national armed forces, and submit all aspects of internal policy to an "Economic Security Council" for approval. It has called for the creation of a World Police, a World Court, a World Central Bank, a World Treasury, a World Anti-Monopoly Authority, and a World Trade Organization (see EIR, June 10, 1994, p. 44).

In a press conference announcing the 1994 report, UNDP official Mabubbul Haq revealed that it sent a special team to Chiapas seven months before the insurrection broke out, and warned that other states might face similar treatment. "If poor people are concentrated in a region, then they get organized, like Chiapas in Mexico," he said. The report lists 13 nations allegedly in the throes of disintegration crises, and four others, including Mexico, which it lists as "vulnerable to disintegration."

13) **United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.** Formed in 1948, Unesco funds a vast network of indigenous and environmentalist organizations throughout the world, in close coordination with the UNDP. According to its first director, British intelligence top official Sir Julian Huxley, the prime purpose of Unesco is to popularize the need for eugenics and to protect wildlife through the creation of national parks. It has been one of the major promoters of "cultural relativism," and has argued for the superiority of indigenous cultures. It was one of the founding organizations of the World Wide Fund for Nature and the
World Federation of Mental Health.

Former Mexican President Luis Echeverría has been a major promoter of Unesco within Mexico and internationally, both during his 1970-76 term of office and afterwards; Echeverría has been one of the top promoters of the British indigenist agenda in Mexico. Julian Huxley ran extensive operations in Mexico, and had been a popularizer of purported Mexican Indian history glorifying the Aztecs. Mexicans constituted among the largest number of the agency's founding executives, including former Mexican Minister of Education Jaime Torres-Bodet, who later succeeded Huxley as Unesco director general.

14) U.N. Office of High Commissioner for Refugees. Established in 1950, the agency has been integral to U.N. destabilizations of regions racked by war and natural disasters. The organization is an offshoot of the U.N. Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), which in close collaboration with Tavistock studied and utilized the destabilizing effects of the mass movement of refugees after World War II, especially in generating xenophobia. Since 1989, the office has been central to orchestrating fears of mass migration of North African Muslims to Europe, and of eastern Slavs to western Europe. Among its most important roles has been the creation of refugee camps in war-torn areas, which serve as recruitment bases for insurgencies. It has been active in Chiapas, nominally taking care of Guatemalan refugees since the mid-1980s.

15) World Federation of Mental Health. The WFMH was formed in 1948 by British intelligence’s psychological warfare division, the Tavistock Institute. The newly formed Unesco was its co-sponsor. During the war, the director of Tavistock, Gen. John Rawlings Rees, later the first WFMH director, called for the creation of “mobile psychiatric shock troops” to police the postwar world. Rees directed the WFMH through 1962, and oversaw its extensive growth, which included the creation or reorganization of dozens of medical schools and psychiatric departments throughout the world. The group has long served as an advisory body to Unesco, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Health Organization, and a variety of other key U.N. bodies.

The WFMH has always been active in Mexico, and one of its leaders, Dr. Erich Fromm, resided there for 30 years after the war. Fromm’s associate, Jesuit sociologist Ivan Illich, established a “dynamic group therapy” center in Cuer- navaca, Mexico, the Intercultural Documentation Center (CIDOC) in 1961, where many of today’s Ibero-American revolutionaries were trained. Fromm also personally trained the psychiatrists now running the Serbian terrorist gangs and Serbian state.

In 1991, the WFMH held its world congress in Mexico. In 1992, it created a special refugee project in Chiapas in conjunction with Harvard’s Psychiatry Department. The project is also active in former Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Rwanda, and Burundi. In 1993, Federico Puente of Mexico was elected president of the group.

16) World Wildlife Fund. Founded in 1961 by Prince Philip of Britain and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, the WWF, now called World Wide Fund for Nature, remains the leading European oligarchical families’ intelligence arm. Its professed concern with “endangered species” has served as a cover for blocking development programs as well as fostering terrorism, insurrections, and civil wars. It has done this in part through setting up “national parks” and “ecological reserves,” outside the control of national governments. The group has been a primary patron of “indigenous movements.” It has even listed indigenous peoples as “endangered,” as though they were animals, in its literature.

The WWF has been very active in Mexico, particularly Chiapas and southern Mexico, since its inception, and is in the process of setting up a Mexican affiliate. The Jan. 1, 1994, Zapatista insurgency began in an area of Chiapas which overlaps two WWF-fostered “national parks” on or near the Mexico-Guatemala border. The parks continue to be the insurgents’ safe-haven. Shining Path of Peru was also created and safehoused in national parks established by WWF. WWF sub-organizations active in Chiapas include Survival International and Greenpeace, which has claimed that Army actions against the rebels are harming the environment. Under this pretext, Greenpeace has organized support demonstrations for the EZLN in the United States. The WWF is currently carving out large extraterritorial reserves in Brazil, Argentina, and throughout Africa. (See EIR, Oct. 28, 1994 for a full dossier.)

17) Inter-American Dialogue. The Dialogue is a Washington-based bankers’ think-tank made up of prominent Americans and Ibero-Americans—including such establishment luminaries as McGeorge Bundy, Robert McNamara, and Cyrus Vance. It has promoted drug legalization, and has been a clearinghouse for the project to annihilate the armed forces and the nations of Ibero-America. As part of this strategy, the Dialogue in 1993 founded an “Ethnic Division Project” to promote ethnic separatism. It has also sponsored visits and other activities by leaders of the narco-terrorist São Paulo Forum.

18) São Paulo Forum. Created in 1990, under the sponsorship of Fidel Castro’s Cuban Communist Party, the forum held its first meeting in São Paulo, Brazil. Its membership includes several dozen leftist movements and organizations (see p. 40). It has come to represent the political face of a narco-terrorist international sponsored from abroad as a battering ram against the continent’s sovereign states and national institutions.

The Forum is strongly backed by the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based bankers’ think-tank which promotes the destruction of the armed forces and the nation-states of Ibero-America, and influences the U.S. State Department.
Sorbonne: center of indigenous terrorism

by Joseph Brewda

Of all the pseudo-sciences concocted in the last century, modern anthropology may be the worst. Axiomatically opposed to the universality of man, it champions imposing backwardness and isolation on the supposed “natives.” It first arose as a means through which European imperialists profiled and manipulated colonial populations; now it is a primary means through which the British and French seek to destroy the nation-states that have thrown off the colonial yoke. Under the claim that all cultures are relative, and fiercely hostile to the ideals of western civilization, anthropology gives the excuses for preventing the industrial and agricultural development of non-white people. In its most virulent form, it denounces science itself as “oppressive.”

Anthropology, sometimes termed ethnology, has been historically based at the University of Paris (Sorbonne), especially since the era of Napoleon III, the British puppet who ruled France 1852-70. Today, the Sorbonne is also the most important institution deploying indigenist terrorist gangs against nation-states, particularly in the underdeveloped countries. The Société des Americanistes (Americanist Society), formed in 1875 in the aftermath of Napoleon III’s effort to take over Mexico during the U.S. Civil War, is a closely allied institution.

The dominant figure in this Sorbonne-based network after World War II was Jacques Soustelle, a member of the Society board since 1937, and president from 1977 until his death in 1990. Soustelle published a book in the mid-1980s on “Mayan” culture, spent several years during the late 1930s and early 1940s doing “anthropological” research in Guatemala and southern Mexico, including three years in Chiapas. He was the textbook Nazi-Communist: during the war, U.S. intelligence identified Soustelle as a member of the Soviet espionage ring, known as the Red Orchestra; Soustelle later played a prominent role in the fascist Secret Army Organization (OAS) movement in France, which initiated over 30 attempts to kill President Charles de Gaulle.

Soustelle insisted that the “bloody rites” administered by the Aztecs of pre-Columbian Mexico were not “cruel,” but “coincided with social and cultural evolution. . . . What our analysis cannot reach is the link, apparently obvious to the peoples of Mexico, between the continuity of natural phenomena and the offering of blood.” Soustelle was a protégé of Prof. Paul Rivet, the head of the Museum of Man in Paris, who had been a leader of the Nazi eugenics movement, and who preceded Soustelle as head of the Society.

Pol Pot, Bani Sadr, Rwanda . . .

Among the Sorbonne’s anthropologist alumni:

- Pol Pot, the Cambodian dictator who slaughtered 3 million out of 7 million Cambodians during his 1975-79 Khmer Rouge regime. Prof. Georges Balandier, his academic adviser at the Sorbonne, founded the new “discipline” of “political anthropology,” which teaches “new models” for developing countries based on fostering tribalism. In an apparent effort to return Cambodia to its tribal roots, the Pol Pot regime slaughtered anyone who was educated, or even wore eyeglasses. Yet it imposed the death penalty for hunting birds and animals, in an effort to preserve endangered species, a policy which led World Wildlife Fund official Teddy Goldsmith to commend Pol Pot as a “pioneer of decentralized rural society.”

- Bani Sadr, the first President of Ayatollah Khomeini’s Islamic Republic of Iran. His Sorbonne doctoral thesis under Balandier argued for Iran’s radical ruralization as an alternative to the Shah’s industrialization efforts—although he later broke politically from the most extreme exponents of such views. The British-steered “Islamic” revolution collapsed Iran’s industry, and sacrificed over 1 million people through the British-manipulated Iran-Iraq war.

- The Uganda-backed Tutsi leaders of the Rwandan Patriotic Front, who seized power in Rwanda in 1994 following the massacres of hundreds of thousands of Hutu. In 1972, Sorbonne-educated Tutsis supervised a program to murder Hutu in neighboring Burundi, under the slogan of “hunting down the python in the grass.” A new Tutsi slaughter of Hutus in Burundi is in progress.

The Shining Path insurgency which has tormented Peru for 25 years was also planted by the Sorbonne and its Americanist Society networks, particularly through its University of Huamanga base (see p. 36). At a 1970 conference in Peru, the Society called for anthropologists to “support the liberation struggles of oppressed natives,” and passed a resolution urging the Peruvian government to free “political prisoners” Abimael Guzmán and Osmán Morote Best, then in jail for leading student riots in 1969 organized by “Revolutionary Student Front—Shining Path.” Guzmán and Morote went on to become Shining Path’s #1 and #2 leaders. Another Shining Path leader, Huamanga University Prof. Antonio Díaz Martínez, a member of the Society, was arrested in 1983 and charged with organizing, instigating, or executing over 100 terrorist attacks between April 1982 and December 1983.

The leader of the Chiapas rebellion, Subcommander Marcos (Rafael Sebastián Guillén) was trained at the Sorbonne, as was Adolfo Orive, founder of Mexico’s Proletarian Line organization, one of the various leftist groups feeding into the Chiapas “indigenist” revolt.
FIGURE 1
Leading countries targeted by action anthropology and ecologist organizations

Targeting organizations:
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FIGURE 2
Leading countries targeted by Liberation Theology organizations

Targeting organizations:
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FIGURE 3
Leading countries targeted by the Non-Governmental Organization network
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FIGURE 4
Leading countries targeted by United Nations 'special operations'
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Countries most targeted by the ‘Terrorist International’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Action Anthropology</th>
<th>Theology of Liberation</th>
<th>NGO support network</th>
<th>U.N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemisphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia and Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruiz’s ideological support networks in Germany

by Elisabeth Hellenbroich

In a March 6 article in the German daily Süddeutsche Zeitung about the upheaval in Chiapas, Bishop Samuel Ruiz is quoted: “If I am guilty of anything then it is of the fact that I helped to open the eyes of the Indios.” Yet the same article reports that Eduardo Castellanos, chairman of Mexico’s National Reconciliation Commission (CONAI), demanded Bishop Ruiz’s resignation, charging that by defending the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) he not only hardened the battlelines, but very possibly equipped the rebels with arms.

The article appeared to reflect what a spokesman for the German Catholic Bishops Conference described to a journalist as a deep split within the Catholic Church in Germany. One faction wants Samuel Ruiz, a fervent follower of the “Theology of Liberation,” which has been officially condemned by the Vatican, to resign at once; the opposing faction thinks there would be a catastrophe in Mexico if Ruiz were forced out. The spokesman claimed that if the German Bishops Conference were to issue a statement even merely “implying” that Ruiz has to go, the proverbial hell would break loose within the German Church, particularly from the base communities.

Indeed, the Bishops Conference is one of the two most powerful institutional supporters of Ruiz and his Zapatista guerrillas in Germany. The other is the Aachen-based charity Misereor, which the Bishops Conference created in 1959 to work for conquering hunger and disease in the world and to deal with development policies. Financed from church offerings and government funds, Misereor disposes of some OM 50,000 per year (about $200 million at the current exchange rate) according to a recent annual report.

The Bishops Conference spokesman insisted that the allegations that Misereor has financed the EZLN were a falsehood spread by the American Spectator’s Vatican correspondent Mary Bell Martínez and denied by the German Foreign Ministry as well as by two Misereor representatives who visited Mexico in January 1995. He then added that the bishops “stand fully behind Bishop Ruiz.”

As for Misereor, when a journalist asked an official to what extent Misereor has financed EZLN weapons purchases, as alleged in Mexico, the answer was that such financing is “in every respect to be excluded.” Misereor is not supporting any “such type of rebellions,” for “violence as a means to structural changes is not the right way.” But while claiming to seek only peaceful solutions, Misereor did state that over the decade 1984-94, some DM 4,984,500 were shipped to the three dioceses of Chiapas, supposedly to fund development programs such as the securing of food production, growing “organic coffee” without chemicals and pesticides, anti-erosion and soil improvement programs, and consultancy programs for the defense of human rights. The spokesman said that every year Misereor sends to San Cristóbal de las Casas in Chiapas, the “relatively small” sum of DM 50,000 for human rights.

Yet on Aug. 19, 1994, Misereor paid for an ad in the Süddeutsche Zeitung headlined: “Legal Protection.” “Your Misereor contribution is in good hands with Samuel Ruiz,” proclaimed the text. “With it he pays for justice. Justice for the indigenous in Mexico. He does this because he has been a friend of the indigenous for 25 years and has their trust. As bishop of San Cristóbal he is there body and soul: when their land is stolen, when their wages are withheld, when they are abused and swindled, and when their language and culture are despised. Even when the indigenous revolt was bloodily repressed in January, he didn’t leave them. He was the one who was spontaneously appointed and entrusted by them to negotiate with the government. They see him as one of theirs and can rely on him, such that Misereor can imagine no one better in Chiapas for using donations from Germany in the way the donors want.”

The same Misereor which rejected allegations of having funded the Chiapas rebellion did tell a journalist that of the DM 5 million that went into Chiapas over 10 years, half of it went to a coalition handling Guatemalan refugees in the state. Reports say that this refugee camp is used as recruiting ground for terrorist activities. Among the 59 Misereor-aided
projects published in their 1993 report, the item “Guatemala” lists DM 230,000 for “health” programs for the indigenous in the diocese of Quezaltenango—right on the border with Mexico. Moreover, according to the Mexico City daily El Heraldo on Feb. 4, 1995, Misereor’s representative in Mexico, Kopf Krauz, turned over a document to the Mexican Bishops Conference declaring that Misereor had delivered $7.5 million (three times the amount stated in Germany) to Samuel Ruiz over the last ten years, half of which was earmarked for Guatemalan refugee camps in the San Cristóbal diocese, and the rest for “aid programs” designed or approved by the bishop. Krauz appeared, El Heraldo reported, because of the “Mexican bishops’ insistence on knowing the EZLN’s sources of funds.”

Another pro-Ruiz organization sponsored by the German bishops is the Essen-headedquarters Adveniat, set up to help the Ibero-American churches. Their spokesman told EIR that Adveniat supports various “pastoral” causes in Mexico, including buildings, vehicles, and education projects. But she sharply distanced Adveniat from the charge, printed in the Süddeutsche Zeitung on March 6, that it paid for the private CB radio equipment used by the guerrillas for communication. If you want to know how much of the aid money went to Chiapas, she added, you will have to ask the German Foreign Ministry or the embassy in Mexico.

Pro-Zapatista propaganda is also welcome in the German media, where after more than a decade of the Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union’s dominating the Bonn government, the Catholic parties have considerable clout. As recently as March 8, 1995, the Arte TV Program (a German/French co-production) aired an exclusive interview with a pipe-smoking Subcommander Marcos. In a romantic “macho” style familiar to Germans from the Baader-Meinhof Gang in the 1970s, “Marcos” swaggered that his guerrillas will never give up their arms, that they are not seeking death but that they have to defend life by facing death, and have recruited and trained 1,000 troops in the past year for this.

The poison of Heidegger

What motivates the German Catholic Church and its people who influence the media, to come out more and more strongly in favor of Bishop Ruiz and Subcommander Marcos?

The answer lies in the existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), who elevated the “irrational” to the status of a fundamental value. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche proved in a speech printed in EIR’s Sept. 16, 1994 issue, Heidegger was a raving Nazi who was rehabilitated after World War II by the British, French, and American victors for use in the “reeducation” of Germans, and whose ideas formed the current chairman of the German Bishops Conference, Bishop Karl Lehmann.

It was Heidegger who made Friedrich Nietzsche, the National Socialists’ favorite philosopher, fashionable through his lectures in the 1920s, by crediting Nietzsche in particular, with heaving out the window Plato’s concept of universal Ideas, the idea of the Good, followed by Christian metaphysics; Nietzsche’s nihilism, which Heidegger admired, was exactly the revaluation and depreciation of all universal values. Heidegger became famous with his 1927 Being and Time, and in his 1929 What Is Metaphysics? he threw overboard 2,500 years of metaphysical tradition.

For Heidegger, there was no absolute being, no God as source of divine natural law, nor was man in the image of God, God’s helper in creation. Rather, he fixated on investigating the Dasein, man’s existence as man. Man’s primary experience, Heidegger claimed, is fear; and the essence of man’s existence is the transcendence into Nothing.

For Heidegger, technology is the power which turns man away from the real meaning of his life. In Being and Time, he calls the condition of being turned away from the actual meaning of one’s life, the “oblivion of being.” Man in the course of the history of western culture, says Heidegger, has forgotten the essentials of human life. People live life in an unactual way and they look for entertainment in their flight from the death agony. The actuality of true life lies in the banal, the basic experience of “being thrown.” That is the depth of Heidegger’s existentialist philosophy: Man is part of the world, and he must live with it in sorrow. The individual’s fear of his death, at the end of his unactually-lived life, is the basic subject of existential philosophy.

Heidegger’s fervent admiration of the Nazis—no surprise given his hatred for Christianity—was revealed by Victor Farias in his book Heidegger and Nazism, published in 1987. In his speech in 1933, upon being made rector of the University of Freiburg, Heidegger proclaimed: “The university has to conduct a decisive fight in the National Socialist spirit, which must not be suffocated through humanizing or Christian conceptions.”

“Continuously, your courage should grow,” said Heidegger, “for the saving of the essence and the elevation of the most inner force of our people in its state. The Führer himself, and he alone, is the present and the future German reality and its law.” In the Freiburg student newspaper in the fall of 1934 he wrote: “Not theorems and ideas should be the rules of your existence. The Führer himself and he alone is the present and future reality and its laws.”

The occupying powers assured the rehabilitation of Heidegger in Germany in 1951, despite his Nazi past. His full reintegration into the academic world, and the fact that it became obligatory to teach his work in the theology faculties, were part of the misnamed “denazification.” Heidegger and the ideologues of the Frankfurt School—Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt (Heidegger’s mistress), and Herbert Marcuse, who, like Heidegger in the 1920s, considered Nietzsche’s “immoralism” a basis of their own “critical theory”—were made the center of the postwar ideol-
ology of a "reeducated" Germany.
In the 1930s, Heidegger had avidly defended the Nazi blood and soil ideology and the Nazis' collective conscience; after the war, in line with the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, he paved the way for postmodernism. Thus, in 1953, he said: "It is not nuclear war that represents the greatest threat, even if that is the worst thinkable; but more threatening, is the peaceful, continuous development of technology, because it robs the thinking human being of his essence, of his ability to think."

The case of Bishop Lehmann
This brings us to the case of Bishop Karl Lehmann. On the occasion of the U.N. population conference in Cairo in September 1994, Lehmann authorized the publication of a paper by the German Bishops Conference in cahoots with sundry economists, called: "Economy, Globally and Ecologically: Reflections on the Protection of Resources and Maintenance of the Environment." The paper called for "sustainable development" and a malthusian economic policy, aimed at curbing the world population growth—an unabashed echo of the same nihilistic "principles" defended by Leonardo Boff, Hans Küng, Eugen Drewermann, and other "Theoliberati."

It turns out that Lehmann, from the early 1950s to the 1960s, had been a devout pupil of Heidegger, studying philosophy at the University of Freiburg, where Heidegger had just been reinstated. In 1961, Lehmann presented a 1,400-page doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University in Rome, entitled "On the Origin and Meaning of the Existential Question in the Thought of Martin Heidegger," based on his study of Heidegger's *Fundamental Ontology*. Father Hen­nci, currently bishop of Zurich, was his thesis adviser. The thesis is now available only in an excerpted version in the public university libraries. A journalist who requested it from the Gregorian University was informed that Bishop Lehmann is in possession of the three-volume dissertation and would have to grant his "personal recommendation" in order for anyone to consult the copy at the Gregorian University. In the available extracts, Karl Lehmann wrote that Heidegger represents an incredible new "beginning" in western European history, meriting a "painstaking word by word" study of his texts.

In 1966, Lehmann published an essay in the *Philosoph-

---

**Misereor's fellow travelers**

The Samuel Ruiz aficionados in the German Catholic Church keep company with a spectrum of New Age outfits spanning liberals, social democrats, and communists. Among them:

- *Der Überblick*, a self-styled “Magazine for Ecumenical Movement and International Cooperation,” and *Forum*, a magazine for "development policy action groups." Both are Hamburg-based.
- The Third World Action Information Center in Freiburg.
- The Latin America Information Post (ILA) with its Oscar Romero House in Bonn.
- The International Youth Social Service (IJGD) in Berlin: calls on youths to join in the “Qué Tal” programs in Chile, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.

- Editorial Nautilus, Hamburg. Published a Spanish-language “solidarity” declaration with the ELZN on Feb. 2, 1995 under the title, “Our Solidarity Is with the Zapatistas.” Among its signers: the former East German commentator Karl Eduard von Schnitzler, notorious for over 30 years as Mr. “Black Channel,” a TV propaganda channel of the East German secret service, the Stasi.
- Certain social-democratic trade unions, such as the Hesse state education and science union, whose chairman Hartwig Schroeder wrote an article for the national daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on March 27, 1994 making plain the racist stereotypes underlying the pro-Zapatista networks. In it, he lauded the Chiapas rebellion as a "reflex" against the 1992 celebrations of Christopher Columbus’s landing in the Americas. The indigenous feel that they are the "heirs of an old and rich culture," opined Schroeder. "The last Aztec ruler Cuauhtémoc is a national hero while Hernán Cortés (who led numerous indigenous nations as well as his small band of Spanish troops to victory over the Aztec empire) is, for Schroeder, "historically a nobody." "Awareness of a certain tradition is gaining more and more political ground. The resistance against exploitation and not being granted elementary and political rights . . . this new awareness awoke with the 1992 quincentenary celebrations.” Now, thanks to the Zapatista rebellion, Mexico could become “democratic,” and the indigenous communes part of Mexico’s political life and society, Schroeder wrote.
isches Jahrbuch on the “Christian Experience of History and the Ontological Question in the Young Heidegger,” where he revamped Christian theology to fit the rehabilitated Nazi philosopher’s mumbo-jumbo. Thus, “Heidegger’s notion of fear, this fear of death agony, which is the determining aspect of life, is the same as the suffering and martyrdom that St. Paul is talking about.” Or: “The destruction of traditional theology through Heidegger was shocking, obviously; but his conviction that ontology could not be based on the traditional theological form, he already says very clearly in Being and Time”—the book published in 1927, just before Heidegger emerged as a raving Nazi apostate.

The same Bishop Karl Lehmann, in a book published in 1993, upholds precisely the method of the moral theologians whom Pope John Paul II took to task in his 1993 encyclical Veritatis Splendor: those who by referring to the purely subjectivist and individual interpretation of freedom, relativize freedom and overlook the fact that it can only exist in connection with a higher, a divine natural law.

For Lehmann, there is no such thing as a norm concerning the “Christian image of man.” Rather: “The theological image of man is dependent on the historically formed understanding of man. There is not the chemically pure theological image of man, given that the interpretation, for example, of ‘man in the image of God’ carries clearly the footprints of a certain time.” And he concludes: “Each theological image of man is historically determined, given that it stands in its relation to the relative self-conception of man at a given time. There is no ideal normative image of man.”

Having rejected the notion of man in the image of God, Lehmann naturally favors a reinterpretation of the Biblical text of Genesis, in light of today’s “ecological crisis” and the awareness that man has plundered the planet Earth. “Now we must work out norms for how the conditions for life can be maintained on this Earth. . . . If we read attentively the important investigations of the Club of Rome on Limits to Growth, we can show how man’s only chance consists in a radical change.” For Bishop Lehmann, the Club of Rome report shows the need “to change the fundamental ethical norms of our society.” A Copernican-scale spiritual revolution is needed for realizing this—not only practical change, but a general change of consciousness.

For Lehmann, the task of Christian man is “to exercise a new thinking which leads to a perceptible responsibility between man and God and world history and nature.” Maybe in this effort “we can have an encounter with the thinking of the late Heidegger,” who indeed offers a treasure trove of deep-sounding verbiage with which to give “philosophical” cover to the arguments of those who justify looting and oppression in the name of “sustainable development” and “planetary consciousness.” And lo and behold, Heidegger’s 1951 lecture, “Building Dwelling Thinking,” contains just the grist for Lehmann’s mill: “Saving the Earth is more than to use or abuse it. Saving the Earth does not subdue it, from whence there is only one step toward limitless exploitation.” Or: “Man only lives truly if he keeps all dimensions of his existence in balance and does not miss himself. For Heidegger this means: Save the Earth, receive the sky, expect the gods and assist the mortals.”

The case of Boff, Drewermann, and Küng

With this open sore festering at the top of the German hierarchy, one can hardly be surprised at the ever-growing New Age and “Theology of Liberation” orientation within the German Catholic Church. The famous “Theoliberati,” Leonardo Boff, Hans Küng, Jean Baptiste Metz, Eugen Drewermann, and their co-thinkers, are frequently invited by the Munich-based Catholic Academy and favorably quoted by the Hanover-based Catholic Institute. Their “theology,” as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger summed it up in his critique of theolob guru Gustavo Gutiérrez in 1983, “is not to have a social revolution . . . It is a permanent ‘cultural revolution’ (inspired by the ideas of Marx, Freud, Ernst Bloch, St. Simon, Jeremy Bentham) and the creation of a new man.” Ratzinger, the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, went on to write, “The real criticism of this kind of theology, is its philosophical irrationalism which deploys religious forces as justification for the irrational . . . which would become totalitarian.”

Despite (or perhaps because of) this clear rejection by the Vatican, during the 1992 Columbus celebrations, the Brazilian ex-priest Leonardo Boff was a prominent guest in many a German event. At a seminar in the Tutzing Evangelical Academy, this author heard him make inflammatory speeches against the Spanish conquistadors and in praise of the mysticism of the indigenous Indians. What was most astonishing was that, despite his overt preference for mass-murdering pagan cults over Christianity, Boff won the full support of Germany’s leading moral theologians as well as spokesmen of the Bavarian Catholic Academy. Throughout 1992 Boff was hailed in Miserere’s magazine as the “advocate of the poor” and given voluminous coverage to expound on his reasons for quitting the priesthood, to promote the 1992 Rio U.N. summit (which sought to impose a world environmental dictatorship), and to deliver his sermons about the oppressed Indios in Venezuela and Brazil.

Boff’s human-rights veneer wears thin when it is realized that his zeal is not to dispel the dehumanizing poverty and backwardness which enslaves many indigenous people, but rather to promote the same New Age paradigm fanatically espoused by Conservative Revolutionist Newt Gingrich, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and by Gingrich’s idol, futurologist Alvin Toffler: a post-industrial utopia in which a small elite runs the computers, and 95% of humanity is doomed to illiteracy and misery. In this fascist vision, “left” and “right” political labels are irrelevant. Boff’s 1994 book, A New Earth in a New Era: A Plea for a Planetary Culture, is a plea for a “cultural revolution” centered
around the syncretic “religion” forged by such monied institutions as Stanford, Esalen, and Tavistock Institute (London) as a battering-ram against the optimism rooted in scientific and technological progress.

In this book, Boff asserts that there is no “binding divine and natural law” as ordained by God’s injunction to man in Genesis, “Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it.” Instead of conceiving of man as created in the “image of God,” Boff sees man as a “cosmic being with a planetary consciousness... If we look at the planet Earth we see Gaia”—the Earth Mother goddess whose worship led to human sacrifice, and which was rejected categorically by Judaism and Christianity. The “Gaia” thesis, cited approvingly by Boff, portrays the Earth as a living supra-humanism which keeps a dynamic balance between the physical, chemical, and energetic elements. According to Boff, we are cosmic brothers and sisters with the plants and the animals. “We want a new consciousness, a new noosphere. A new cosmogenesis. We are in a phase of deep cultural and civilizational changes. We enter into a new level of consciousness,” he raves.

What Boff means by that is what Alvin Toffler calls the “Third Wave” (information) society, which comes after the “Second Wave” industrial society. Boff outlines a schema of the old and new society, in which the “new” society emphasizes communal life, ecology, and cosmic consciousness.

Boff speaks of a life in syntony and synchrony with the movements of the planet Earth, while attacking Christianity, in particular the Roman Catholic Church, for having been an “accomplice of genocide and ethnocide—whose traumatic effects are still felt by the survivors up to this day.” For Boff, this is all the more deplorable since the official church does not want to recognize its historic guilt, as was evidenced by the 1992 Latin American Bishops Conference in Santo Domingo, celebrating the 500th anniversary of Columbus, or the 1994 Synod in Rome of the African Church. Christianity, by striving to impose universal values (exemplified by the recent Catechism), therefore becomes pathological, in Boff’s view, and will hinder the new civilization, whereas he who opens up toward multiculturalism will be good for “planetarization.” “Mankind is in a difficult transition—from the nation-state to the world-state, from the worldwide to the cosmic; from mass to energy to information and communication; from macro to micro from materialism to holistic spiritualism... we are before a new planetary civilization.” In another book on ecology and mysticism in 1992 after his much-publicized challenges to Catholic moral teachings, Drewermann, in order to “free” this world from its anthropomorphism and its ethical fixation on Christian values, wants to return to animism and totemism and therefore is fully in agreement with the trend launched by Nietzsche, Freud, and C.G. Jung.

For Drewermann, in his book The Deadly Progress, Friedrich Nietzsche was the one who eradicated Christianity’s otherworldliness, who exposed the oppressive, lying morality of Christian anthropocentrism, and who is responsible for “having freed from its narrowness the radically egocentric... worldview of Biblical historiography by reminding us of the mythical world of the Greeks and thus fundamentally of the world of myths as a whole.” (By “Greek myth,” he means the maniacal cult of Dionysus.) Drewermann devotes pages to quoting the Club of Rome report and discusses how world population can be limited to 2 billion people.

Drewermann’s book makes no bones of his admiration of the Aztec religious practice of cutting out the hearts of living victims by the tens of thousands. He argues that human sacrifice among the primitives served to maintain the balance of the “Great Mother”: “The human sacrifices of the Aztecs were necessary, so that the Sun, the salvation of the world, could win back its power out from the hearts of men; and even if the Aztecs did conduct wars with the aim of exploiting, their wars did serve as a means to capture sacrificial prisoners for the Sun God. Within this worldview, death is not the enemy, but a serving part of life, and war is an eternal institution so that life can have permanent duration.”

Then there is Hans Küng, the much-publicized Catholic dissident theologian, perhaps the most influential of Heidegger’s spawn. In his 1991 book Global Responsibility, Küng speaks in favor of a “paradigm shift” into a postmodern, post-industrial society. “Progress, this great god of modern ideologies... has revealed its double face and the belief in progress is lost. Economic progress shows its human consequences: destruction of the natural environment, resulting in social destabilization, lack of resources, infrastructure problems, environmental pollution, deforestation, acid rain, ozone hole, population explosion, debt crisis, nuclear death... we are threatened with the self-destruction of our planet,” writes Küng.

What Küng understands about the new world ethos, is inspired by British intelligence mouthpiece Arnold Toynbee and his plea for “multicultural” societies. So Küng calls for a post-colonial, post-industrial, post-confessional, interreligious world: a kind of pluralist, holistic synthesis as he calls it, between all cultures and religions. Küng’s New Age syncretic religion would have no room for the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, or the mandate of Genesis to fill and subdue the Earth—but plenty of room for the culture of death which fosters “Zapatista” terrorism.

Drewermann praises Aztec human sacrifice

One of Boff’s German co-thinkers is Eugen Drewermann, who was dismissed from his post as a priest in Paderborn in 1992 after his much-publicized challenges to Catholic moral teachings. Drewermann, in order to “free” this world from its anthropomorphism and its ethical fixation on Christian values, wants to return to animism and totemism and therefore is fully in agreement with the trend launched by Nietzsche, Freud, and C.G. Jung. Drewermann, in his book The Deadly Progress, Friedrich Nietzsche was the one who eradicated Christianity’s otherworldliness, who exposed the oppressive, lying morality of Christian anthropocentrism, and who is responsible for “having freed from its narrowness the radically egocentric... worldview of Biblical historiography by reminding us of the mythical world of the Greeks and thus fundamentally of the world of myths as a whole.” (By “Greek myth,” he means the maniacal cult of Dionysus.) Drewermann devotes pages to quoting the Club of Rome report and discusses how world population can be limited to 2 billion people.

Drewermann’s book makes no bones of his admiration of the Aztec religious practice of cutting out the hearts of living victims by the tens of thousands. He argues that human sacrifice among the primitives served to maintain the balance of the “Great Mother”: “The human sacrifices of the Aztecs were necessary, so that the Sun, the salvation of the world, could win back its power out from the hearts of men; and even if the Aztecs did conduct wars with the aim of exploiting, their wars did serve as a means to capture sacrificial prisoners for the Sun God. Within this worldview, death is not the enemy, but a serving part of life, and war is an eternal institution so that life can have permanent duration.”

Then there is Hans Küng, the much-publicized Catholic dissident theologian, perhaps the most influential of Heidegger’s spawn. In his 1991 book Global Responsibility, Küng speaks in favor of a “paradigm shift” into a postmodern, post-industrial society. “Progress, this great god of modern ideologies... has revealed its double face and the belief in progress is lost. Economic progress shows its human consequences: destruction of the natural environment, resulting in social destabilization, lack of resources, infrastructure problems, environmental pollution, deforestation, acid rain, ozone hole, population explosion, debt crisis, nuclear death... we are threatened with the self-destruction of our planet,” writes Küng.

What Küng understands about the new world ethos, is inspired by British intelligence mouthpiece Arnold Toynbee and his plea for “multicultural” societies. So Küng calls for a post-colonial, post-industrial, post-confessional, interreligious world: a kind of pluralist, holistic synthesis as he calls it, between all cultures and religions. Küng’s New Age syncretic religion would have no room for the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, or the mandate of Genesis to fill and subdue the Earth—but plenty of room for the culture of death which fosters “Zapatista” terrorism.
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Action anthropologists train the ‘indigenous’ shock-troops

by Gretchen Small

Cultural Survival, one of the leading global “action anthropology” associations operating worldwide, dedicated the Spring 1994 edition of its quarterly to a double theme: welcoming the Zapatista insurgency in Chiapas, Mexico, and assessing the potential for rapid advances in the institutionalization in international law, through the United Nations system, of the anti-nation-state agenda of the global “indigenous peoples movement.” The two themes are related, Research Director Ted Macdonald argued in the editorial, as each—the Zapatistas and the U.N. global process—advances the cause of the other.

The Salinas government’s decision to accept the Chiapas insurgency’s demand that it negotiate granting autonomy to quasi-governments controlled by the self-proclaimed representatives of Mexico’s indigenous peoples, “dramatically illustrates” the power which the U.N.-centered global indigenous movement already wields, and the similar power of “long-term social science research” in areas such as Chiapas around the world, Macdonald gloated.

Thus, Cultural Survival’s man proposed, the time has come for anthropologists to step forward around the globe “to manage the inevitable conflicts of any multi-cultural world,” as they have in Chiapas. “Issues of ethnicity and ethnic conflict vie for center stage in the world’s political arena,” he asserted, but whether Serbs, Pathans, Somalis, Tzotzils, or Yanomamis, such ethnically defined “peoples” “have always been the research subjects of much anthropology.”

Subjects—and victims.

Wenner Gren: Nazi money, Nazi ideas

Chiapas was selected in the 1950s as the site of what has become the world’s longest-running concentrated anthropological experiment (p. 18). Three generations of Harvard University anthropologists have now made their careers out of “studying” the small, sparsely populated state of Chiapas. Some of the eight Harvard-trained anthropologists writing in the Cultural Survival Quarterly special edition on Chiapas, for example, have spent more than 20 years tracking—and shaping—the thoughts and doings of the inhabitants of a single small town, bragging that they continue to follow the lives of any inhabitants who move to another town in the state. The project ought to be shut down simply on the grounds of ending voyeurism.

The anthropological project in Chiapas began as a joint training project for the anthropology departments of four U.S. universities, and was financed from the start by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

The Wenner-Gren Foundation stands at the center of these operations. The largest private institution in the world funding anthropology, Wenner-Gren was originally founded in 1941 as the Viking Fund, and endowed by the private fortune of a public supporter of the Nazi cause, Swedish industrialist Axel Wenner-Gren, who was also a yachting- and money-laundering buddy of Britain’s Duke of Windsor, the abdicated King Edward VIII. In 1942, the fund’s financier was blacklisted by the U.S. government as a Nazi agent, for supplying the Nazi machine with war matériel. Paul Fejos, an Hungarian expatriate friend of the Swedish Nazi, was named the Viking Fund’s first director of research, and served as president of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for decades. Fejos, who had gotten his start in the United States in the 1920s as medical researcher for the Rockefeller Institute, had been busy filming and studying Indians in the Peruvian jungle, before being handed the new anthropological fund.

The foundation has shaped the deployments of post-World War II anthropology. For example, from 1958 until 1980, Wenner-Gren sponsored yearly conferences at its castle, Burg Wartenstein, in southern Austria, where leading anthropologists from around the world, including from the Soviet bloc, would meet for weeks in private, retreat-like circumstances.

Venetian-British race science dominated all its work. In 1952, the foundation initiated a 15-year program based on the Nazi premise that man, and African man in particular,
was nothing but another monkey. Its 1959 conference in Chicago, “The Darwin Centennial, Evolution after Darwin,” was led by the dean of British eugenics, Unesco founder Julian Huxley. Out of its 1965 conference on the “Origins of Man,” came a second long-term program dedicated to proving man-as-ape, under which it convoked six international anthropological symposia on “non-human primate behavior,” and co-sponsored a conference with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., on the subject, “Man and Beast Revisited.” In 1967, it pulled together the personnel, and provided the financing, for the World Association for the Study of Primate Variability (Human and Non-Human), a network dedicated to the man-as-ape thesis.

As part of that project, Wenner-Gren also provided the funding for studies of chimpanzees “in their naturalistic settings” in Tanzania, and of the mountain gorillas in the parks in Rwanda—which provided safe haven for the British-run Ugandan army invasions into Rwanda which led to the mass slaughters of 1994. (See EIR, Aug. 19, 1994.)

The foundation also promoted the thesis that all human behavior and societal practices are genetically determined. Working with the U.N. World Health Organization’s 1962-founded “Scientific Committee on Research in Population Genetics of Primitive Groups,” they laid the cornerstones for the discipline known today as population genetics and the evil, London-centered global Human Genome Project.

This network argues that any human depravity, such as cannibalism or infanticide, is acceptable, because it is genetically determined. Wenner-Gren publications praise a 1984 study, Infanticide: Comparative and Evolutionary Perspectives, which argues that the “custom” of killing unwanted babies is a genetically determined instrument of Darwinian “natural selection.”

With this outlook, Wenner-Gren eagerly promoted “action anthropology,” the school which actively fosters terrorist ethnic “liberation” movements under the tenet that anthropologists are no longer to be merely “participant/observers” of societies, but rather must now direct them. For example, it was Viking Fund money which allowed the Société des Americanistes (Americanist Society) to publish its journal again after World War II, and which financed a number of the Society’s international congresses. And it was Wenner-Gren which, in 1960, sponsored the founding of the journal Current Anthropology, whose founding editor, University of Chicago’s Sol Tax, first elaborated the doctrine of “action anthropology.”

Peru’s Shining Path: a parallel case

While the Wenner-Gren/Harvard team was building up the terrorist networks that surfaced in 1994 as the Zapatistas in Chiapas, the same international networks were busy creating the Shining Path terrorists in Peru. In 1985, EIR published a Special Report, Narco-Terrorism in Ibero-America, which documented how action anthropologists created, and ran, the bestial Shining Path as part of a decades-long project to, in the words of anthropologist José Matos Mar, “forge a new face of Peru.”

That face was to be enraged “indigenism.” Following World War II, teams of foreign anthropologists swarmed over Peru, under the direction of Luis Valcárcel, a close collaborator of French ethnographer Paul Rivet (see p. 27) and the father of Peruvian anthropology. Valcárcel set up Peru’s first ethology department at San Marcos University in Lima with funding by the Wenner-Gren Foundation.

As teams from Cornell, the Smithsonian Institution, the Americanist Society, the University of California at Berkeley, etc. profiled numerous regions of Peru, Valcárcel’s leading disciple, Matos Mar, led a team of “young indigenists”—by vocation, not birth—who reviewed the centuries of reports on the demographics and religious practices of Peru’s Indian populations contained in the archives of the Catholic Church. These combined activities put together a precise map of Peru’s indigenous populations, stretching back for centuries.

Then, in 1959, Valcárcel, along with his student and close friend José María Arguedas, led the committee which established a new anthropological training center in Peru, based at the newly reopened University of Huamanga in Ayacucho. Today, the university is well-known as the institution out of which the Shining Path emerged as a fighting force. It was there that Shining Path chief Abimael Guzmán used his posts as both professor in the university’s teacher training program and director of personnel, to recruit and brainwash terrorist cadre for almost two decades before Shining Path fired a shot. (Some 30 years later, Arguedas’ widow, Sybila Arredondo, was convicted of being an intellectual leader and money-bags for Shining Path.)

Guzmán did not have to take over the university for his project, however. The school had been established from the outset as an experiment in creating an “indigenous” rebellion, designed to channel its students and surrounding townpeople into Guzmán’s operation. Closed for over 70 years, the university was reopened in 1959 as an experiment in “mass education” in the area which anthropologists had mapped as containing the greatest concentration of Peruvians of Indian heritage in the country. Some 30% of its professors were foreigners, and foreign funds poured in to finance it. In the mid-1960s, one of its anthropology professors was named rector of the university, a post he would retain until the end of the 1970s. Efraín Morote Best, the specialist in folklore and “Andean myths” who had coordinated Peru’s first Jungle Bilingual Education program, directed the university’s anthropology department to carry out an aggressive “community outreach” program, under which students and professors systematically profiled and “educated” every community around Huamanga.
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As one of the department’s leading professors, “black magic” specialist A. Yaranga Valderrama—another product of the Sorbonne’s anthropology department—told investigators in 1983, “The University of Huamanga was the best anthropological institution which Peru has ever had.” Yaranga admitted also that he was familiar, in detail, with Shining Path’s activities, but refused to give any details. “Anthropologists are like priests; we see and hear confessions, but we never speak,” he explained.

When it finally began its terrorist war in 1980, Shining Path’s base of operations coincided precisely with the towns and communities where the University of Huamanga had carried out its extensive “community outreach” programs. As the terrorists’ war spread throughout the Peruvian sierra, Morote Best justified its hideous violence, with the familiar line that “the power of the state” was responsible for the violence, not Shining Path. Two of his sons were proven to be leaders of Shining Path; his daughter married a central committee member. His oldest, Osmán, is today serving a life sentence for being Shining Path’s second in command, responsible for planning its military operations. In 1985, Peruvian security forces arrested the ex-rector himself on suspicion that he was one of the intellectual masterminds of the killer cult, but political pressure forced his quick release.

Varcarcel called Peru, “an anthropologist’s paradise.” In this “paradise,” at least 20,000 have died as a result of anthropologist-induced violence, which also inflicted an estimated $25 billion in damage to the infrastructure and economy of the country in the 13 years of warfare before the Fujimori government finally broke the back of the insurgency in 1993.

1968: Indigenism goes global

In 1965, leading Sorbonne anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss issued a call for “urgent ethnological research” globally, to collect “data” on peoples’ whose life-styles were threatened by “westernization.” The call-up of the troops for the new war was under way. In April 1966, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, together with the Smithsonian Institution, held a conference on “Urgent Anthropology,” to plan out a global campaign in “defense” of backward cultures. By 1968, the Americanist Society had created a special “Commission to Save the Indians.”

New international structures were needed to run this campaign to “protect” starving Indian populations from modern civilization. So, between 1968 and 1972, three international “action anthropology” associations were established: the Society for Endangered Peoples (Gesellschaft für Bedrohte Völker), was set up in Germany in 1968; Survival International was founded in London in 1969; and in 1972, Cultural Survival was formed, headquartered in Boston, and initially conceived as the U.S. branch of Survival International.

The three associations, which have worked closely together since their founding, were set up directly by the British royal family in order to create an “indigenous movement” which then did not exist, as a subsumed deployment of the global assault against industrial society then being put together around the ecology movement. Survival International, first founded under the name “Primitive Peoples Fund,” was set up by Prince Philip’s World Wildlife Fund. Prince Philip’s cousin Queen Margareet of Denmark, lent her patronage to Cultural Survival, serving to this day as “Honorary Member.”

The Society for Endangered Peoples, founded out of the anthropology department of the University of Göttingen, Germany was an appendage of the Club of the Isles’ neo-Nazi Conservative Revolution. Its principal director, Tilman Zeluch, claimed as his mentors, two of the leading Nazi theorists in Europe, “de-schooling” linguist Ivan Illich, and neo-Nazi activist and separatist theoretician Henning Eichberg. Eichberg, who informally advised the Endangered Peoples, is, in turn, a protégé of former Swiss Nazi SS volunteer Armin Mohler, author of the 1949 work The Conservative Revolution, one of the leading books advocating universal facism circulating today (see EIR Feb. 17, 1995). Eichberg told investigators in 1982 his ideas were a mix taken from Armin Mohler, Nazi ideologue Gregor Strasser, and Qadafi’s Green Book, and he pointed to the collaboration between environmentalists and the Basque terrorist-separatist movement, ETA, as a model for other groups to follow. His motto was, “Balkanization for everyone.”

Goldsmith: Return to primitive society

Survival International is most aptly characterized by the views of Teddy Goldsmith, whose billionaire brother is one of the British Crown’s top financial operatives, Sir Jimmy Goldsmith. Teddy is the founder of the Green Party movement internationally and the financial money-bags for Survival International since its founding. He has dedicated his life to forcing upon the world what he terms The Great U-Turn—the title of his 1989 book reprinting six of his articles from his magazine, the Ecologist—away from industrial society, back to “traditional primitive societies,” where, for tens of thousands of years, man lived in unchanging stability, Teddy believes.

Goldsmith argues that the serfdom of the feudal manorial system is preferable to industrial society, but a hunting and gathering society is even better because, he lies, in those societies, “the very concept of work” is unknown, and people spend their days “gambling, gossiping, and visiting friends.” He denounces monotheism as a creation of a disintegrated society. Science, education, health systems, industry, transportation, the nation-state, all these introduce change—discontinuities—which must be reversed, he writes. The invention of writing itself was a blow to social “stability.”
Goldsmith, citing Ivan Illich’s “de-schooling” work as a model, demands modern education be revised by studying how “non-human animals” communicate from generation to generation. Health care demands a return to the primitive witch-doctor, where shamans cured, not individuals, but only the socio-ecological conditions of the collective. Government must be reduced to a series of “village republics.” Science has to be replaced by nature worship; work, by “ritualization.”

Teddy acknowledges that “deindustrializing society” will be difficult, but suggests that “a global economic catastrophe is likely to provide the only effective method of pollution control.” We must “aim for negative growth; economic and demographic contraction,” which can be forced upon the world by “dismantling the power grids,” ending labor-saving technology, industry, agricultural machinery, and chemicals.

Such also are the aims of the ecological and indigenist movements which Goldsmith’s Survival International finances and directs. For example, Teddy’s “main man in Mexico,” the Maoist Gustavo Esteva, wrote happily in the pages of Ecologist magazine that the Zapatistas had seized control of Chiapas in order to impose “post-economic initiatives,” to “expel economy altogether. The Zapatista group is an uprising against development, Esteva explained, who have “opted for a more dignified form of dying.”

Imposing the politics of ‘fang and claw’

Few national or regional indigenous organizations existed at the end of the 1960s. Over the next decade, they proliferated across the globe, as the anthropological associations provided the logistics, financing, and leadership training, and often, the writing for the publications of their “indigenous” movements.

It was the anthropologists who called for indigenous “liberation.” In 1971, leading Ibero-American anthropologists, including Mexico’s Guillermo Bonfil Battalla and Cultural Survival board member Stefano Varese of Peru, met in Barbados. The now-famous “Barbados Declaration” committed the participants to organize “the liberation of the indigenous populations.” Not a single “indigenous” representative was provided the logistics, financing, and leadership training, and often, the writing for the publications of their “indigenous” movements.

The ideology of the groups so created echoed the fanatic war-cry of their oligarchic masters. The founding document of the South American Indian Council (CISA), a U.N. indigenist non-governmental organization set up in 1980 with support from Soviet as well as “western” anthropologists, declared: “We must organize and prepare ourselves physically and ideologically so that when we install our peoples in power, we totally change the judicial and governmental system: In power, we will change the Western System and Thought. Death is no terror for us Indians; many of us wait for it with great joy as a return to Mother Nature to emerge once again forming new lives.”

Indigenism demands a return to bestiality, proclaimed the document on “indigenous philosophy” presented to a 1981 U.N. Indigenous Peoples meeting by the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), an early leader of the U.N. “indigenous peoples” structure. Mankind is “the weakest of all creatures,” less worthy even than wolves, because “humans are only able to survive through the exercise of rationality, since they lack the abilities of other creatures to gain food through use of fang and claw,” the IITC declared. Because “rationality is a curse,” European science and religion must be overturned.

It was to a board member and spokesman of the IITC that the Nobel Prize committee awarded its Peace Prize in 1992: Rigoberta Menchú, an admitted leader of the terrorist Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG).

The final phase of uprising: U.N. rule

The project took another leap forward with the establishment of the U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in 1982. Out of its annual conferences in Geneva, attended by some 600 people by the 1990s, was forged the global “indigenous movement,” which to this day consists of little more than a small group of radical activists who are paid by the U.N. to travel from international conference to international conference, speaking in the name of their “peoples.”

Now this U.N.-centered, anthropologist-run apparatus has set out to institutionalize its program to return mankind to barbarism as international law. Two documents, International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention #169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, adopted in 1989, and the 1993 U.N. Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, are the cutting edge of the plot to outlaw man’s own hu-
No longer are indigenous peoples to be considered human beings under the law. ILO Convention #169 declares that previous United Nations documents contained an “assimilationist orientation” which must now be “removed.” Indigenous peoples are now placed by international law in a special category, in which they live, in the words of Cultural Survival board member and international human rights law specialist James Anaya, “in co-existence” with humankind!

Only five countries have ratified this convention to date. But, signators or not, any government which tries to bring the benefits of modern civilization to any of its peoples designated as “indigenous,” may find themselves brought before the World Court, charged with violating Article 23 of Convention #169, which instructs governments that they must ensure that “subsistence economy and traditional activities . . . such as hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering . . . are strengthened and promoted.”

In fact, the Spring 1994 issue of Cultural Survival Quarterly suggested that the Zapatistas could make Mexico (which has ratified the ILO convention) into “an important test of the ILO procedures,” by having “Mayan peasant organizations or plantation-workers unions” bring their land claims before the ILO. In October 1994, the Zapatista-run State Council of Indian and Peasant Organizations (CEOIC), announced they would do just that.

Ending individual rights

The U.N. Draft Declaration doesn’t stop there. It also asserts a principle of “collective or group rights,” overriding those individual human rights recognized worldwide, until now, as inalienable. Such “collective rights” include the “prevention of and redress for . . . any form of assimilation or integration by other cultures of ways of life imposed on them.” It also would grant “indigenous communities” the “right to autonomy or self-government,” including maintenance of their own legal systems, governments, education systems, and “control” over “the lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used,” including the right to exclude all military activity by the national government within those lands.

A manifesto of the indigenous peoples’ movement published in 1992 by the World Resources Institute, a sub-group of Prince Philip’s World Wildlife Fund apparatus, summarizes their one-world objectives:

“In a world of perhaps 5,000 indigenous cultures, the status of these cultures cannot be ignored . . . . The dominance of the nation-state—thought of as seat of all sovereignty—may be near its zenith. The locus of decision-making seems likely to shift downwards to provinces and indigenous domains even as it shifts upwards to regional bodies, such as the European Community, and global bodies such as the United Nations.”

The São Paulo Forum

The following are among several dozen leftist parties making up the São Paulo Forum (see p. 26):

1. Mexico: PRD. The Party of the Democratic Revolution, led by Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, the defeated Mexican presidential candidate in the 1994 elections, recently named “official interlocutor” by the EZLN’s “Marcos.”

2. Guatemala: URNG. The National Revolutionary Union of Guatemala, founded in the early 1980s, has spent years conducting irregular warfare against the Guatemalan nation while financing itself through the drug trade. In the early 1980s, URNG activist Rigoberta Menchú was plucked from obscurity by combined efforts of Fidel Castro and the United Nations apparatus, and turned into a mouthpiece for the region’s indigenous-terror forces, culminating in her receiving the 1992 Nobel Peace Prize.

3. El Salvador: FMLN. A founding member of the São Paulo Forum, El Salvador’s Farabundo Martí National Liberation guerrillas wreaked havoc with that nation for over a decade, with the full backing of Fidel Castro’s regime. In 1992, the FMLN struck a deal sponsored by the Bush State Department and the U.N. apparatus, which gave the FMLN a share of power as well as a decisive role in dismantling the Salvadoran Army in the name of “peace.”

4. Nicaragua: FSLN. Since seizing power in 1979, the Sandinista National Liberation Front have financed themselves through drug trafficking, and provided financing, weapons, and training to their narco-terrorist brethren elsewhere on the continent. In May 1993, an enormous clandestine arsenal containing tons of sophisticated weaponry, exploded in the capital of Managua. Evidence obtained at the site revealed the existence of a continent-wide kidnapping network involving several member organizations of the São Paulo Forum and, prominently, the Spanish Basque terrorist organization ETA. Later, some 50 more arsenals were discovered in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Peru, all belonging to one or more terrorist or “former” terrorist members of the Forum.

5. Cuba: PCC. The Cuban Communist Party, ruling party of Fidel Castro and the sponsor of innumerable narco-terrorist insurgencies across the continent, is also the initiating force behind the São Paulo Forum.
6. Haiti: Lavalas. The hard-core of this Jacobin “people’s movement” in Haiti is the bloody mob of “necklacers” (assassins) which Jean-Bertrand Aristide and the Theology of Liberation movement carved out of the most crazed and desperate elements of Haiti’s voodoo-infected poor.

7. Venezuela: Causa R. The Radical Cause Party is the “left opposition” which had hoped to use the ferment against the corrupt Carlos Andrés Pérez presidency as its ticket to the presidency in last year’s elections—but failed. Causa R advocates the elimination of the continent’s armed forces as a “threat to democracy,” and has been bankrolled by dirty banker Orlando Castro, tied to the Cisneros interests, who is currently a fugitive from justice. Causa R’s leader Pablo Medina, is currently under indictment for receiving and hoarding stolen military weapons.

8. Colombia: CNG and M-19. The National Guerrilla Coordinator is an umbrella group of narco-terrorist organizations, including the National Liberation Army (ELN) and the Communist Party’s Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC), which have assassinated, kidnapped, blackmailed, and bombed their way through several decades of terror. Over the past decade, they have established themselves as the armed muscle of the country’s various drug cartels and today are themselves considered a cartel in their own right. The narco-terrorist M-19 in November 1985 slaughtered half of Colombia’s Supreme Court justices and burned down the country’s Justice Palace at the bidding of the country’s drug cartels. Through “peace negotiations,” the M-19 was transformed into a legal political party, granted cabinet posts in the last government, and played a leading role in drafting the pro-drug 1989 Constitution.

9. Peru: MRTA. The Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement, kissing cousins of the bloody Shining Path narco-terrorists, first surfaced in 1984. Throughout the 1980s, the MRTA formally participated in the Andean-wide “Americas Battalion” of guerrilla movements. In 1993-94, the Peruvian Armed Forces succeeded in dismantling the bulk of the MRTA’s extensive kidnapping apparatus, which had targeted hundreds of Peruvian businessmen.

10. Bolivia: MBL. The Free Bolivia Movement has been a member of the São Paulo Forum’s coordinating committee since its founding. As a promoter of radical indigenism, the MBL seeks to reorganize Bolivian society and institutions on the basis of ethnic, rather than national, identities. Inter-American Dialogue member Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, the current President of Bolivia, brought the MBL into his government and handed it the Foreign Ministry.

11. Chile: PSCh. The Chilean Socialist Party is the successor to Allende’s Socialist Party of the 1970s, a Cuba-linked and explicitly pro-terrorist movement to the left of the Chilean Communist Party of the time. Today, the PSCh holds cabinet posts in the Frei government as a result of its participation in the Democratic Convergence electoral front.

12. Argentina: MTP. The All for the Fatherland Movement was created by professional terrorist Enrique Gorriarán Merlo out of the dregs of the old People’s Revolutionary Movement (ERP) of the 1970s. Gorriarán was fresh from working with the Sandinistas in setting up their intelligence directorate, modelled on the Cuban one, and had personally led a terrorist squad to assassinate Anastasio Somoza in Paraguay in September 1980. In January 1989, Gorriarán led his MTP terrorists in an assault against the La Tablada infantry regiment in Buenos Aires, in which 39 died.

13. Uruguay: Frente Amplio. The Broad Front is a coalition made up of “former” Tupamaros terrorists, Communist Party members, and other assorted leftists. It has garnered sufficient electoral strength in the recent period to win the mayoralty of the capital city, Montevideo, while still publicly supporting terrorist groups like Argentina’s MTP.

14. Brazil: PT. The Workers Party of Brazil was a co-founder of the São Paulo Forum, and has embraced every New Age agenda, from homosexuality and drug legalization to abortion on demand, and is virulently anti-military. Its leader, Luis Inacio “Lula” da Silva, is a member of the Inter-American Dialogue. The PT has built up an extensive political machine in the country, such as in the Liberation Theology’s “base communities” and the terrorist Landless Movement.
The EZLN's terrorism: an eyewitness account

by Hugo López Ochoa

The self-dubbed insurrectionary movement known as the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) is neither indigenous, nor popular, much less Mexican. It is one of the most criminal narco-terrorist movements in history, modeled on the criminal narco-terrorist movements in history, modeled on the rights by the Mexican Army. The truth is that the EZLN has systematically employed the most barbaric tortures and assassinations; has carried out more than 1,600 illegal land invasions; has terrorized and forced off their lands more than 36,000 Chiapans; and has caused more than $500 million in material damage. The EZLN openly advocates a return to the bloodiest practices of the Aztecs and Mayans and seeks to impose by force a literally bestial view of man.

This reporter was able to confirm this all first hand, in recent trips to the state of Chiapas, and in private conversations and interviews with some of the victims of these practices. In the following, we document our charges, and present the direct testimony and evidence that shows that the EZLN's leaders should be tried for crimes against humanity in accord with the Nuremberg code.

EIR talked with indigenous Indians, collective farmers, small property owners, priests, and businessmen, all of whom stand ready to give witness before any national or international court.

Demonic ideology

The criminal nature of the EZLN begins with its ritual ceremonies, which are a Wagnerian parody of pre-Columbian Aztec and Mayan cult rituals, characterized by the practice of mass human sacrifice.

On the eleventh anniversary of the EZLN, according to the Zapatista mouthpiece La Jornada, in October 1994, Rafael Sebastian Guillen Santiago, a.k.a. "Subcomandante Marcos," presided over a ceremony where a supposed Indian council handed him the seven symbols of leadership, the last of which was a cup of blood. La Jornada does not specify in its coverage whether the blood was human or animal, nor if "Marcos" drank it or not. Hundreds of EZLN militants lined up in the shape of a snail, and Marcos reviewed the ranks, lighting the torches of each in turn. The snail is the symbol of Tlacaetl, the Aztec priest who initiated the demonic practice of human sacrifice. The ceremony was, of course, held in the dead of night in the Lacandón jungle.

As a Chiapan producer reveals in his interview below, the first measures taken by the EZLN and its various front groups, such as the CEOIC, the Anciez, the OPEZ, etc. in the "autonomous" zones of the Chiapan highlands, were to shut down the schools and hospitals, and expel the teachers and doctors. These were also the first measures taken by Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge, and by the Shining Path of Peru and Rwandan Patriotic Front in Rwanda in the areas they controlled. Teachers and doctors, as agents of western culture, were declared "enemies of the people" under a radical communist regime. "The people" would be reeducated to serve as slaves, through the terror methods described below.

Demonic practices

On Feb. 20, 1995, Jorge Constantino Kanter, president of the Belisario Domínguez Regional Union of Rural Property Owners, denounced the murder of his relative Gustavo Mar Kanter by the EZLN, in Tumbala, Chiapas. Kanter maintained that when they went to collect Gustavo's body, they found that his lower extremities had been ripped from his trunk by two cars, and he had been allowed to bleed to death (La Jornada, Feb. 20, 1995).

Gustavo Mar Kanter was kidnapped on Feb. 6, one day after Jorge Constantino had issued a call before the national news media for the Army to intervene in Chiapas to stop the civil war. Mar Kanter's call had already sparked a national outcry; President Ernesto Zedillo announced the Army's deployment into Chiapas on Feb. 9.

The revival of the centuries-old practice of quartering in the killing of Gustavo Mar is but one variant in the EZLN's arsenal of tortures, Domingo Encino Jiménez, a collective farmer, told EIR during the hunger strike of 120 cattlemen and farmers from the Chiapan Highlands, which they carried out in Mexico City during October-November 1994 to protest the EZLN's vandalism.

December 1992: Morelia collective farm, near the town of Altamirano. The Zapatista organization later to become the EZLN is Anciez (Emilio Zapata National Peasant Association). Anciez harasses the PRI members of the farm to force them to either leave or join their terrorist ranks. During a drinking bout, Mariano Encino Jiménez (brother of Domingo and a PRI member) gets into a heated argument with Anciez member Francisco. The argument turns to blows and Mariano ends up killing Francisco with a machete. The next day, after rousing from his drunken stupor, Mariano hands himself in to the local authorities.

The Zapatistas organize a demonstration to demand that the authorities hand over Mariano to them, or they will storm...
The cathedral of San Cristóbal de las Casas, seat of Bishop Samuel Ruiz. Graffiti on the adjoining wall (r.) proclaim, “Long Live the EZLN, Democracy and Justice.”

the prison. The mayor, Amílcar Pinto Kanter, is a Zapatista and a member of the collective leadership of the EZLN. Pinto Kanter hands Mariano over, tied hand and foot, to the Anciez.

For the next three days, Mariano is tortured. His teeth are pulled out, one by one. They put out his eyes. They cut off his ears. They cut out his tongue. They cut off his testicles. On the third day of this, Mariano dies.

The Anciez members did not personally engage in the torture. Rather, they forced Indian members of the PRI, one by one, to commit these bestial acts with hammer and chisel. *EIR* interviewed one of these Indians, whose name we withhold, who was forced to commit these inhuman acts.

According to Domingo Encino, he has submitted a complaint to the Attorney General of the state of Chiapas against the following members of Anciez-EZLN for this horrible crime against his brother: Francisco Luna Santis, Miguel Pérez López, Leonardo López Santis, Jesúes Santis Vazquez, Marcelo López Gómez, Emilio Santis Pérez, Sebastián Santis Garca, Estanisla Luna Santis, and Mario Pérez Luna.

According to the cattlemen of the Highlands, there has been at least one other such case of torture, in 1993, when a dissident was set afire before he died of his tortures.

The method of forcing the friends of the victim to carry out the torture is for the purpose of humiliating them and destroying their identities, eradicating any sense of moral authority so that they can be more easily recruited to the EZLN ranks. This is the method used by Shining Path, according to the testimony of hundreds of survivors from the regions once dominated by Shining Path in Peru. This is not some sort of natural savagery on the part of Chiapan Indians. Rather, these are methods that were refined at London’s Tavistock Institute and copied from the methods of the Communist Chinese and Koreans, among others, who brainwashed U.S. prisoners of war.

Another cruel case was denounced by Army Division General Miguel Ángel Godínez Bravo, commander of the VII Military Region, in a letter to Bishop Samuel Ruiz on March 31, 1993, published in the magazine *Impacto* No. 2333 on Nov. 17, 1994.

General Godínez relates how, on March 20, 1993, officers Marco Antonio Romero Villalba and Porfirio Millán Pimentel “disappeared” in San Isidro El Ocotal. Their bodies were discovered a week later. The general told how they had been literally roasted to death. “They were burned for eight days, and then moved to another pit whose sides and bottom . . . were lined with cow chips, to conserve the heat I suppose, and they continued to burn them.”

Cattlemen from the region interviewed by *EIR* told how the officers had been mutilated by a chainsaw before being incinerated.

At the time, those believed responsible for this crime were protected by the Fray Bartolomé de las Casas Center for Human Rights, run by priests Pablo Romo Sedano and Gonzalo Iturbe Verduzco. Both are lieutenants of Bishop Samuel Ruiz. They mobilized their ranks to pressure the Attorney General’s office, and launched a human rights propaganda campaign both nationally and internationally to prevent the criminals from being tried.
In his letter to Bishop Ruiz, General Godínez refers to this "sad and disappointing spectacle," and writes: "I was there . . . when an investigator from the Attorney General's office confirmed this, and I personally saw and heard an individual named Erasmo González López cynically describe how they had been burned, even telling how they had placed them on the pyre; if this doesn't move you, I am awed by your hardness."

Members of the EZLN directorate, according to information published in the magazine Impacto and confirmed by EIR through the testimony of cattlemen who knew them, are Gumaro Trujillo Fritz, Javier Trujillo Fritz, and Hugo Trujillo Fritz, all secretaries of Samuel Ruiz's diocese.

**Robbery and recruitment by terror**

Like many others, "Jaime" (whose full name we withhold for security reasons) personally experienced the EZLN's "recruitment" methods: "In January [1994], you could still enter [the area controlled by the EZLN], but you arrived in the afternoon and they showed up at nightfall to tell you, 'Okay, either you join us or you get out of here.' And if you didn't, they gave you a beating, or tied you up, or killed you.

"Those who didn't join them had to flee, and had to be careful how they escaped, because if they left by road they would be seized.

"From that time onward, we could no longer enter our ranch. . . . We had fat pigs, lambs, calves, cattle. . . . When we returned, in February-March, they had taken everything. They left empty ranches behind. They carried off an average 350 cows. It was a small property. We each had some 50 hectares, others 60, others 40."

"We were all working men," relates Roberto Trujillo Trujillo. "We dedicated ourselves to the land, we had good coffee crops, but every time they began to organize . . . they stopped working, stopped cultivating the land, stopped clearing the coffee fields, they abandoned everything completely and only dedicated themselves to training, nothing more. . . . They had their animals, but they sold them and turned that money into buying weapons. And everything was gone.

"They seized everything, all the land, the houses. There, in the presence of the owner, they would ask you if you wanted to join them, and if not they would tell you to go to hell, because they owned everything now.

"So, what could one do? Nothing more than cross one's arms and withdraw. . . . When we left, we had nothing more than the shirts on our backs, the same with our families. We weren't even allowed to take a glass with us, imagine! But what could we do? We had to leave and they kept everything. . . . You can't just join them and go out and rob your neigh-

Zapatista "justice": This very elderly shopkeeper was assassinated by the EZLN for refusing to join them. His 12-year-old grandson (inset), who witnessed the crime, escaped in a hail of bullets. The photos were provided to EIR by Altamirano cattlemen.
bors. I think that is wrong."

"Pedro," a collective farmer and cattle raiser from the town of Ocosingo, told EIR how he managed to avoid recruitment to the EZLN:

"On Jan. 3, I was there on my ranch, when some 100 armed individuals showed up. I was rounding up the cattle. They tied me up, they tied up my son. They destroyed the doors of the houses. . . . Some 20 of them held our women at gunpoint. . . . They said they wanted to talk with my wife and I. Then I told them, 'Look, there's another ranch up the road where my brothers are. It's better if we go there and we all talk together.' We'll see, they said.

"When I arrived, everyone was already tied up. Then they began to tell us their rules. As we had little cattle, we had to give them 20%. They wanted our sons to begin to train, 'and those of you who are too old can bring food to the camps.'

"We gave them four cows. . . . The people who opposed them had already left. . . . Only pure Zapatistas remained. They told us, 'We aren't going to do anything to you, but you have to join with us.'

"They left. But after about five days they came back again, to find out what we had decided.

"We told them okay, but when they left we got a small airplane to get the little ones out of there. . . . We five brothers remained. . . . and then, at night, we escaped by river and arrived in Comitán.

"Afterwards, when we returned, people who had been my friends, were now Zapatistas. They sold all their cattle to buy weapons. They robbed everything from us. They left us with nothing."

Foreigners

There is a great deal of testimony from the people of the Chiapan Highlands confirming that the EZLN is largely made up of foreigners. Here we present two eyewitness accounts gathered by EIR from that area:

"Jaime," a farmer from the township of Ocosingo, told EIR how, when the narco-terrorists stopped him and stole his truck on Dec. 31, 1993 on the collective farm of Guadalupe Tepeyac, he realized that the majority "were not from the farm but were foreigners. . . . A few were from the farm. . . . but those who were armed with machine guns and other sophisticated weapons were foreigners. . . . They had many foreigners among them."

"Pancho," a collective farmer from Guadalupe Victoria, township of Altamirano, who participated in the early recruitment meetings to the EZLN organized by the "catechists" of Bishop Samuel Ruiz, added: "Later, people from El Salvador, from Guatemala, from elsewhere, began to arrive. They came to Guadalupe Victoria, we saw them.

"They held their meetings at the church. They held their meetings in the houses of Armando Jiménez Aguilar, of José Trinidad Cruz Vázquez, of Pedro Cruz Cruz, of Carmelino García Morales, who were the catechists, they totally ran the situation.

"Later . . . they sent the same kids from Guatemala to buy their uniforms, their red neckerchiefs.

"On the last day of December, at five in the afternoon, I saw some ten with their military uniforms at Pedro Cruz's house. They all left his house with weapons, with their bags of tortillas. . . . They went to the El Porvenir ranch . . . where they gathered to stage their takeover of the municipal seat of Altamirano, which was on Jan. 1.

"On Jan. 1 . . . more strangers arrived . . . some tall, some fair, some dark, they went directly to Armando Jiménez Aguilar's house because they had the communications center there. They were in touch with Guadalupe Victoria, San Francisco, Delicias Pachan, San Antonio La Esperanza, San Miguel Tzicip, Belisario Domínguez, El Triunfo, San Marcos, La Florida, Puebal, these were the collective farms that were involved in the conflict, which are all in Altamirano township."

Comandante Samuel and his catechists

"Pancho," the farmer from Guadalupe Victoria, in the township of Altamirano, told EIR how he learned that Samuel Ruiz was EZLN's commander:

"We know perfectly well how the problem came about . . . directly through organizations of priests, of Marists,
with the catechists, because they directly trained in a course at the Castalia de Comitan. . . . They were handled by Bishop Samuel Ruiz, because he went twice to Guadalupe Victoria where meetings were held to inform us that all the Indians were preparing to rise up in arms.

"That organization was in preparation for more than 20 years. We realized this . . . because when they began to organize we also went.

"First they taught us the Gospel, but later they weren't teaching us the Gospel so much as that now we were a political organization.

"Later still they began the training, from eight at night until two in the morning."

Father Luis Beltrán Mijangos, a Catholic priest from San Cristóbal de las Casas, was interviewed by EIR on Sept. 8, 1994. He explained how Bishop Ruiz created this network of narco-terrorist "catechists." He described how, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Ruiz shut down the seminary in San Cristóbal de las Casas, and pressured, expelled, or forced all the priests who opposed him to leave. Today, all the churches of San Cristóbal are controlled by followers of Samuel Ruiz.

The only priest opposing him whom Ruiz was unable to expel is Father Beltrán. Asked by EIR what Ruiz has to do with the EZLN, Father Beltrán responded:

"He is the commander! . . . And I say this because of all the actions he has carried out since 1967, when he began to ideologize all the catechists. I have written proof, since 1978, to demonstrate the kind of ideology he was spreading."

The radical priests around Samuel Ruiz today are:

- Hervé Camier Duplouy (French).
- Heriberto Cruz Vera, from Torreón, now in Tila.
- Jorge Barón Torres (Argentine).
- Ramón Castillo Aguilar, from Amatencano del Valle.
- Joel Padrón González (commander).
- Eugenio Alvarez Figueroa, from Comitán, now in San Cristóbal.
- Mauricio Olvera, from Las Margaritas.
- Rogelio Victoria, from Michoacán, now in Frutis.
- Eduardo I. García Ruiz (Salvadoran).
- Gonzalo Ituarte Verduzco
- Pablo Romo Sedano

On Jan. 1, 1994, according to the interview with EIR, Beltrán was nearly assassinated by EZLN thugs who, after seizing and burning down the mayor's offices, deployed a death squad to the cathedral at the hour in which Father Beltrán was supposed to be there. However, acting on a hunch, he did not go to the cathedral that day, despite repeated telephone calls insisting that he attend. The priest who went in his place was about to be killed when one of the Zapatista assassins shouted, "It's not him, it's not him."

Interview: Jorge Constantino Kanter

Government must act against Zapatistas

The president of the Belisario Domínguez Regional Union of Rural Property Owners of Altamirano, Chiapas, Kanter headed the growers' hunger strike in Mexico City. His property is 55 hectares in the township of Altamirano, part of a joint property of 165 hectares held among three brothers, of which 15 hectares are for coffee, and the rest is pasture for cattle. Because of the armed conflict, he told EIR, they

The economic toll

The state of Chiapas has a total population of 3.5 million, of whom 28% are of Indian origin and 8% speak no Spanish. Of the state's economically active population, 58.3% is employed in agriculture, and the main productive activities generating jobs and income are in coffee, corn, beef cattle, bananas, and beans.

The state is one of the country's principal sources of energy, both in terms of oil and in hydraulic and hydroelectric resources.

Before Feb. 9, when President Ernesto Zedillo deployed the Armed Forces into Chiapas to dislodge the EZLN from the "free zone" granted them by the Carlos Salinas de Gortari government, Chiapas had suffered severe economic disruption because of the war declared by the Zapatistas on Jan. 1, 1994. Until the monetary crisis of 1994, losses incurred because of the Zapatista insurgency in Chiapas equaled more than $500 million, equivalent to the state's entire gross product in 1988.

According to local journalistic sources, and according to information gathered firsthand, the statistics were the following:

Until Feb. 9, 1995, some 36,000 families were displaced from their homes as a result of the EZLN's "liberated territories," and more than 1,600 land invasions outside those territories.

More than 120,000 hectares of land have been invaded by Zapatistas and their sympathizers. The last 50,000

**EIR:** Before January 1994, were there threats of invasion and warnings that the Zapatistas were coming, or did it all take you by surprise?

**Kanter:** With the anniversary of the 500 years of the Conquest [Oct. 12, 1992], they said they were coming. The rumors were very ugly, very strong. We prepared to defend ourselves and they never came.

But this time they caught us unawares. We had to leave because of the conflict. I went to Altamirano at the end of January. We stayed there until March. But my brothers had a problem because the Zapatistas held them at gunpoint some 10 kilometers from Altamirano and threatened them if they didn’t return. They confused one of my brothers with me, saying that he was the leader of the ranchers, that we had to get out of there because the land was theirs and because they had orders to shoot us.

After that, some eight days later, they threatened us again with another friend who was beaten; they sent us a handful of bullets and a message saying the bullets were for Jorge Constantino Kanter. As president of the Belisario Domínguez Regional Union of Rural Property Owners, I opted not to leave. There are no guarantees of protection on the highway between Altamirano and San Cristóbal. It has already been more than six months since I travelled.

**EIR:** We have gathered many accounts of people who did not join and were expelled by the Zapatistas. Do you have any idea of how many people were kicked out?

**Kanter:** I continue to insist that the Zapatistas are a minority, an armed minority. The majority of the people are not with them.

One proof of this is the fact that the PRI [the ruling party] won [in the 1994 national and state elections]. Of the 19 townships of the Highlands, the strongest townships in terms of bullets and a message saying the bullets were for Jorge Constantino Kanter. As president of the Belisario Domínguez Regional Union of Rural Property Owners, I opted not to leave. There are no guarantees of protection on the highway between Altamirano and San Cristóbal. It has already been more than six months since I travelled.

**EIR:** We have gathered many accounts of people who did not join and were expelled by the Zapatistas. Do you have any idea of how many people were kicked out?

**Kanter:** I continue to insist that the Zapatistas are a minority, an armed minority. The majority of the people are not with them.

One proof of this is the fact that the PRI [the ruling party] won [in the 1994 national and state elections]. Of the 19 townships of the Highlands, the strongest townships in terms

were invaded in just the past three months. The masked Zapatistas occupied a total of 78,380 hectares in the “Free zone,” and the non-masked Zapatistas (outside the conflict area) occupy another 50,440 hectares.

Those mainly affected are cattle ranchers, collective farmers, and private growers.

Losses in cattle were $242.4 million through Dec. 20, 1994. By March 1995, it is estimated that accumulated losses will be more than $706 million. In non-monetary terms, the state has lost 25% of its herds, out of a total of 3.2 million head of cattle as of Jan. 1, 1994. The losses have occurred in many forms, ranging from total abandonment of the herds, forced slaughter and premature sales, to theft and smuggling to Guatemala—all derivatives of the Zapatistas’ activities.

The government offered to pay an “invasion rent” to affected cattlemen, to be paid until “their ranches are returned.” However, this pay has only been partially disbursed, and that unevenly. The state still owes some $5.3 million in compensatory “rent” due through Dec. 20.

The state of Chiapas is the nation’s leading coffee producer. Losses in this sector already reach $25 million, and are expected to reach $350 million if a deal isn’t struck with the so-called State Council of Indigenous and Peasant Organizations (CEOIC), one of the EZLN’s irregular warfare front groups. CEOIC is asking 150,000 hectares of land from the government, while the government has promised to distribute only 80,000. A large percentage of the land that CEOIC is seeking is already cultivated with coffee, while the government has promised land in other areas where coffee is not produced. If a deal isn’t struck, the CEOIC’s occupation of the cultivated lands will lead to losses of 300,000 quintals of coffee, worth some $70 million.

Coffee cultivation employs a large proportion of Indian labor, and 80% of the income generated remains in Chiapas itself. To get a better idea of this, 93% of the land under coffee cultivation is in the hands of owners who have no more than 14 hectares apiece, and this represents 32% of total coffee production.

It is estimated that coffee production in Chiapas yields some $500 million a year, obtained through cultivation of about 231,000 hectares. Another 700,000 hectares was dedicated to corn. However, since the best lands have been invaded and occupied, to the tune of some 120,000 hectares, corn production is expected to fall some 40%.

In commerce, 2,500 businesses have been shut down as the result of the Zapatista insurgency, leading to unemployment for some 5,000 families. Sales have fallen 50% across the board, causing another 7 million new pesos’ worth of losses.

In Tuxtla, the collapse of sales of furniture and household goods is infamous. For example, one furniture store in the center of the city sold only one set of furniture in 1994. One owner of a store for kitchen appliances, who usually averages 30 such sales a year, last year sold only 7.

The hotel business has suffered nearly $6.2 million in losses, and only 40% of capacity is in use. In San Cristóbal de las Casas, reservations do not even reach 5% of capacity. There are an estimated $440,000 worth of losses in the transport sector.
of votes are Ocosingo and Margaritas. And those gentlemen lost there. And they are still a minority. The problem is that they are armed. The majority of the people are kept in line by them.

**EIR**: And what is the situation now that they have declared autonomy?

**Kanter**: The people want nothing to do with that. The majority don’t agree. The proof is that there is a vast exodus of families. What must be understood is that it isn’t the mixed-race population that is leaving; they left in early January. The ones who are leaving now are the Indians, pure Indians—Tzeltales, Tzotziles, Tojolabales, Choles—for whom the government bought land in the area. They aren’t even from the area. Eighty percent of those displaced by the conflict—and that number is growing by the day—are Indians. That is a key question.

Now, according to reports from friends in Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Simojovel has been under siege by peasants from CIOAC and other [Zapatista] organizations for five days. They aren’t letting anyone in or out. They’ve cut off water, electricity. They are already going in to loot stores and homes. It is a very difficult, a very serious situation. There is no access; all the communication lines are down, there is no access for anyone and the government is doing nothing.

We don’t know what’s going to happen with this. In the autonomous zones they claim to be forming, they are already closing all the schools, they’re driving out all the teachers, all the doctors. They are running the situation at their will.

**EIR**: Mustn’t it be assumed that all of this has a limit, that the people will begin to leave en masse and that the government will be forced to intervene to prevent the chain reaction caused by this declaration of autonomy?

**Kanter**: The problem is that the government has to do something. And it hasn’t done anything. We are fast reaching the limit. Why? Because if it doesn’t act the way it must, where are you going to put all these displaced people? Where are they going to live? How are they going to live? There are already demonstrations in Altamirano, Margaritas, from 5-10,000 Indians on the march, demanding that their lands be returned, saying that the EZLN movement is a farce, a lie. At first they believed they would improve their lot, but then they realized they were fooled and defrauded by the movement, that it seeks nothing more than political power, both statewide and nationally.

This is why the government must do something, because if it doesn’t, this is all going to overflow.

It is also increasingly obvious that this is more difficult to resolve by means of dialogue and agreement, because these gentlemen are a sham, they change the rules. I have said it again and again: They act according to the circumstances, accommodating their movements in accordance with the political conditions in which they find themselves.

---

**Profiles in Fascism**

---

**Samuel Ruiz, the red bishop of Chiapas**

The bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas (Chiapas, Mexico) is the key to the British operation run through the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN). Known in Mexico as the real Zapatista “comandante,” Ruiz has used his investiture as a priest to cover for the training and creation of the EZLN’s political leaders and militants—his famous “catechists”—and to protect that apparatus after it launched an armed insurrection.

Immediately following the EZLN’s first attack on Jan. 1, 1994, Samuel Ruiz named himself “mediator” to demand “dialogue” with the terrorists and prevent the Mexican Army from crushing the EZLN and reestablishing the rule of law in Chiapas.

Ruiz has also been the leading figure working through so-called civil society on the EZLN’s behalf.

He gave his blessing to the pro-terrorist National Democratic Convention and then created the National Mediation Commission (CONAI) over which he presides and which has adopted all of the EZLN’s demands.

In all of these activities, Ruiz has gone directly against the Vatican, and in particular, Pope John Paul II, who has asked for his resignation on two occasions.

**Who is Samuel Ruiz?**

Born in 1924 in Irapuato, Guanajuato, Mexico, Samuel Ruiz was ordained as a priest in 1949 in Rome, where he received his degree in Dogmatic Theology and in Holy Scripture. Upon returning to Mexico in 1952, he was named rector of the León Seminary in Guanajuato, and at the end of 1959 was named bishop by Pope John XXIII. In January 1960 he became the bishop of Chiapas. (In 1965, the dioceses of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Tuxtla Gutiérrez—both in Chiapas—were created, followed by the diocese of Tapachula.)

Ruiz participated in all the sessions of Vatican II (1962-68) where, he reported, he came into contact with “progressive” bishops such as Helder Câmara of Brazil, one of the promoters of existentialist Theology of Liberation in Ibero-America. Ruiz was quickly won over. After the first conciliar session, Ruiz met with the bishops of Pampapala (Veracruz), Alfonso Sánchez Tinoco, and of Zacatecas, Adalberto Almeida, to set up the Bishops’ Mutual Aid Union (UMAE), which eventually included 25 bishops but was dissolved in 1971 as a result of pressure by the Bishops Conference. The
UMAE is best known for carrying out sociological studies in dioceses.

In 1968, Ruiz was named president of the Department of Indian Missions of CELAM (Latin American Bishops Conference), which gave him tremendous mobility and the chance to establish ties with liberation theologians around the continent, notably with Peruvian Gustavo Gutiérrez, known as the founder of Theology of Liberation. Ruiz also presided over the National Indian Commission of the Mexican Bishops Conference.

As Ruiz himself has admitted more than once, it was the anthropologist Gerardo Reichel-Dolmatoff who brought about his great transformation. His meeting with Reichel-Dolmatoff occurred in Melgar, Colombia, in 1968 at a conference organized by CELAM’s Missions Department, at which Dolmatoff argued that it was a grave mistake to have introduced western culture with the evangelization of the New World. (Reichel-Dolmatoff, who died in 1994, was an Austrian anthropologist who had lived in Colombia since the 1940s. A disciple of the indigenist French anthropologist Paul Rivet, his work earned him Britain’s “Thomas Henry Huxley” award in anthropology.)

In statements made to Carlos Fazio, the ex-Tupamaro (Uruguay) terrorist now resident in Mexico, reproduced in his book Samuel Ruiz. El Caminante (1994), Ruiz reiterated that Reichel-Dolmatoff “showed me that the evangelization, as it was carried out on the continent, was very simply the destruction of cultures and an attempt at domination. The anguish which that argument aroused in me, was enormous. . . . It left me upset, confused. . . . The next day, Gustavo Gutiérrez summarized very simply the Ad Gentes document, and the [Vatican] Council’s missionary position. And there I found the answers to my questions.”

Between 1962 and 1968, with the aid of a French canon, Boulard, Ruiz created his catechists movement in Chiapas, which today totals 8,600 people. In his book, Carlos Fazio reports that at the time, after the Melgar meeting, Ruiz and his people “dedicated themselves to training Indian cadre, since priests were in short supply. . . . He created the ‘Exodus’ catechism. . . .” But Fazio fails to report that Ruiz closed the diocese’s seminary and expelled those priests and other church personnel who disagreed with him, and replaced them with priests and liberation theologians from different countries.

After a time, Fazio continues, Ruiz “understood that his actions would have to be redirected to an evangelization which would help the Indian become aware of his oppression,” and mentions Franz Fanon, author of The Wretched of the Earth. “That was when he went into the jungle and found his liberating ‘Moses.’ And he began a dialogue with them . . . and out of this came ‘Exodus.’

Operation “Exodus” would later become the EZLN. Ruiz admitted on Jan. 13, 1994 before a Mexican congressional commission, “I would have been the world’s most unhappy bishop if, after 30 years of work, the lay people hadn’t become more conscious and opted for political participation.”

Ruiz told Fazio that after the Melgar meeting, he was invited to speak at CELAM’s II General Assembly (1968), and in preparation for that, upon returning to Mexico, “he began to frequent a very large library in Cuernavaca, at the center for linguistic and theological training run by the famous Msgr. Ivan Illich,” protected by then Bishop of Cuernavaca Sergio Méndez Arceo. Among other things, Illich is a radical ecologist and Maoist who in the 1960s turned his CIDOC in Cuernavaca, in the state of Morelos, into a meeting center for the left in general and specifically for liberation theologians.

Illich’s protector Méndez Arceo was known as the “red bishop”: He was a personal friend of Cuba’s Fidel Castro, a promoter and frequent visitor of the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, and founding member and activist of the network of Ibero-America’s Liberation Theology bishops. Méndez Arceo was also the protector of the Belgian Benedictine Gregorio Lemercier, who maintained that psychoanalysis could best determine if a person were a good candidate for the priesthood or other religious functions, and set up a convent in Cuernavaca where he practiced his insane theories.

In the 1970s, Ruiz presided over the CELAM Missions Department, where he promoted Theology of Liberation.

In October 1974, Ruiz organized the First Indigenous Congress in San Cristóbal de las Casas with representatives of over 1,000 of Mexico’s Indian communities. The next year, several indigenous organizations were set up in Chiapas, some of which later emerged as backers of the EZLN. During the 1980s, Ruiz was the Mexican coordinator of the national campaign to raise funds for the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, whose slogan was “Against Dollars for War, Contributions for Peace.”

He also worked with Guatemalan refugees in Chiapas, and in January 1993, “with the believers of the diocese, we witnessed the collective, organized return of some 2,500 Guatemalan brothers,” Ruiz said in his Pastoral Letter: In this Hour of Grace, dated August 1993, which was delivered to the pope during his second visit to Mexico. But that return of refugees was the cover for a significant penetration of Guatemalan guerrillas from the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG), tightly controlled by the United Nations, and in which terrorist Rigoberta Menchú, a Nobel Peace Prize laureate and one of the first to express solidarity with the EZLN, took part.

Theology of Liberation

Samuel Ruiz was one of the first Ibero-American bishops to embrace existentialist Theology of Liberation at the end of the 1970s, and in February 1995 he explained this to the Italian daily L’Unità and Panorama magazine, arguing that at issue in Chiapas is the post-conciliar position of the Church on the American continent. This is precisely what Theology
of Liberation maintains.

Ruiz was one of 15 bishops who in 1972 participated, along with two archbishops, in the conference of Liberation Theology bishops in Riobamba, Ecuador, organized by Riobamba Bishop Leonidas Proaño. Mexico’s “red bishop” of Cuernavaca, Sergio Méndez Arceo, was also present. However, the conference was broken up by Ecuadoran authorities and its participants were expelled from the country.

Since the EZLN’s Jan. 1, 1994 insurrection and Ruiz’s assuming the role of mediator, he has received constant support from prominent liberation theologists, among them the Brazilian Bishop Pedro Casaldáliga (who recently stated that “Chiapas is the ecclesiastical miracle that has raised up Liberation Theology . . . Ruiz is today the ecclesiastical figure with the greatest credibility in the indigenous world of this continent”), Nicaragua’s Cardenal brothers (Ernesto and Fernando), and Brazil’s Dominican Frei Betto, the biographer and intimate friend of Fidel Castro, and director of América Libre, house organ of the narco-terrorist São Paulo Forum coalition. His funding from the German charity Misereor (see article, p. 31) is a link to Theology of Liberation strongholds in western Europe.

Ruiz’s particular wrinkle on Liberation Theology is to deny the biblical Genesis in favor of Exodus. In his book Biblical Theology of Liberation (1974), Ruiz affirms that “no one would dare judge Exodus from the standpoint of Genesis: rather, the other way around. Thus we can affirm that before the exodus, the Israelites were not a people, they had no history, they weren’t worshippers of Yahweh. . . . Moses’s only concern was liberation.”

Why does Ruiz try to deny Genesis? Because Genesis establishes that “God created man in His own image,” and if he denies this, then it is easy to justify class struggle. If man is not created in the image and likeness of God, then human beings become mere objects, and the Indians of Chiapas are mere cannon fodder used for a political project.

The ‘autochthonous indigenous church’

Ruiz’s utopian project is to create an “autochthonous indigenous church.” In religious terms, this is heresy; politically, it implies territorial separatism.

On Jan. 11, 1994, just days after the EZLN’s armed uprising, Ruiz stated in a press conference that, due to the Zapatistas’ actions, the Mexican “pyramid” had been inverted: At that moment, from the government’s standpoint the vertex was the Commissioner for Peace and Reconciliation, Manuel Camacho Solís, and in the case of the church, “the vertex of that pyramid . . . not because I sought it, is myself. I am no longer the bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas but an interlocutor representing, and supported by, the entire Mexican church.”

Although Ruiz’s banner is that of indigenism, his callous view of the Indians was shown on Jan. 1, 1994, when the EZLN sent groups of Indians armed with wooden rifles to attack an Army post, sending them to certain death. Ruiz hasn’t even tried to apologize for this crime. In statements published Jan. 8, 1994 by the pro-EZLN newspaper La Jornada, Ruiz denied that the EZLN had tricked or manipulated Indians into becoming guerrillas, saying, “No one was forced, or fooled into joining.”

On several occasions, Ruiz has referred to his proposal for an “autochthonous indigenous church,” as during his lec-
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Luis Mena Arroyo, confirmed that some time ago Bishop Guadalajara, Jalisco, Cardinal Juan Sandoval Iniguez, has stated that the Vatican has asked for Ruiz’s resignation, on March 7, the bishop of Zacatecas, Javier Lozano Barragán, stated that “only Samuel Ruiz’s conscience can determine whether he resigns as bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas and as mediator, for the good of Mexico. The church’s responsibility is one of extreme unity not uniformity.”

Ruiz defies the Vatican

Pointing to “doctrinal deviations” and a pastoral practice which does not cohere with what the church understands as pastoral, the Vatican has twice requested Ruiz’s resignation, but he has refused to comply.

El Heraldo de Mexico reported Feb. 23 that Ruiz hysterically insisted to Italy’s L’Unità and Panorama that Pope John Paul II has never asked for his resignation. “I have a pontifical mandate; if they take that away, I shall obey, but if they take it away based on false statements, even in obeying I will make the truth known. I swear obedience in Christ to the Roman Pontiff, not to Caesar.”

Ruiz lies when he says that there has never been a request for his resignation. On several occasions, the archbishop of Guadalajara, Jalisco, Cardinal Juan Sandoval Iniguez, has stated that the Vatican has asked for Ruiz’s resignation. On Feb. 7, 1995, Cardinal Sandoval told the media that the Holy See had asked for Samuel Ruiz’s resignation for a second time, but that Ruiz hasn’t complied, and that a final decision on his status is imminent, since no one agrees with the work he is doing.

On that same day, the auxiliary bishop of Mexico City, Luis Mena Arroyo, confirmed that some time ago Bishop Ruiz was told that he could make an honorable exit by resigning from the diocese of San Cristóbal de las Casas. And the bishop emeritus of Papantla, Genaro Alamilla, said that “Don Samuel should decide whether he’s going to resign as bishop, or from the CONAI [mediation group] and everything, and all that that implies in terms of [his] sociopolitical leadership. . . . He can’t have it both ways.”

Then again on Feb. 10, Cardinal Sandoval reiterated that “if Samuel Ruiz wants to be a politician, he should respond to the Vatican’s request for his resignation made last October.”

And on March 7, the bishop of Zacatecas, Javier Lozano Barragán, stated that “only Samuel Ruiz’s conscience can determine whether he resigns as bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas and as mediator, for the good of Mexico. The church’s responsibility is one of extreme unity not uniformity.”

Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, terrorists’ frontman

Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas is the son of one of Mexico’s most renowned Presidents, Gen. Lázaro Cárdenas (1934-40), and the leader and ex-presidential candidate of Mexico’s Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD), an agglomeration of leftist and pro-terrorist movements which has become the de facto electoral arm of the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN).

Cárdenas has long attempted to parlay his famous father’s name to political advantage. He came close to snagging the presidency in 1988, but it was not until the Zapatistas came on the scene in January 1994 that he emerged as their frontman, Mexico’s leading “terrorist with a democratic face.” Hoping to ride the EZLN insurgency into the presidential palace, Cárdenas endorsed the myth of a “Mayan rebellion” and capitalized on Mexicans’ fear of violence. On Jan. 6, 1994, he warned that Mexico’s August 1994 presidential elections “may be the last opportunity to save peace, ensure the country’s stability, and prevent the government’s oppression from unleashing terrible explosions.” Cárdenas added that his PRD party would “not permit fraud, because the cost will be blood flowing across our country.” For Cárdenas, the only proof of a “clean” election would be the defeat of the ruling PRI party.

Trounced at the polls (a mere 17%, against Ernesto Zedillo’s more than 50%), Cárdenas moved to convert the PRD into the nationwide complement to the Zapatistas. The policies that Cárdenas hoped to bring to the Mexican presidency are also the policies of the São Paulo Forum, the Castroite narco-terrorist international which Cárdenas helped to found in 1990 (see p. 40). Those policies include:

- support for the international financial oligarchy’s debt-collection and free-market privatization schemes, including
the North American Free Trade Agreement;

- support for the economic and political “globalism” of a United Nations one world order, which Cárdenas has described as “inevitable”;
- support for legalized drugs, for abortion as a means of birth control, and for “sexual diversity”;
- a commitment to destroying the Armed Forces of Mexico and the rest of Ibero-America.

After his August 1994 electoral defeat, Cárdenas began calling, along with the EZLN’s “Marcos,” for a “crusade of civil resistance.” He demanded that the elections be annulled and an interim President be named in Zedillo’s place. While Cárdenas threatened new Zapatista outbreaks in other parts of Mexico, his forces began to push a secessionist agenda.

Cárdenas and the PRD’s defeated gubernatorial candidate in Chiapas, Amado Avendaño, went on simultaneous tours of Europe in October-November 1994 to organize financial and political support for their war plans. They jointly visited the Basque region of Spain, home of the ETA terrorists. Sources in both Spain and Mexico insist that the ETA—with a reported 150 cadres living in Mexico—is a key conduit of funds and weapons for the EZLN. Avendaño later reported that he received documents from contacts in Spain outlining a separatist scenario, which he vowed to pass on to various PRD “peasant” organizations which have allied with the Zapatistas in Chiapas.

Cárdenas and his PRD also provided the impetus to the National Democratic Convention, which gathered gay rights activists, liberation theologians, and openly pro-terrorist forces from Mexico and abroad into a high-profile support network for the Zapatistas. Cárdenas met several times with the masked “Subcommander Marcos,” who formally named him “the EZLN’s valid political interlocutor.”

This January, one year after the EZLN’s official emergence and in response to Army deployments against them in Chiapas, Cárdenas and “Marcos” formalized their alliance, launching their “National Liberation Movement.” The 100,000-person pro-Zapatista rally was organized in the main square of Mexico City Feb. 11. There, Cárdenas railed against the government’s “repression” against the “second force in the country.” The crowd yelled in response, “We are all Marcos!”

Many have asked where the money is coming from to fund the Zapatista/Cárdenas “National Liberation Movement.” Part of the answer may lie with Cárdenas’s past. In 1994, a former operative in Oliver North’s clandestine Iran-Contra networks, Terry Reed, alleged in his book, Compromised, that Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas was on the CIA payroll to facilitate a several-year project of illegal smuggling operations inside Mexico. Reed says CIA agent “Max Gómez” told him: “Let me present you to Mr. Cárdenas. . . . His father was President of Mexico. But don’t forget, we have him in our pocket. Personally, I am paying him a lot of Agency money to make this project work.”

North’s weapons- and drug-smuggling operations, or “Project Democracy,” were run in part through the U.S. government-funded National Endowment for Democracy (NED). The NED channeled hundreds of thousands of dollars into Mexican “civic groups” like the Citizens Movement for Democracy, the Union of Civil Groups for Democracy, the National Accord for Democracy—all of which supported Cárdenas’s presidential candidacy. Today, Project Democracy’s cutouts in Mexico form part of the so-called “civil society” convoked by Chiapas Red Bishop Samuel Ruiz to back the Zapatistas.

Manuel Camacho Solís, United Nations agent

Manuel Camacho Solís has been the leading promoter inside the Mexican political system of every major EZLN demand, especially using his post as official peace negotiator with the Zapatistas during the first half of 1994 to achieve these goals. Camacho achieved national fame when in November 1993 he violently opposed the presidential candidacy of Luis Donaldo Colosio for the ruling Revolutionary Institutional Party (PRI), of which he was also a prospective candidate. Camacho was convinced that his friend Carlos Salinas de Gortari would choose him as the next President of Mexico. This did not occur.

For years, Salinas had sponsored Camacho’s meteoric political rise. During his stint at the College of Mexico and his doctoral studies at Princeton University in the United States in the early 1970s, Camacho created, along with Carlos Salinas and José Francisco Ruiz Massieu, the Revolutionary Policy and Practice group. After what Camacho calls his “entrance into politics in 1979,” Salinas had brought Camacho from undersecretary of Planning and Budget, to secretary of Urban Development and Ecology, to secretary general of the PRI and regent of Mexico City.

The Zapatista uprising of January 1994 was seen by various commentators as Camacho’s revenge against Salinas. Within 10 days, Salinas had designated Camacho as commissioner for peace and reconciliation in Chiapas. Camacho flouted his attempts to use the post to substitute himself for Colosio and thus arrive at the presidency.

On March 23, 1994, when Luis Donaldo Colosio was assassinated in Tijuana, Baja California, many suspected Camacho’s hand in the murder. According to journalist Leopoldo Mendivil, even Colosio’s widow, Diana Laura, pointed the finger at Camacho when she observed that if her husband had been as tough with Camacho as President Zedillo was, “surely he wouldn’t be dead, but my husband
treated Manuel nicely.” According to the Spanish daily *El País*, Mrs. Colosio said, “Members of the PRI and the people of Mexico never heard Camacho congratulate my husband” for his nomination to the presidency.

Who is this man who has tried so hard to reach power on the shoulders of the EZLN? Where does his political clout come from which, according to many, has checkmated the national political system and his own party—from which he has yet to be expelled?

Camacho Solís studied under a group of professors at the economics faculty of the Autonomous National University of Mexico (UNAM), with whom he collaborated in creating the “student movement” of 1968 and, later, a myriad of terrorist groups that fed into the EZLN. In 1969, the 23-year-old won first prize in an essay competition sponsored by the publishing house Editorial Siglo XXI, on the theme “How do youth view contemporary Mexico?” Camacho’s essay presented the philosophy that would guide his entire political career: that the national institutions which have been the basis of the Mexican political system must be annihilated, and replaced by supranational, one-worldist, and malthusian institutions. In a later work, Camacho explained that this is necessary to help put an end to the cycle of history launched by the Renaissance, and to return to hearing “other voices” that existed prior to “western values.”

To achieve this cultural warfare objective, Camacho stated that politically, “it is technically impossible to carry out a nationalist correction that would be effective on the economic level, without changing the basic structure of power. . . . [We must] be ready to modify that structure and face the consequences that that implies.” The targets of this threat were: the presidential system, the Armed Forces, and the unions.

Assisting Camacho in this initial work were Adolfo Orive de Alva and Vladimiro Brailowsky. Orive de Alva is the father of Adolfo Orive Benguier who, together with Hugo Andrés Araujo, created the Maoist movement *Línea de Masas* (also known as People’s Politics, or the Torreón Group). They have been identified as those who “sowed the seed of the Chiapas conflict,” when Bishop Samuel Ruiz García first brought them to San Cristóbal on Oct. 12, 1976 to give “courses” to his diocese (see article, p. 18).

Among Camacho’s mentors and political sponsors, identified in the prologues of his own writings, are:

- Jesús Reyes Heroles, who helped Camacho “describe the nature of the system.” Reyes Heroles, Mexico’s most important agent of British influence in the second half of this century, wrote *Mexican Liberalism*, a paean to the nineteenth-century Mexican “free-trade” advocates who tried to destroy the national economy, and to British radical empiricism.

- Pablo González Casanova, recognized by Camacho for “his decisive support.” Dean of UNAM during the Echeverria presidency (1970-76). Currently a member of the editorial board of *América Libre*, magazine of Fidel Castro’s São Paulo Forum, and a member of the National Democratic Convention of the EZLN.

- Victor L. Urquidi: Camacho’s “entire debt” is owed to him. A Spanish communist emigre who directed the College of Mexico for more than ten years (but who was an active member for more than four decades), with the task of rewriting Mexican history. The only “Mexican” founding member of the malthusian Club of Rome.

- John Womack, who “educated me.” Carlos Salinas de Gortari’s thesis tutor at Harvard University, he wrote one of the most famous studies of Emiliano Zapata, the Mexican revolutionary from whom the Zapatistas took their name.

**History of a British agent**

When he wrote his prize-winning essay, Camacho was a veteran of the 1968 student movement, which he later praised for having “called into question the survival of the Díaz Ordaz government and, up to a point, the Mexican Revolution itself.”

In the early 1970s, Camacho Solís used a grant from Enrique Ramírez y Ramírez, founding director of the daily *El Día* and Mexican Communist Party leader and Comintern fellow traveler, to tour Ibero-America and interview “political leaders and movements” such as the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) and the National Liberation Army (ELN) of the Jesuit priest Camilo Torres. He interviewed the Communist Party of Chile, the Tupamaros of Uruguay, the Montoneros of Argentina, the Puerto Rican National Liberation Armed Forces (FALN), and the Communist Party of Venezuela, among others. He ended his visit in Fidel Castro’s Havana.

Camacho Solís then went to Princeton University to study for his doctorate under Richard Falk, a member of the Trilateral Commission and New York Council on Foreign Relations known for his enthusiastic support for the Ayatollah Khomeini during the 1979 Iranian revolution. Falk believes that the sovereign state is an “oppressor of the community,” and that “the concept of community stands in opposition to the state as the center of military, bureaucratic, juridical and territorial power. . . . The concept of global community is international.” Camacho is a co-author with Falk of the essay “Nationalization and Illicit Enrichment.”

Yet in 1979, Camacho plunged full-scale into the politics of the Mexican system, as deputy director of Economic and Social Policy of Mexico’s Budget and Planning department (SPP). The director was Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and at the head was Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado. When De la Madrid became President of Mexico (1982-88), Camacho went from the SPP to become secretary of Urban Development and Ecology (SEDUE), and then secretary general of the PRI during Salinas’s 1988 presidential campaign.

Meanwhile, Manuel Camacho was climbing in the ranks of the United Nations. In 1980, he presided over the Tepoz-
tlán Center, among whose members were Maurice Strong (Canada), Saburo Okita (Japan), William Clark (Britain), Mustafa Tolba (Egypt), and 25 other top stooges of the one-worldist oligarchy. Here, Camacho wrote “The Formation of a National Culture: The Values of the Mexican Revolution,” in which he spoke for the first time of “global problems” and of a “heterogeneity of the planet” in a crisis “which roughly falls between 1968, the year of the youth revolutions in the West, and 1973, the year of the oil revolution in the Middle East.” According to Camacho, “the modern world can be seen as a clash of western values which are being replaced by a distant chorus of voices.” The chorus is “cultural values that history began to put aside in the sixteenth century and which today, at the end of the cycle begun in the Renaissance, newly demand a role in the definition of human activity.”

Camacho was clearly expressing the ecologist-Maoist outlook which has made him one of the pets of the British-centered oligarchy. At the center, he also developed some of the globalist contacts (such as Maurice Strong) who then promoted him as Mexico’s Secretary of Ecology, situating him to set up the “biosphere reserves” promoted by Prince Philip’s World Wide Fund for Nature—haven for the training camps of the EZLN, such as Montes Azules and Lagunas de Montebello in Chiapas.

Camacho was named mayor of Mexico City in December 1988 by President Salinas. As chief executive of the world’s largest city, Camacho coozi up to the international speculators’ jet-set, commissioning Juan Enriquez Cabot Lodge, chief of Metropolitan Services for the Department of the Federal District, to “attract foreign investment” into Mexico City real estate. Enriquez Cabot Lodge is the son of Marjorie Cabot Lodge, heiress of the Cabot Lodge family which founded the Bank of Boston, and of Antonio Enriquez Savignan, secretary of tourism under the De la Madrid presidency and designer of the world’s costliest real estate projects to “reurbanize” Mexico City. The partners attracted by Camacho’s rule in Mexico City included such fabulously bankrupt giant speculators as George Soros and Paul Reichmann, of Soros Realty and Reichmann International, according to London’s Financial Times, which quoted Enriquez Cabot Lodge that Soros’s “investments are a vote of confidence in Mexico and in its economic future.”

**Zapatista and one-worldist**

Enriquez Cabot Lodge continued to serve Camacho even after he left his post as mayor. In March 1994, when CBS’s “Sixty Minutes” program in the United States interviewed “Subcommander Marcos,” Juan Enriquez Cabot Lodge participated as “the public relations man for the peace commissioner [Camacho] . . . with the U.S. news media.”

Peace commissioner Camacho consistently defended the Zapatista cause. According to later revelations, Camacho proposed with regard to the EZLN’s ethnic separatism: “I am thinking of new municipalities where you would have the ability to govern, electoral redistricting so that the Indian communities would have state and federal representation.” He called this plan “a great step forward.”

Camacho had to resign as peace commissioner after PRI presidential candidate Ernesto Zedillo declared on June 12, 1994 that the negotiations in Chiapas had been “a failure” and denounced “political experiments that are a leap into the void.” But Camacho was not long in resurfacing, this time in Geneva, Switzerland as a member of the so-called Committee for Global Governance, a dependency of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the same body which in its “1994 Report on Human Security” described Mexico, along with 17 other nations, as “countries which are facing serious danger of disintegration” (see p. 25). In 1995, Camacho became an active member and a spokesman in Ibero-America for this committee, which produced a report entitled “Global Neighborhood,” the agenda for the U.N. conference on world poverty held in Copenhagen, Denmark over March 6-12.

In the Committee for Global Governance, Camacho shares the views of the presidents of that body: Sir Shridath Ramphal, former secretary of the British Commonwealth, and Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson. Another prominent member of the committee is Julius Nyerere, former President of Tanzania. Nyerere was a sponsor of all the black “national liberation movements” in that country, whose leaders found refuge in the Dar Es Salaam University of Tanzania, controlled by the Chinese communists.

Schoolmates at that university were the current dictator of Uganda, Yoweri Museveni (gendarme of British interests in Central Africa), and John Garang of the Sudan People’s Liberation Army, both involved in the assassination of the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi which produced last year’s genocidal war.

Other members of the committee are the ex-undersecretary general of the United Nations, Brian Urquhart; the former president of the World Bank, Barber Conable; Britain’s former Minister of Overseas Development Frank Judd; Zimbabwe Finance Minister Bernhard Chidzero; and Canadian Maurice Strong. Strong is one of the world’s foremost globalist bureaucrats, having been vice president until 1975 of the World Wildlife Fund, secretary of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment in 1972, the first director of the U.N. Environment Program through 1975, undersecretary general of the U.N. in 1985-87, and secretary of the U.N.’s Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992.

The “Global Neighborhood” that Camacho now promotes as an agent of the U.N. maintains that we have reached “the end of geography” and that “the concept of global security should be broadened . . . beyond the exclusive interest of the state.” It proposes that supranational institutions intervene in the internal affairs of nations, as in the case of Chiapas, to “eliminate the economic, social, environmental, po-
itical and military conditions that generate threats to the securities of people and the planet.” Further, according to Camacho and company, these institutions should intervene in advance of these problems, “anticipating and handling crises before they escalate into armed conflicts.”

On Feb. 17, 1995, Manuel Camacho Solís appeared in Belize, the “former” British colony on Mexico’s southern border, to officially present the report “Global Neighborhood,” where he attacked the Zedillo government for provoking “an escalation of the conflict in Chiapas” and warned that there would appear “many other conflicts throughout the country, starting with Mexico City.”

Marcos, terrorist from a test tube

The case of the EZLN’s most visible leader, Sebastián Guillén Vicente (a.k.a. “Subcommander Marcos”), varies little from that of Shining Path’s Abimael Guzmán, the living and dead leaders of Colombia’s narco-terrorist M-19, and the other terrorists with university degrees who since 1968 have suffered “the passion of impotence,” as former Mexican President José López Portillo described Marcos and company in a Feb. 20, 1995 interview published in the daily El Sol de México.

“Marcos” doesn’t speak the Indian dialects of Chiapas, but he does speak English and French to perfection. His “indigenist” image is the pure creation of the international press and television.

The Heideggerian existentialism of “Marcos” is known worldwide through his statements and communiqués, in which he constantly delights in the idea of death—his own and that of others (although more that of others, to judge from the dozens of indigenous people he deliberately sent to their death by convincing them to attack a military barracks armed with wooden rifles). Typical is a communiqué published last Feb. 13 by the Clandestine Revolutionary Committee of the EZLN, saying that “we the Indians have nothing to lose, and we are both conscious and ready to die if it is necessary. We do not fear death, because we have always been the living dead.”

But his Heideggerian existentialism is not just talk. It is rigorously academic.

Guillén studied philosophy at the Department of Philosophy and Literature at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), from which he graduated in October 1980. For his “brilliance,” he received a scholarship to study at the Sorbonne in Paris, from which other anthropologists and terrorist groups bearing ethnic indigenist identities have also emerged (see p. 27). The Mexican press has also indicated that “Marcos” gave design classes at the Metropolitan Autonomous University (UAM) in Mexico City, and studied anthropology at Mexico’s National School of Anthropology and History, a deployment center for indigenist currents of British origin.

The main authors upon whom he based his university thesis, entitled “Philosophy and Education. Discursive Practices and Ideological Practices: Subject and Historic Change in the Official Texts of Mexican Primary Education,” are Karl Marx, Louis Althusser, and Michel Foucault.

We already know what to expect of Marx, and Guillén’s other two sources are equally revealing. The Marxist structuralist Althusser is known for his mental instability and for having strangled his wife in 1980. In Ibero-America, Althusser is famous for his book Reading “Capital,” and for having been “the teacher” of Régis Debray and of Martha Harnecker, the latter the author of Dialectical Materialism, which has been used as a textbook in so many Ibero-American schools and which has destroyed so many minds.

Marcos’s other source is Michel Foucault, who was Althusser’s most famous disciple. Foucault was an open homosexual who made many attempts on his own life and who finally died of AIDS in 1984. An avid reader of Nietzsche and Heidegger, Foucault became a Marxist under Althusser’s influence and entered the French Communist Party, but the class struggle did not prevent him from proposing masturbation as a means of liberation. Foucault had a disciple who may very well also be among Marcos’s sources: Jacques Derrida, the leading exponent of the “deconstructionist” philosophy, whose theories make one think of the title of Marcos’s university thesis, and the way in which he mangles language.

As if this weren’t confirmation enough, Guillén’s thesis director was Cesáreo Morales, who in 1993 was accused of being linked to drug trafficking and to the terrorist “El Pelacuas” group which operated in the 1970s in Guadalajara.

For Marcos, everything is class struggle, and philosophy is to be used as a “weapon of the revolution.” His university thesis is impotent blather against “authoritarianism” associated with the father figure, and it is rather inexplicable how it came to be approved, much less how it won him a scholarship. In that thesis, Marcos attacks the family because “with one’s parents,” he says, the individual learns to “identify himself suberviently. . . . In the Basic Code of Culture which shapes this discourse of power, the Father is the first power image the individual recognizes, that is, he constitutes the first relationship of ideological subjection. The Father may be wrong, but he is still the Father.” And further, Marcos writes: “It is here, within the family, that the individual first sees himself as subject, according to the structures of power of the family apparatus.”
How LaRouche unearthed the truth about international terrorism

by Jeffrey Steinberg and Scott Thompson

In 1986, the German professor of natural law and military historian Friedrich August von der Heydte gave exclusive permission to the New Benjamin Franklin House, publisher of the writings of Lyndon LaRouche, to republish his 1972 work, *Modern Irregular Warfare*. When the book was published in English and German, it featured an introduction by LaRouche. The book was subsequently published in Spanish by *EIR* and then republished by the Peruvian Navy and the Brazilian Army.

It was telling that Lyndon LaRouche played a pivotal role in reviving and recirculating one of the great works on the subject of irregular warfare, at a critical juncture in the East-West conflict. Although largely known for his work as a political economist and as the head of an influential worldwide political-cultural association, LaRouche is also one of the world’s most accomplished specialists in irregular warfare and the subsidiary field of international terrorism.

No other institution comes close to LaRouche and *EIR*’s track record in analyzing modern irregular warfare. The LaRouche method is to approach the problem of terrorism from a top-down *global* standpoint that axiomatically rejects the absurd, but widespread fraud that international terrorism is a "sociological phenomenon."

What follows is a chronological account of the most important breakthroughs in the fight against international terrorism accomplished by LaRouche and *EIR*.

I. Bundy joins the Weatherunderground, spring 1968

In the spring of 1968, Lyndon LaRouche intervened into the middle of the student protests on the campus of Columbia University, in New York City. From spring 1966 through spring 1973, LaRouche taught a one-semester course presenting and criticizing Marx’s economics. By June 1968, in a study published under the title of “The New Left, Social Control, and Fascism,” he warned that the strong countercultural bent of the anti-war movement carried the seeds of a new, irrationalist fascist movement.

His personal intervention as a teacher into the campus ferment was aimed at combatting the counterculture and preempting the emergence of a left-wing shocktroop formation that echoed the early-1930s Nazi youth movement under the leadership of Gregor Strasser.

This effort drew LaRouche and his student collaborators into a head-on conflict with the man known as the unofficial dean of the Eastern Establishment,” McGeorge Bundy. As the Columbia University student protests evolved into a campus-wide strike, and eventually a city-wide protest, a power struggle developed between LaRouche’s supporters and a proto-terrorist group led by Mark Rudd, Bernadine Dohrn, John Jacobs, and other future founders of the Weatherunderground.

The political-philosophical fight was tilted by a substantial and shocking infusion of funds—a virtually bottomless checking account—that helped launch the Weatherunderground. LaRouche’s allies at Columbia learned that the funds had been passed into the Rudd organization, “Up Against the Wall, Motherf—kers,” from the East Side Service Organization, a New York City poverty program run by Tom Neumann, the nephew of New Left ideologue and Frankfurt School social engineer Herbert Marcuse. Neumann’s source of funds? The Ford Foundation, whose president was McGeorge Bundy.

Bundy had served from 1961 to 1966 as the national security adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He was the undisputed architect of the Vietnam War, who abruptly left the government to take charge of the $3 billion a year Ford Foundation. Under Bundy’s direction, Ford bankrolled the creation of the anti-war movement.

Confronted with the “check stub” proof of this apparent anomaly—Bundy’s bankrolling of the creation of the terrorist Weatherunderground at Columbia University—LaRouche quickly recognized that factions at the highest levels of the national security apparatus and the eastern liberal establishment were engineering the “New Left” project, including its hard-core terrorist wing.

LaRouche and his associates’ late-1960s discovery of Bundy’s orchestration of the New Left, and their subsequent battle against it during the 1969 New York City teachers strike, when the New Left legions were deployed as union-busters and race war agitators, undermined the project and forced the premature dismantling of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). It was a partial victory for LaRouche and his emerging association. It was a crucial discovery.
II. East-West skullduggery, winter 1973-74

During summer 1973, LaRouche’s political association established roots on European soil, in Britain and West Germany. This sparked great interest among intelligence services on both sides of the Cold War divide. Britain’s Secret Intelligence Service (SIS) branch MI-6 and the East German State Security Service (Stasi) launched simultaneous aggressive probes of the LaRouche organization. LaRouche associates in West Germany and England were targeted for drugging and other mischief.

These efforts reached a fever pitch at the end of 1973, when several European-based associates of LaRouche landed in New York City to attend an international conference, the victims of clandestine psychedelic drugging. In the scramble to debrief the victims and provide them with competent medical treatment, evidence surfaced of a plot on the life of LaRouche. The planned assault implicated the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA) and terrorist cells associated with a Puerto Rican group, MIRA, with known links to Cuba. Other fragments of information pointed to FBI collusion in the plot.

Attempting to sort out this convoluted puzzle involving intelligence services from East and West, terrorist cells, and sections of the U.S. national security apparatus, LaRouche issued a widely circulated series of press releases, accusing the Stasi, Britain’s MI-5, and the FBI of conducting a joint campaign against his association. At a public event in New York City in January 1974, LaRouche spelled out the evidence of East-West collusion in deploying and protecting terrorists. LaRouche and his associates had unearthed one of the best-kept secrets of the Cold War era.

Later, under the Freedom of Information Act, LaRouche received confirmation of his January 1974 discovery. A series of FBI cables revealed that the Bureau, using its agents inside the leadership of the CPUSA, had solicited the assassination of LaRouche in autumn 1973!

III. The ‘Tavistock Grin,’ spring 1974

If the concept of terrorism as a form of irregular warfare had not yet fully crystallized in the minds of LaRouche and associates, the point had been driven home that terrorism was an instrument of psychological warfare.

In spring 1974, a task force of investigators under the direction of LaRouche launched a study of British intelligence’s psychological warfare apparatus. Researchers in Newark, New Jersey, probing the role of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. in bankrolling violent black nationalist gangs, had stumbled upon the name of Dr. John Rawlings Rees. A quick probe of Rees led to the London Tavistock Institute.

The findings of the larger investigation that the Rees-Tavistock discovery triggered, were published in The Campaigner, a monthly journal of LaRouche’s philosophical association, in spring 1974, under the headline “The Tavistock Grin.” Tavistock had developed a rich arsenal of mass psychological warfare techniques, first during World War II, when the Tavistock Clinic staffed the British Army’s Psychiatric Division, and later, during Britain’s counterinsurgency campaigns against national liberation movements in its African and Southeast Asian colonies, and in Northern Ireland.

LaRouche investigators discovered a series of counterinsurgency primers by Tavistock’s Gen. Frank Kitson, “spilling the beans” on how British SIS created synthetic terrorist gangs through torture and behavior modification techniques, and then exploited violence by their controlled “countergangs” to impose martial rule.

Tavistock Director John Rawlings Rees, the founder of the United Nations’ World Federation of Mental Health, advocated the deployment of “mobile teams of psychiatric shock troops” into every community, to implement an ambitious social control blueprint. In summer 1967, Tavistock hosted its own indoctrination session for future leaders of the terrorist movement in the advanced sector, attended by Angela Davis and Stokely Carmichael, leaders of the violent wing of the “Black Liberation” movement.

IV. A shooting in the Bronx, autumn 1974

During the peak of the MI-6/Stasi chaos operations in early 1974, a LaRouche associate finishing his medical internship at the Albert Einstein Medical Center in the Bronx, New York, reported an amazing incident. While working at the Lincoln Hospital drug detoxification center in the South Bronx ghetto, the intern discovered that the “security staff” of the clinic included several fugitive members of the Black Liberation Army. The BLA had murdered several policemen in New York City and was considered one of the most dangerous of the terrorist gangs to have been spawned out of the student and Black Liberation movements of the late 1960s.

Counterintelligence investigators for New Solidarity International Press Service (NSIPS), the precursor to EIR News Service, launched a quiet, cautious probe of the BLA-Lincoln Detox story, well aware of the dangers involved in pursuing the story. Even New York police were under orders to stay out of the neighborhood.

The NSIPS team discovered that the Lincoln Detox Center was not only a safehouse for BLA killers. True to the Tavistock dictum of creating “psychiatric shocktroops” in every neighborhood, the detox center was staffed by medical doctors, psychiatrists, and social workers who were all veterans of the Weathermen and RYM II factions of the defunct SDS. One of the key players in the Lincoln Detox operation was Dr. Steven Levin, a member of the Revolutionary Union (RU), a violent Maoist group sponsored by Communist China’s intelligence services, but also supported by American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) socialist and U.S. State Department consultant William Hinton (Hinton served as a back-channel for Henry Kissinger’s secret diplomacy with Beijing).

Dr. Levin and other “barefoot doctors” (after Mao’s Cultural Revolution) at Lincoln took hardened drug addicts and...
street criminals and forced them to sit through all-day political indoctrination and behavior modification sessions, administering the synthetic form of heroin developed by Nazi scientists, methadone. The addicts and criminals were taught that they were "victims" of discrimination by "the ruling class" and transformed from petty thieves into cop-killers, through the techniques perfected by General Kitson and other Tavistock specialists in "gang-countergang warfare."

As the Lincoln Detox investigation progressed, it generated further probes. The Episcopal Archdiocese of New York, headquartered at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, was discovered to be a safehouse and indoctrination center for the Puerto Rican terrorist group FALN, which, like the BLA, carried out acts of terrorism in the mid-1970s. The cathedral was a gathering place of the upper crust Anglophile families in New York, and was a hotbed of New Age mysticism and freemasonry.

With the evidence of the Lincoln Detox terror laboratory in hand, NSIPS called a press conference outside the clinic to release the evidence. A gang of gun- and club-wielding thugs—clinic staff and patients—stormed the press conference. One LaRouche associate, Tom Ascher, was shot and wounded. An eyewitness described the assailants as glassy-eyed zombies, right off the set of the Hollywood 1950s horror film, "The Night of the Living Dead."

In the wake of the press conference and the assault, the New York Police Department’s Arson and Explosives Unit finally got the green light to shut down the clinic. Shortly thereafter, Dr. Steven Levin, the RU Maoist who ran the operation, was found dead in the clinic basement, the apparent victim of a drug overdose. FALN support networks were also rolled up in New York City by the NYPD, following the NSIPS expose.

V. Ponto, Schleyer, and LaRouche are targeted, spring-summer 1977

By 1975, LaRouche had further infuriated London and Wall Street financial circles by launching an initiative to replace the International Monetary Fund and World Bank with a new International Development Bank (IDB) to issue gold-backed, low-interest, long-term credits to modernize the Third World, following global debt cancellation and restructuring. When several Arab governments, led by Iraq, expressed interest in the LaRouche plan (along with senior Israeli diplomats), Henry Kissinger personally interceded to shut down the governments’ dialogue with LaRouche, flying to Paris to deliver an ultimatum. A year earlier, EIR researchers had published a profile of Kissinger labeling him a British agent and pinning the Watergate assault on the Nixon presidency on Kissinger and his British patrons.

On May 10, 1982, in a speech at London’s Chatham House, headquarters of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Kissinger admitted his British agentry and his treachery against the two U.S. Presidents he had served as national security adviser and secretary of state.

When some prominent western Europeans began pushing policies sympathetic to LaRouche’s IDB, a wave of assassinations occurred. In spring 1977, Jürgen Ponto, president of West Germany’s Dresdner Bank, was assassinated in his home by Red Army Faction terrorists. RAF member Susan Albrecht, a school friend of Ponto’s daughter, was part of the hit squad.

Right after the Ponto assassination, American and West German security officials alerted LaRouche that he was on the same RAF hit-list as Ponto and other leading German industrialists and bankers. LaRouche commissioned a comprehensive study of the support structure for international terrorism.

The study not only revived earlier LaRouche evaluations of the East-West secret service complicity and collusion in terrorism. It also highlighted the role played by an "invisible" command structure involving radical-liberal university professors, above-ground protest groups, radical environmentalists, lawyers, and tax-exempt charities—as well as organized crime rings—in providing support to the terrorist underground. Without the aid of ostensibly "law-abiding" circles, no terrorist cell could survive for very long, LaRouche concluded.

European colleagues of LaRouche, working from the profile of Tavistock operations, found that many members of the “second generation RAF” had been part of the Heidelberg Mental Patients’ Collective, a radical commune that recruited mentally ill youth and brainwashed them as terrorists.

The public expose of the broader terrorist command structure, combined with a tightened security screen around LaRouche, who was then residing in West Germany, kept LaRouche safe during those years of the “strategy of tension.” Others were not as fortunate. In late summer 1977, Hanns-Martin Schleyer, head of the German Industrialists Association, was assassinated by the RAF.

Even before the 1977 “summer of assassinations,” LaRouche’s credentials as a counter-terror specialist had been enhanced by his warnings of an imminent major terrorist incident. LaRouche had warned about a spectacular terrorist incident coinciding with the American bicentennial celebration.

LaRouche’s European colleagues had been tracking a fugitive RAF terrorist, Wilfred Böse, who had been released from a French prison under suspicious circumstances, and had then entered Germany without hindrance from Federal Republic security forces. Böse entered the area of the Frankfurt left-wing scene, where reported sightings of him ended. LaRouche’s published assessment of these developments was that Böse would turn up relatively soon as part of a major international terrorist operation.

Shortly afterwards, RAF terrorists hijacked an aircraft and landed it at the airport at Entebbe, Uganda. Israeli commandos stormed the aircraft, ending the hostage siege. Al-
though news accounts suggested that all the terrorists had been either killed or captured, it later was revealed that Böse had been present at Entebbe, yet he was listed among neither the captured nor the dead. LaRouche cited this case as further proof of the top-down nature of international terrorism and the shadowy role of certain intelligence services in carrying out terrorism as a kind of psychological warfare "living theater," directed as much against the populations of the advanced sector, who were inundated with propaganda about the imminent danger of "blind" terrorism, as against the immediate victims.

VI. Kissinger versus Moro, May 1978

Another prominent European figure who dared to buck Kissinger and the International Monetary Fund—and paid with his life—was former Italian Premier Aldo Moro. When Moro moved in the mid-1970s to forge an "historical compromise" unity government between his own Christian Democracy and the mass-based Italian Communist Party (PCI), to break the stranglehold of both London and Moscow over Italian politics, he was kidnapped and eventually killed by Italian Red Brigades terrorists.

This time, Italian security services sought out LaRouche to provide leads on the spectacular kidnapping-murder of one of Italy's most important postwar politicians. An EIR research team under LaRouche's guidance, prepared and eventually published a series of detailed counterintelligence memos drawing upon the profile developed over a decade of investigative work.

The memos identified a network of university-based radical sociologists—protected by a section of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI)—who had profiled and indoctrinated a generation of students. Some of those "students," including Renato Curcio and Francisco Piperno, had founded the Red Brigades. The EIR memos singled out University of Padua Prof. Tony Negri as a suspected mastermind of the Moro plot, and urged Italian police to avoid the pitfalls of normal "police methods" that would have investigators start with the leads discovered at the scene of the crime. Rather, LaRouche urged a more sophisticated political approach, targeting the support environment without which the kidnap-murder could never have occurred.

On April 7, 1979, nearly a year after Aldo Moro's kidnapping, Italian police arrested Negri and his entire circle of Red Brigade controllers. The police probe, based on the LaRouche method, produced hard evidence that Negri had masterminded the Moro murder.

Negri had been part of a transatlantic network of "radical criminologists" and "action anthropologists," with ties to Tavistock, who used their standing as academics and, in some instances, consultants to police agencies and interior ministries, to fine-tune the actions of the terror cells under their direction.

The EIR Moro probe went further, linking the kidnap-murder to a "strategy of tension" directed against Italy by the circles of Dr. Kissinger.

It would later emerge in public testimony by Moro's widow, son, and personal secretary at the Negri trial, that months before Moro's kidnapping, Kissinger had delivered a personal threat to the Italian Christian Democratic leader, warning him against the move to create the DC-PCI unity government.

VII. Assassination attempt against President Reagan, March 30, 1981

On Jan. 20, 1981, the day Ronald Reagan was inaugurated as President of the United States, EIR published a warning: that there would be an attempted assassination of the new President within the first 90 days of his term. The assessment was not based on detailed "clues" about a specific plot. Rather, it was based on the fact that Reagan was the first President since John F. Kennedy to have been elected without the endorsement of London and Wall Street.

The strategic assessment by LaRouche was buttressed by a series of security breaches that occurred shortly after the Reagan inauguration. The most serious was when the President traveled to Canada.

On March 30, 1981, Ronald Reagan was shot while leaving the Washington Hilton Hotel. The assailant, John W. Hinckley, Jr., had been under psychiatric care in Colorado just prior to the shooting.

As soon as Hinckley's name was made public, along with scant details of his recent history of psychiatric treatment, EIR investigators initiated an investigation. They tracked down the clinic and psychiatrists handling Hinckley, even before such data were released publicly by government agencies, by tracing leads found in Marilyn Ferguson's New Age propaganda tract The Aquarian Conspiracy.

While the establishment media in the United States were peddling the line that Hinckley was a "deranged lone assassin" obsessed with actress Jody Foster, EIR focused its investigation upon the "psychiatric shock-troop" networks that had been working for decades to perfect behavior modification techniques that could produce "Manchurian Candidate" assassins. The EIR investigation concluded that Hinckley's attempt on the President's life had come very close to succeeding. Not until the beginning of 1995 was the medical evidence released corroborating the LaRouche assessment.

However, Secret Service agents injured in the Hinckley attack eventually sued Hinckley's psychiatrists, charging that they were responsible for the shooting.

VIII. The Bulgarian Connection and the attempt to kill the pope, May 1981

Less than two months after the shooting of President Reagan, Pope John Paul II was shot and nearly killed by Mehmet Ali Agca. The trail of the would-be assassin turned up intelligence ties on both sides of the East-West divide.
Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in New York City, 1981. After his murder, EIR investigators found a trail that led to the circles behind the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

EIR once again cut through the efforts to cover up the crime by focusing on the East-West collusion, which, in this case, centered around the “Bulgarian Connection”—Soviet intelligence’s main point of contact with western drug- and arms-trafficking cartels. Agca, a professional assassin, was in Sofia, Bulgaria in the months before the assassination attempt.

Although EIR singled out the East-West collusion in the attempt to kill the Pope within weeks of the shooting, the papal assassination plot did not crack open until Nov. 23, 1982, when Italian police raided the Milan offices of the shipping company Stipam International Trading, headed up by Syrian national and longtime “French Connection” heroin smuggler Henri Arsan. Arsan worked with the Bulgarian export agency Kintex, running heroin and arms.

Evidence gathered during the raid on Stipam’s Milan headquarters tied the firm to the Turkish and Bulgarian networks that financed the attempt to kill the pope. The Stipam raid went largely unreported in the international press, but EIR recognized the significance of the discovery. While the “Bulgarian Connection” revelations were used by cold warriors among western intelligence services and political circles to pin a “made in Moscow” label on the papal assassination attempt, EIR insisted that the real authorship involved East-West oligarchical collusion—with the British Crown serving as the central convergence point.

A year before these details came to light, LaRouche had pointed toward the Anglican hierarchy as the authors of the plot to kill the pope, based on a strategic assessment of cui bono—“who benefits”—from such an assassination. In June 1981, LaRouche drew the parallel between the recent period of attempted assassinations and the early 1960s, when the British Crown’s assassination bureau killed President Kennedy and attempted repeatedly to assassinate France’s Charles de Gaulle. LaRouche labeled 1981 “The Year of the Jackal,” and warned of threats against Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and other world leaders.

IX. Britain’s Muslim Brotherhood kills President Sadat, Oct. 6, 1981

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat was assassinated by members of the Muslim Brotherhood, who had been infiltrated into the Egyptian Army. In a statement released the day after the assassination, LaRouche warned: “Every one of the world’s political leaders who is not a complete idiot heard the shots of Sarajevo echoing yesterday on the streets of Cairo. If Egypt and Sudan are destabilized to the effect the killers of President Sadat intend, a chain-reaction of escalating strategic instabilities will be unleashed which no existing major power’s government presently has the moral and intellectual resources to understand or control.” LaRouche again singled out the British Crown, which had created the Muslim Brotherhood as a tool in its “Great Game” in Central Asia, and more recently promulgated the so-called Bernard Lewis Plan to turn the Persian Gulf into an “arc of crisis.”

EIR investigators proceeded to establish that the Schlumberger-de Menil family of Houston, Texas, which was deeply implicated in the assassination of President Kennedy, was up to its neck in the Sadat assassination as well. EIR exposed the fact that Mme. Dominique de Menil, the heiress to the Swiss-French Schlumberger fortune, had been the hostess of a secret Muslim Brotherhood gathering at the Houston Rothko Chapel just weeks after the Sadat murder. Virtually her entire family—including her daughter and son-in-law—were prominent figures in the “action anthropology” networks fostering separatist-terrorist destabilizations all over Ibero-America.

X. Action anthropology, the Nazi International, and indigenous terrorism, 1982

Further investigation of the worldwide network of “action anthropologists” by EIR eventually led back to the Swiss-based Nazi International, an amalgam of wartime Nazis, communists, and credentialed anthropologists who were running a global terrorist apparatus under the guise of supporting “endangered peoples” and “indigenous movements.” The Mont Pelerin Society and the Pan-European Union, sponsored by the Hapsburg family, were identified as key components of this feudalist insurgency.
EIR investigators found that these separatist gangs were operating on every continent and functioned as an integrated global network targeting the sovereign nation-state for destruction. The Hamburg-based Society for Endangered Peoples and the Boston-based Cultural Survival U.S. A. coordinated the activities of hundreds of indigenous guerrilla gangs, often drawing in the environmentalist movement as support for the insurgencies.

Despite the well-documented Nazi ties of some of the leading figures in this "action anthropology" international, EIR investigators found that these insurgent gangs were often functioning under Soviet intelligence direction as well. LaRouche, in a 1982 EIR study, singled out Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund as the controller of this global indigenist destabilization.

XI. Anglo-Soviet assassination of Indira Gandhi, Oct. 31, 1984

When Sikh separatists assassinated India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, LaRouche again honed in on British and Soviet intelligence. For years, EIR researchers had been tracking British intelligence's creation and control over a worldwide syncretic cult of Sikh separatists, headquartered in London. In the months leading up to the Gandhi assassination (which LaRouche had begun warning about in 1981), British and Soviet press outlets had run a coordinated smear campaign against the prime minister. The same agencies joined after the assassination in blaming her murder on the Reagan administration.

To counter this, LaRouche commissioned a book-length exposé of the Gandhi murder, contributing a theoretical introduction identifying her murder as a "derivative assassination" run through networks tying London and Moscow to certain U.S.-based Zionist and British Fabian circles. The LaRouche exposé identified both the Heritage Foundation and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) as assets of the Anglo-Soviet "derivative assassination" cabal.

XII. The Olof Palme assassination, Feb. 28, 1986

The assassination of Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme, and its subsequent coverup, provided the most dramatic confirmation of LaRouche's crucial discovery about the East-West "derivative" nature of modern international terrorism.

Within hours of the Palme execution, a concert of Soviet propagandists, the ADL, and NBC-TV planted the disinformation line that "LaRouche killed Palme." Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dismantling of the East German secret police apparatus, a Stasi officer admitted that the foreign covert operations branch of the Stasi had manufactured the disinformation about LaRouche to divert investigators away from the East bloc.

As LaRouche and EIR alone documented, the Palme assassination was a classic "derivative assassination." Shortly before his death, Palme had unearthed a major scandal implicating Sweden's industrial giant Bofors-Nobel with the George Bush-Oliver North Iran-Contra apparatus, with Israeli intelligence, and with the Soviet and East German secret police, in running a global arms- and drug-smuggling operation, fueling wars on three continents. The prospect of Palme blowing the lid off this East-West arms and drugs bazaar made his execution an urgent matter for irregular warfare planners in Moscow, London, and among the Bush crowd in Washington.

XIII. The British plot to kill another American President, 1993-95

Shortly after Bill Clinton's inauguration, British propaganda organs, led by the Hollinger Corp. 's London Sunday Telegraph, launched an all-out effort to destroy his presidency. Using tried-and-tested U.S. media conduits, Hollinger manufactured the Whitewater affair, to tear apart the presidency.

LaRouche understood that the media climate of hate did not constitute an end in itself. Like the early 1960s, the purpose of the propaganda was to create the climate for political violence. Over the next several months, President Clinton was the target of 17 attempts and threats on his life.
EIR's 15-year record on Chiapan terrorism

From 1976 forward, EIR founder Lyndon LaRouche led a fight internationally in support of Mexico’s sovereignty and its right to develop into an industrial and scientific giant. In the course of that fight, LaRouche and EIR identified so-called radical indigenism and the very networks now leading the insurgency in southern Mexico, as the leading instrument of subversion wielded by the enemies of Mexico. The record shows:

Jan. 22, 1980: EIR warned, in an article on “The ‘Iranization’ of the Mexican Republic,” that policymakers in Washington, D.C. were spinning out scenarios for a U.S. military occupation of Mexico’s rich oil fields, under the cover of protecting them from a projected terrorist upsurge along the Mexican-Guatemalan border. Such talk was heard from top Mexico hands at Georgetown University’s Center for Strategic and International Studies and associates of the left-wing Institute for Policy Studies alike. Singled out by EIR was an article in Gallery magazine penned by IPS founder Karl Hess, which suggested a scenario in which the U.S. President decides to “encourage . . . terrorist activities by Marxist anti-American guerrillas” in oil fields in the south of Mexico, in order to create conditions for U.S. intervention.

June 1980: EIR issued a Special Consulting Report, “Chiapas and the Destabilization of Mexico,” detailing the powerful channels of foreign influence organizing conflict in Chiapas, “less than 100 miles from Mexico’s biggest oil fields.” We singled out the role of liberation theology, U.S. and French anthropology networks, and “the international ‘human rights’/ethnocide lobby” in oil fields in the south of Mexico, in order to create conditions for U.S. intervention.

June 1980: EIR identified the leader of the project was the bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Samuel Ruiz, a liberation theologian then organizing peasant and Indian revolts with foreign “radical anthropologists.” EIR documented how “Chiapas has been the target of one of the most intense anthropological investigations of any region on the globe.” Between 1957 and 1977, anthropologists working with Harvard University’s Chiapas Project alone—and other foreign institutes had projects in the area as well—had produced 27 books, 21 doctoral dissertations, 33 undergraduate theses, two novels, and a film on the region.

July 1, 1980: EIR dedicated its cover story to “Aztec Fundamentalism and the Ayatollahs of Mexico,” warning that radical networks organizing unrest in Chiapas, were serving as the shock troops for the New York Council of Foreign Relations and others who sought to “Iranize” Mexico, that is, induce a Khomeini-like revolution to stop all industrial and scientific development.

Here, LaRouche warned that toleration by Mexican nationalists of the “pagan cult of Aztec fundamentalism,” and their “wrong-headed prejudices” against the Augustinian Catholic roots of Mexican republicanism, blinded them to the “Indian card” being developed against them. The goal of the Iranization project is to accomplish “William Paddock’s proposal to approximately halve the population of Mexico by the end of this present century,” LaRouche warned. “A Mexico which tolerates admiration of Aztec culture is a Mexico which will be destroyed because it has lost connections to the moral fitness to survive.”

Dec. 10, 1980: An EIR exposé by Timothy Rush on “The New Initiatives Under Way to ‘Iranize’ the Mexican Nation” identified plans by anthropologists to create “Indian nations” as an instrument of destruction against “the development capabilities of modern nation-states in Latin America.” Rush pointed, as danger signs, to the promotion in the international press of Aztec culture, including human sacrifice and cannibalism, combined with proposals by Mexican and foreign anthropologists “to dismantle the Mexican federal state to form a Yugoslavia-style union of backward ethnic entities.”

Feb. 10, 1981: EIR warned that a new attack by armed peasants against installations of Mexico’s national oil company, Petroleos de México, in Chiapas set a precedent for a broader revolt being organized by liberation theology’s networks, headed by Bishop Ruiz and Arturo Lozano, S.J., head of the Jesuit mission in Chiapas.

March 9, 1982: EIR cover story on “How the IMF and Wharton Plan the Iranization of Mexico” identified the influx of Guatemalan refugees across the Mexican border, then sometimes occurring at the rate of 2,000 a week, as one of the gravest problems faced by Mexico.

July 20, 1982: EIR featured on its cover an expose of how “Nazi Anthropologists Incite New Ethnic Violence.” LaRouche charged that oligarchic financiers are deploying an “anthropologists’ nightmare of ‘separatist movements’ ” in order “to generate throughout the planet a protracted condition of chaos—economic depression, regional wars, dionysiac orgies of assassination, rioting, and insurrection in many nations. This process is intended to obliterate the institution of the sovereign nation-state and to bring forth out of chaos a malthusian world-federalist order.”

In an included case study on indigenist-separatist operations in Central America, EIR urged the government of Mexico to deny entrance, on national security grounds, to the anthropologists from around the world seeking to attend the celebrations for the 25th anniversary of Harvard’s Chiapas Project, scheduled to be held that month in San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas. “War and rebellion in Mexico . . . is an immediate aim of these networks, who talk now of establishing an independent Indian ‘nation’ in Chiapas,” EIR warned.

Aug. 15, 1985: EIR published a 100-page Special Re-
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port, Soviet Unconventional Warfare in Ibero-America: The Case of Guatemala, documenting how liberation theology and anthropological networks, with support from the Cuban communists, created the terrorist movement of Guatemala as a so-called Indian insurgency, with public spokesmen such as Rigoberta Menchú. The report detailed how the Guatemalan terrorist movement was linked to the drug trade, its similarity of methods with the barbaric Shining Path of Peru, and warned of the danger the Guatemalan narco-terrorist movement represented to Mexico and the Americas as a whole.

Sept. 25, 1992: EIR warned that supporters and activists from Peru’s Shining Path were “on the march” inside Mexico. “The existence of this terrorist network could mark the beginning of a terrorist escalation in the country,” we warned.

Nov. 1, 1992: EIR’s Spanish-language publication, Resumen Ejecutivo, ran a profile of the apparatus deployed by Peru’s Shining Path inside Mexico, and its overlap with Mexican groups of similar profile. The Resumen story, a summary of a longer special report circulated in Mexico by EIR, documented Mexican government support for the extensive Maoist apparatus inside the country, and warned of the possible activation of a Shining Path-like insurgency inside Mexico at any time.

Oct. 30, 1992: EIR warned: “The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992, the 500th anniversary of the Evangelization of the Americas, to Rigoberta Menchú, international representative of the narco-terrorist Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG), will unleash Shining Path-style warfare throughout the Americas. Because of its immediate, devastating effect on Guatemala and Mexico, this award could better be called the Nobel’s ‘Shining Path North’ Prize. This is a deliberate decision by the Anglo-American establishment . . . and its purpose is to eradicate western civilization from the area . . . What is going on now in Ibero-America, is a pilot project for what the U.N. plans to unleash in Asia and Africa next.” A fact sheet documenting Menchú’s terrorist history was included.

Feb. 5, 1993: EIR warned that the repatriation back to Guatemala of the first of the over 45,000 Guatemalan refugees living in Mexico, organized by the United Nations and directed by Menchú, was a major escalation of the project to set off “Indian” ethnic warfare throughout the Americas, eradicating Christian civilization in order to reinstate bestial pagan cultures.

April 20, 1993: EIR issued a memorandum on the threat to Ibero-America represented by the Inter-American Dialogue, sounding the alarm over the Dialogue’s new special project on “Ethnic Divisions and the Consolidation of Democracy in the Americas,” whose stated purpose is to foster indigenous movements as a means to splinter the nation-states of Ibero-America and eradicate “the very concept of national identity and national culture.” The director of the Dialogue’s new project hails Rigoberta Menchú as the exemplar of their cause.

July 1993: EIR published a 460-page book in Spanish, The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and Nations of Ibero-America, documenting the plans and operations set in motion by Anglo-American financial interests more than ten years ago to destroy the sovereign nation-states in the region, through genocidal International Monetary Fund policies, elimination of the institutions which historically have formed the backbone of the state (the Catholic Church and the military), and activation of “indigenist” revolts—financed and deployed by the international financial institutions themselves.

Nov. 26, 1993: EIR reported that the Vatican had ordered the schismatic liberation theology bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Samuel Ruiz, “to resign his post because of his ties to separatist and Marxist movements in Chiapas,” provoking a major campaign in his defense by an international network of liberation theology supporters.
British elites gather to reverse ‘inevitable decline’

by Mark Burdman

The British establishment will be holding one of its largest policy gatherings in years, to try to reverse the recent blows to British fortunes and prestige around the world. On March 29, a conference on “Britain in the World” will take place at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. According to RIIA sources, 500-600 invited guests will be in attendance at the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Center. Prince Charles will be among the featured speakers.

The RIIA is the single most important official foreign policy think-tank of the British monarchy. It was founded in 1920, by leading members of the British delegation to the post-World War I Paris Peace Conference, and received its Royal Charter in 1926. The RIIA’s purpose, since its inception, has been to solidify the institutions of the Empire, and to bring the United States back under British control. It spawned a series of institutions around the world, notably the New York Council on Foreign Relations. RIIA is commonly known as “Chatham House,” after the building in which it is quartered. The building is named after the Earl of Chatham, the title of the infamous 18th-century British Prime Minister William Pitt.

The March 22 London Times commented that the event would be “one of the most ambitious foreign policy conferences held in Britain, which the government hopes will restore faith in Britain’s particular strengths, such as its armed forces, the English language, British culture and education and its effective aid program for eastern Europe.” (See p. 62 for the effect such “aid” has had on Ukraine.) According to the Times, “the aim of the conference is partly to bolster British morale at a time when a sense of inevitable decline has eclipsed” British capacity to influence events. The paper stressed that the event is “very much the brainchild of Mr. [Douglas] Hurd, the foreign secretary,” who believes that British “assets” such as BBC and the English language “give Britain a disproportionate moral, cultural, and political influence in world affairs.”

Lady Chalker plots a coup in Nigeria

The March 29 event comes at a time of profound political and institutional crisis for the United Kingdom. The February collapse of the eminent “bank of the empire,” Barings, was a profound shock. This has come on top of repeated assaults on the U.S.-Britain “special relationship,” for which the British elites have expended so much energy over the past century, particularly since World War II. It is lawful, in this light, that the only American speaker at the event will be former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, a diehard British agent-of-influence.

Even before Barings and the latest blows to the “special relationship,” the British establishment was reeling from the effects of the international circulation of EIR’s Oct. 28, 1994 Special Report, “The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor.” This report details the criminal activities of the royal family’s World Wide Fund for Nature and explains how the Windsors and the Club of the Isles group of oligarchs are being caught up in the vortex of a dynastic cycle that is now coming to an end. The report exposes how the WWF and associated institutions are responsible for the genocide in Rwanda.

The Chatham House meeting was originally designed to extend that genocidal destruction to western Africa. The morning session of one panel, “Democracy and Development: Britain’s Role in Encouraging Sustainable Development and Political and Economic Reform,” is being keynoted by Baroness Lynda Chalker, the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and Minister for Overseas Development. As the EIR report documents, Lady Chalker
oversaw the slaughter in Rwanda, in significant part through the agency of her pet dictator in Uganda, Yoweri Museveni. She was to have been followed on the panel by Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo, the former military ruler of Nigeria, who now functions as a full-time asset of British interests. The problem is, that since the Chatham House agenda was originally pieced together some weeks before, Obasanjo was arrested in his native Nigeria, and charged with involvement in a coup plot against Nigerian leader Gen. Sani Abacha.

Evidently, the Chatham House plan was for Obasanjo to come to London as the hero of a "new democratic Nigeria" that would be fully committed to the British policies of free trade and to the "structural adjustment" brutalities of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). It is most revealing that Lady Chalker had, some weeks before, decided to postpone a debate in the British Parliament on Nigeria, from the originally planned date in February, to a new day in March. Obviously, this was in anticipation that the coup against Abacha would work. That operation now appears to be blocked, at least for the moment.

Since early March, some 30 Nigerians, including active-duty military officers, had been arrested on charges of plotting to overthrow Abacha. Well-informed sources in Abuja, Nigeria’s capital, point to British intelligence circles as the initiators and coordinators for the coup attempt. Since last October, prominent Nigerians have been travelling through London to discuss a change of government in Nigeria, so that a new regime would abandon Abacha’s anti-IMF orientations. The arrest of Obasanjo would have hit a raw nerve, since he has highest-level links to the British.

**A decomposing Major**

The opening speaker on March 29 will be Prime Minister John Major. Major is an odd choice to open up an event aimed at puffing up British prestige, since the accelerating decomposition of his government and his Conservative Party is both a symptom of, and a factor in Britain’s "sense of inevitable decline."

The luncheon speech will be given by Prince Charles, and the evening address will be made by Foreign Secretary Hurd. Other speakers will include Lord Tugendhat, RIIA chairman; Sir John Coles, permanent undersecretary of state, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Field Marshal Sir Peter Inge, chief of the Defense Staff; Gen. Sir Peter de la Billiere, who led British forces in the 1990-91 war against Iraq; Sir Crispin Tickell, former British ambassador to the United Nations and one of the international controllers of the ecology movement; Hugh Norton, managing director of British Petroleum; and Sir Colin Marshall, chairman, British Airways.

There will also be four “break-out sessions.” One will be the “Democracy and Development” group featuring Lady Chalker. The other three will be on: “Britain’s Diplomatic and Security Role,” “Britain’s Place in the World Economy,” and "Projecting British Values, Education and Culture."

**Henry returns to ‘Mother’**

Henry Kissinger, described as “chairman, Kissinger Associates,” will give an address on “How Do People outside Britain View Our Role in the World? The View from the United States.”

For Kissinger, this is a return to “Mother.” It was at Chatham House in May 1982, as EIR has reported, that he made an infamous speech, confessing that he had been a British Foreign Office asset throughout his career in government, and that he preferred British foreign policy axioms to those of the United States.

The British are desperate to use assets like Kissinger to “repair” the damaged “special relationship.” In the first days of March, the opportunistic Kissinger publicly endorsed the foreign policy platform of the “Contract with America” of Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and friends. Boiled down to basics, the “Contract” is a manifesto for again making the United States subordinate to British geopolitical interests.

**Down with the ‘disloyal colonists’!**

With Clinton in the White House, the blows to the “special relationship” are occurring with increasing rapidity. There was, of course, the matter of Clinton’s agreeing to meet Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams during the March 17 St. Patrick’s Day celebrations, and to allow Sinn Fein fundraising in the United States. Tensions were made all the worse, when a peeved John Major repeatedly refused to go to the telephone, to answer calls from the U.S. President. British insiders viewed Major’s behavior as an infantile fit unbecoming to a British prime minister who is supposed to “manage” the Yanks, especially at a time of such massive financial crises as are now breaking out all over the world.

When the two men finally did talk, on March 19, Clinton revealed that he would not be going to London on May 6-7, for the 50th anniversary commemorations of Victory in Europe Day, but would instead be going to Moscow for the V-E commemorations there, on May 9. The March 20 London Times reported that British officials were “furious” with the White House over this “strong rebuff” to the Brit. Cosmetic attempts are being made to paper over these differences, in the days leading up to Major’s planned April 2-4 visit to the United States, but the increased stridency of British attacks on the Americans indicates that such maneuvers won’t work.

On March 19, the London Sunday Telegraph, the weekly mouthpiece of the same Hollinger Corp. that has been orchestrating the scandal-mongering campaigns against Clinton, ran a feature, “The United States Is No Friend of Britain,” charging that the Americans are “disloyal colonists” who have used their power “ruthlessly to help dismantle the British Empire.”

The appropriate response to such raving, is “good riddance.” Let the British oligarchs stew in their own juices, and let the next big gathering at William Pitt’s old residence be a funeral for the “British System.”
IMF tightens its grip on Ukraine

by Konstantin George

Prospects for Ukraine, which after Russia is the most important of the independent states to emerge from the breakup of the Soviet Union, look very bleak for 1995. The Ukrainian government of President Leonid Kuchma has, during March, accelerated the policy course it began last year of accepting International Monetary Fund dictates. During the latter part of February and the first half of March, an almost daily reportage of “successful” talks with IMF and World Bank representatives in Kiev, and then with IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus on his arrival in Kiev from Moscow on March 10, dominated Ukraine’s media. A fairy tale is being told to the population that after years of being largely cut off from significant international funding, Ukraine is now lined up to receive “big bucks,” running into the billions of dollars, and that this will somehow magically start the long-hoped-for economic recovery.

The regime’s attempt to fool the population into believing that the desperate situation will soon improve went into high gear on Feb. 24, when Economics Minister Roman Shpek announced that the first $700 million in IMF and World Bank loans would arrive in April, if the government “approves the economic reform program prepared by IMF specialists.” The IMF demands centered on eliminating subsidies to state enterprises, freeing domestic energy prices, and a strict budget in which the deficit could not exceed 6.4% of Gross National Product. On the same day, in a move applauded by the IMF, the government rejected a proposal by a parliamentary commission to raise the official poverty line to 2.7 million karbovantsi (about $18) a month, as a precursor to raising the minimum wage to a level somewhat reflecting real family needs in present-day Ukraine.

On March 1, the cabinet, under acting Prime Minister Yevgeni Marchuk, a former KGB head in Ukraine, adopted a 1995 budget with the deficit fixed at 6.4% of GNP. On March 2, Alex Sundakov, an IMF representative in Kiev, announced that the IMF had “no objections” to the budget adopted, and that the IMF and Ukraine would sign a memorandum on IMF credits even before Camdessus arrived. The next day, Ukraine submitted its official request to the IMF for a standby credit of $1.492 billion, with both the Kuchma regime and the IMF signalling that approval was expected.

The Camdessus visit apparently settled the matter of the standby credit, with the amount promised raised to $1.8 billion, and the Ukrainian government proudly proclaiming that the first installment is “expected” to arrive on March 31. But this glowing picture is an illusion. What the Ukrainian population does not know, because the regime does not mention this, is the fine print of the “deal with the devil” being negotiated with the IMF.

The IMF $1.8 billion standby credit is not only conditional on Ukraine accepting IMF dictates, but on whether the meeting (which began on March 22) in Paris of the Group of Seven representatives decides on a $900 million balance of payments assistance credit for Ukraine. Also, the austerity that will be imposed by pegging the budget deficit at 6.4% of GNP, only concerns the first tranche in the IMF credit. To receive the full amount, Ukraine must further slash the budget, bringing the deficit to 3.3% of GNP. These demands are all the more more brutal, because Ukraine’s GNP is continually shrinking.

Physical breakdown worse than Russia’s

The regime, through its “big bucks are coming” campaign, has scored a psychological victory with the population, which has been driven to extreme desperation after three years of ever-worsening conditions of existence. This, however, will be short-lived. Games can temporarily divert attention from, but cannot change, reality. The physical economy of Ukraine continues its plunge toward a sharp breaking point. Even before this year, the destruction of the nation’s physical economy had already reached breakdown proportions surpassing even what has happened in Russia. Keeping pace with the fall of production has been the never-ending collapse of living standards. Between last autumn and the start of spring, food prices have doubled or tripled, while the cost of other basics, such as rents and utilities, have risen many times over.

The IMF’s attempt to complete the wreckage and destabilization of Ukraine will not proceed without stiff resistance from the patriotic elites of the country. Many patriots had entertained misplaced, well-meaning hopes in so-called “market economy reforms.” However, they are resolutely opposed to seeing the country sold out to foreign interests and transformed from a nation with the potential to become an economic giant, into an eastern European version of a banana republic.

A potentially decisive turning point in the thinking of elite groups occurred at the height of the regime’s pro-IMF campaign. The occasion was the signing, on March 20 in Kiev, of the Russia-Ukraine agreements settling Ukraine’s $2.5 billion in outstanding debts to Russia. The agreements covered Ukraine’s overall debts and, specifically, an agreement with the Russian gas monopoly Gazprom concerning the large debts for Russian deliveries of natural gas. The Russian delegation was led by First Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Sokovyet, and the Ukrainian side by acting Prime
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Minister Marchuk. As announced by both parties, the terms had been worked out earlier in the month in Moscow between the IMF (during the visit of Camdessus) and the Russian government.

A ‘debt for equity’ agreement

What were these terms? On the surface they appeared to be very generous for Ukraine. Ukraine was given 12 years to pay off outstanding debts, starting with a grace period of two years in which only interest payments were required. But there was a catch. In return, Ukraine had to grant Gazprom and other Russian business interests, the right to acquire majority shareholdings in 15 choice Ukrainian state enterprises in the energy sector, such as oil refineries, and in the petrochemical sector. These Ukrainian enterprises are scheduled for privatization this year, and it is now apparent that many will become Russian holdings. This will probably mean, following the pattern established in Russia’s privatization program, that in many cases Russian banks and firms will be, in part, front-men for western financial interests.

In short, the agreements represent a back-door version of what the IMF terms a debt-for-equity arrangement. Furthermore, they set a dangerous precedent. Given the regime’s policy course, Ukraine’s physical economy will continue to shrink, while its debts, both to Moscow and the IMF, will continue to grow. This will lead to demands from both western and Muscovite creditors for Ukraine to place more and more choice assets up for sale.

The IMF, working hand-in-glove with evil interests in Moscow to assist an economic re-colonization of the nation, has provided a well-needed lesson for Ukrainians. Many have also seen through President Kuchma’s attempt to deflect from his sellout policies by staging a show of strength against the pro-Russian separatist government in the autonomous Crimea region of Ukraine. This attempt was launched on March 17 when, after an address by Kuchma, the Ukrainian Parliament suspended Crimea’s constitution and deposed its so-called President, Yuri Meshkov. Right after that, Kuchma dispatched 200 crack riot police to the Crimean capital of Simferopol.

The news behind the news was that Kuchma launched the campaign against the Crimean separatists after close consultations with Moscow. He needed a “patriotic” sideshow in Crimea to cover for the first installment in the sellout of Ukraine. Moscow, clearly preferring the opportunity to buy up in stages Ukraine as a whole, to ruining its all-Ukrainian strategy by being provocative in Crimea, more than gladly played along with Kuchma. The Russian government and Duma (Parliament) leaders responded to the Crimea crisis by declaring Crimea to be strictly “an internal affair of Ukraine.” The same formulation was repeated by Soskovyets on arrival in Kiev, where he even went so far to say that Crimea would not be “discussed at all” during his talks with the Ukrainian government.

Britain and U.S. renew Iraq embargo

by Hussein Al-Nadeen

On March 13, the U.N. Security Council voted to prolong the sanctions imposed on Iraq since August 1990. The United States and Britain are the only states opposing easing or lifting the embargo, which has no reasonable basis for being prolonged further. The determination to continue this genocidal policy against the Iraqi population leaves in place a dangerous manifestation of the Bush-Thatcher Persian Gulf war policy, a time bomb that will destroy the Clinton administration’s effort to secure a greater Middle East peace settlement. The destruction of the once-proud and once-strong nation of Iraq threatens to annihilate millions of innocent Iraqis through starvation and disease.

The Iraqi Foreign Ministry recently forwarded a memorandum to the U.N. and the Arab League accusing Britain and the United States of genocide against the Iraqi people. The memo contained reports by the World Health Organization, International Red Cross, and Harvard University exposing the horrible health and food conditions prevailing throughout the country. Due to lack of efficient health care, clean water, and food, such diseases as cholera, typhoid, scabies, malaria, and blindness are spreading on an epidemic scale. The medicine required to cure these diseases, many of them fatal, is no longer available in sufficient quantities in government hospitals. For the same reasons, cases of severe anemia among pregnant women have risen to 48%, while cases of moderate anemia are at 95%. This has contributed to the increase in the number of premature births from 16% before the embargo, to 30% now, and the rate of congenital deformities is 18%. Cases of malnutrition among Iraqi children, particularly under the age of five, have reached 5,577,000. A Unicef report released in February revealed that 3.5 million Iraqis, of whom 2.5 million are children, are threatened by various infectious diseases in the near future.

What was not hit by the massive bombing of Iraq’s cities and infrastructure during the Gulf war is being affected by almost five years of the U.N. economic embargo, a “psychological holocaust” which is destroying the people’s will, even for its very survival. The reports assert that mental and psychological illness among women and children is spreading at an unprecedented rate. A research group from Harvard University reported that children are suffering from various mental and emotional problems, and are having severe difficulties concentrating and sleeping. Pregnant women suffer
severe depression and general health collapse during pregnancy, either as a result of lack of proper health care or because of the direct effects of the Gulf war; this usually leads to abortion or premature birth accompanied by congenital deformities. One of the most horrible aspects of this psychological holocaust is the high incidence of suicide among teenagers and young adults.

Who wants the embargo?

Britain and the United States are putting heavy pressure on Security Council members in order to shift the focus away from the growing international disapproval of the U.N. policy. France, Russia, and China have been indicating their intention to support proposals favoring Iraq—although much of this is for commercial and geopolitical reasons. More important is the growing opposition from nations in the Middle East that are directly affected by the sanctions, including several states that were part of the anti-Iraq coalition. Policymakers in the region know that any enduring regional peace must include Iraq. While potentially the biggest oil producer in the region after Saudi Arabia and Iran, its relatively large population and strong industrial base also give it the potential to become an economic powerhouse in the region. The development of a regional infrastructure of ports, roads, and railroads must include Iraq if it is to be viable. Economic experts in the region know that countries such as Jordan and the emerging Palestinian state require the powerful “hinterland” which Iraq represents. The acknowledgment of this reality among leaders in the region has driven them to take action.

Jordan and Turkey, Iraq’s major trading partners before the war, have suffered huge economic losses since 1990. Jordanian Foreign Minister Abdulkarim Al-Kabariti declared in mid-March that his government intends to negotiate with Security Council members the lifting of sanctions. Al-Kabariti pointed out that Article 50 of the U.N. resolution gives Jordan the right to demand direct negotiations with member states because it is directly affected by the sanctions. He also said that Jordan, like many other countries, sees that the suffering in Iraq must not continue, and that destroying Iraq will endanger the security and stability of the whole region. To show Jordan’s support for the Iraqi people, a delegation from the Jordanian Chamber of Commerce visited Iraq on March 19 and brought 500 tons of food and medicine.

Turkey, which had been a member of the anti-Iraq coalition, also intends to use Article 50 in order to relieve the massive economic difficulties resulting partly from the oil embargo on Iraq. Iraqi Foreign Minister Muhammed Said Al-Sahhaf, during a visit to Turkey in February, said that Turkey had sustained losses due to the closure of the Kirkuk-Yumurtalık pipeline, and that it has the right to compensate its losses. The Turkish foreign minister told Al-Sahhaf that Iraq should “take its place in the international arena and [that] a new era of Turkish-Iraqi relations will be beneficial and of vital importance for the establishment of peace and economic stability in the Middle East.”

Another aspect of Turkey’s concern is the power vacuum left by Iraq’s weak position in northern Iraq. Turkey recently intervened militarily into northern Iraq, penetrating up to 40 km inside Iraqi territory to wipe out Kurdish separatists insurgents of the Kurdish People’s Party (PKK), a result of the power vacuum brought on by the U.N.’s so-called “safe haven” in northern Iraq.

Other countries in the region are showing concern about the continuation of the conditions in Iraq. Most significant has been Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, who previously had been calling for maintaining the sanctions. Mubarak said that “the time has come to think about stopping the suffering of the Iraqi people and lessening the burden they bear.” Mubarak told German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel that the sanctions must be lifted. A delegation representing the Egyptian Al-Ahwar (Liberals) party visited Iraq in an attempt, as chairman of the party Mustafa Kamil Murad said, to bring Iraq back into the Arab political front. He asserted that officials in the Iraqi government had expressed their willingness to “turn a new page in their relationship with rival Arab states.”

Qatar and Oman have presented easing the embargo in the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council, and expressed support for Iraq and opposition to the U.N. resolutions during the Iraqi foreign minister’s visits to each country.

Voices from Israel

Calls have also unexpectedly come from Israel, supposedly Iraq’s number-one enemy, for easing the sanctions. The cover story of the Arabic weekly Al-Wasat the week of March 20, on the “Iraqi Lobby in Rabin’s Government,” reported on the ongoing policy debate in the Israeli government on normalizing relations with Iraq. Abdulwahab Darawsha, an Arab member of the Israeli Knesset (parliament), said that he had been lobbying to arrange a visit to Iraq by Knesset members and Israeli ministers of Iraqi origin. Darawsha said that the object of the visit would be to call on the international community to help lift the embargo and to try to bring Iraq within the Middle East peace process, because, he said, without Iraq’s participation, peace in the Middle East will be “impossible.”

Whether the Israelis are geopolitically attempting to balance Iraq off against Iran, or are pressuring Syria to get a better peace agreement, the current Israeli government regards Iraq either as an indispensable partner in peace, or else a fierce enemy. Al-Wasat, citing high-level sources, reported that it is only because of U.S. pressure that Israel has not made its own initiative.

The only countries fully supporting the U.S. and British position are Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. This support stems more from fear of Iraq entering the international oil market than any security threat.
Chávez caught running Venezuela-Colombia border provocation

by Miguel Angel Piedra

The Feb. 26 massacre by Colombian terrorists of eight Venezuelan soldiers in an attack on a military outpost in Cararabo, Venezuela, created two very different results. One outcome desired by the terrorists, a state of conflict between Venezuela and Colombia, was achieved. The other, the dismantling of a planned major uprising inside Venezuela, however, was far from the terrorists' desires.

On March 15, Gen. Camilo Zúñiga, commander of Colombia's Armed Forces, charged: "We have information that [Lt. Col. Hugo Chávez] has been in contact with the National Liberation Army [ELN]. The movement which Chávez leads, the Revolutionary Bolivarian Movement-200 [MBR], has made contact with the Colombian Guerrilla Coordinator, specifically with the ELN, with the idea of creating the Great Colombian Revolutionary Alliance." Zúñiga also named the leftist Venezuelan group Bandera Roja (Red Flag), as involved.

One day before, Venezuelan Interior Minister Ramón Escobar Salom had announced that Venezuela's DISIP (political police) had arrested 150 leaders of Red Flag and the MBR, including Hugo Chávez's brother, Adán, on the eve of an operation to provoke chaos nationally. DISIP director Gen. Rivas Ostos (ret.) reported that one of the detained, a 15-year-old boy, confessed that his assignment was to blow up DISIP headquarters, using four containers of a black powder which were found on him. Rivas added that among documents seized were plans for crimes against leading individuals, including parliamentarians. The operation was to have begun the night of March 15.

Colombia's La Prensa reported on March 18 that members of Venezuelan and Colombian guerrilla groups had recently held a summit in Caracas's Los Andes University and mapped out plans for a cross-border raid, aided by drug traffickers, designed to turn the two nations against each other and force a redeployment of Venezuelan troops to its border. Venezuelan military sources confirmed that the Cararabo attack was intended to draw troops out of the center of the country, leaving it unprotected during the planned March 15 uprising.

On March 21, Venezuelan media reported that Jesús López, linked to Chávez's MBR, had been among those detained for the Feb. 22 robbery of the Western Armored Cars company, in which two vehicles carrying more than 1 billion bolivars had been hijacked. The robbery, which did not appear to be the act of common criminals, was one of the tip-offs to the government that broader subversive plans existed, the interior minister told the press.

In articles in El Diario de Caracas on March 8 and 15, Alejandro Peña Esclusa, secretary general of the Venezuelan Labor Party, warned of a British plan to foment border wars in Ibero-America, and of British support for "leftist" subversion. Peña had been the first to tie Chávez to the attack on the Cararabo outpost. On March 18, El Nacional reported that Chávez had admitted that he had received an invitation from the British government to visit that country. Chávez protested that the invitation had been cancelled after President Rafael Caldera had made calls to the British government.

Frustrated, MBR activists leafletted the Central University of Venezuela, attacking the government and Peña Esclusa, the latter labelled "a representative of the New North American Doctrine in Latin America," a reference to Peña's friendship with Lyndon LaRouche. LaRouche has become an obsession with Chávez, who announced in December that he had discussed his "LaRouche problem" with Fidel Castro when they met in Havana.

Chávez then flew to Bogotá, to meet with Colombia's President and defense minister to demand they retract reports that they had proof his movement is linked to the ELN. To no avail. "He didn't get beyond the waiting room," headlined Colombia's papers on March 22. No Colombian official received him, and the Colombian presidency informed the press that it had sent the Venezuelan government a classified report documenting evidence of the Chávez-ELN tie.

Border tensions are dangerous

The dismantling of the guerrilla apparatus inside Venezuela has not deactivated the danger of a border war, however. Some 5,000 Venezuelan soldiers are ready to cross into Colombian territory in "hot pursuit" of terrorists, in case of any new attack upon Venezuelan territory, the Bogotá paper La Prensa said. Colombian Vice President Humberto de la Calle Lombana stated that Colombia will not accept any unilateral military action by Venezuela which violates national sovereignty. "We will defend our sovereignty firmly," he said. Likewise, Colombian Armed Forces commander General Zúñiga announced on March 17 that Colombia has placed its troops on permanent alert.

That same day, in an interview in Colombia's El Espectador, Venezuelan Foreign Minister Miguel Angel Burelli stated: "The friction has been caused by irregular forces which seek to make the two governments fight. . . . This could be interpreted in different ways. First, as a very clear attempt to confront the two countries. Second, to take advantage to the drug trade, which is what finances all these operations." President Caldera, while in Guadalalito, Apure to activate a new Border Theater of Operations, declared: "Those who wish to make Venezuela into an enemy of Colombia, and Colombia into an enemy of Venezuela, are wasting their time."
The French elections: Cheminade throws his hat into the ring

by Our Paris Correspondent

Jacques Cheminade, a well-known French political figure and a colleague of Lyndon LaRouche, on March 17 submitted to the Constitutional Council the signatures of 517 French elected officials supporting his campaign for the presidency of France (500 signatures are required to become a candidate in next month’s presidential elections). Cheminade was the first candidate to file his signatures, out of a field that is expected to include 8-12 candidates, by the time the campaign officially begins on April 7.

The news came as quite a shock to the French ruling nomenklatura, both on the left and the right. The political scene is highly charged, although the leading candidates are doing their utmost to avoid addressing the vital issues facing the nation. Cheminade’s view is that, up until now, “the other presidential candidates have been giving great orations on the deck of the Titanic, pretending not to see the iceberg which will soon destroy their illusions.”

In a scandalous intervention into the political process, the Bank of France (central bank), according to press reports, has asked candidates not to discuss the financial crisis during the election campaign, for fear of inciting a new round of speculative attacks on the French franc.

As an officially certified candidate, Cheminade will have access to one and a half hours of national television time, and additional radio time, to air his views. He will certainly have a great deal to say about the collapse of the world financial and economic system. His four-page campaign program will be distributed by the state to all of France’s 40 million voters. The program highlights a quote from Gen. Charles de Gaulle: “The policies of France are not made in the stock exchange.”

Cheminade and his program

Cheminade, 53, has a long background in commercial, trade, and economic work for the French government (in 1969-72 and again in 1978-81, he worked in the Foreign Relations Section of the French Ministry of Economics and Finance; from 1972 to 1977 he was a commercial attaché, then counselor, in the French Mission in New York).

In addition, from 1981 to 1991, he was president of the Schiller Institute in France; he also worked with the newspaper Nouvelle Solidarité and the magazine Fusion. He remains extremely active with the Schiller Institute, which was founded and is led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the wife of American statesman and economist Lyndon LaRouche.

Cheminade has vowed that his campaign will attack social Darwinism and the marginalization of the weakest members of society, the ill and the elderly, a phenomenon he lays at the door of what he calls a “truly savage liberalism.” He is combating the racialist ideologies of blood and soil created and maintained by this same philosophy of liberal economics.

He proposes a new East-West and North-South Marshall Plan based on great infrastructure projects, to reestablish a policy of long-term investment and of the creation, in Europe and internationally, of skilled jobs.

In a platform issued recently, Cheminade said that his campaign has three goals: to expose those responsible for the present financial and economic crisis; to put forward a new program for peace, economic growth, and job-creation; and to reintroduce into French political life a real debate on ideas, which he characterizes as a necessity if France is to save its democratic republican form of government.

On the first point, Cheminade’s literature charges that the Anglo-American financiers, “the banks of the City of London and Wall Street, the International Monetary Fund, GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade], and the U.N., are the pillars of a ‘one world’ system which is attempting to destroy any form of resistance we might put up.”

But he says that, as opposed to his opponents, he “knows how to identify the internal malady of the West by its right name, and to organize a resistance against it.”

The creation of a new Marshall Plan, an economic program devoted to peace and growth, requires, according to Cheminade, that “the state retake control over credit and over the issuance of money, to the detriment of the financial oligarchy.” In addition, he sees a “firm Franco-German alliance” as the basis for a European-wide economic effort based on the application of high-technology to transport, defense, energy generation, and the like.

Finally, to re-create in France the interest in ideas, and the basis for substantive debate, which are essential to a democratic republic, Cheminade insists that it is necessary to resist the blandishments and “the bludgeonings of television . . . the world of the media, which is a product of financial speculation.”

What is needed, he said, are leaders of “resolve, of dar-
ing, of foresight,” people who can inspire their fellow citizens to take on and destroy the cancer of financial speculation, and, having done that, can set about creating the jobs so desperately needed, and drawing back into society those whom the malthusian cost-cutters wish to kill off.

The other candidates

Prominent among Cheminade’s opponents, the other presidential candidates, are: Prime Minister Edouard Balladur of the Gaullist RPR; Paris Mayor Jacques Chirac of the Gaullist RPR Party; conservative Philippe de Villiers; extreme right-winger Jean-Marie Le Pen of the National Front; and Socialist Party candidate Lionel Jospin.

As the campaign first began in January, analysts seemed to consider Balladur a shoo-in. But a series of scandals had, by the Ides of March, driven down Balladur’s ratings to the point that, polls showed, if he had to face Chirac in the runoff, Chirac would get over 60% of the vote. (The French election, which is run on a non-partisan basis, is a two-step process: On April 23 there will be a qualifying round from which the two finalists will emerge. Those two face off at the polls on May 7.)

By March 17, things had gotten worse for Balladur. His ratings in the polls were around 16%, lower than those of the Socialist Jospin. “Free fall” is how various press have been describing Balladur’s trajectory.

Cheminade sometimes refers to the other candidates collectively as the French nomenklatura, the idea being that their entrenched and bureaucratic outlooks have made it impossible, as Cheminade charges in his campaign literature, for them to offer anything but “bandaid solutions or ideological demagogy.”

Campaign off and running

As an initial measure of the impact Cheminade’s campaign can be expected to have, the Paris newspaper Le Monde, probably the most influential French establishment daily, on March 19 covered his presidential bid extensively—and with hostility and falsehoods. (Lyndon LaRouche, for example, was referred to as an American “billionaire.”) Le Monde also seems angry that Cheminade has for years refused to be typed as “right-wing” or any other political category.

Since that “warning article” appeared, the establishment media in Paris have virtually blacked out Cheminade’s campaign, even while giving extensive coverage to the views of would-be candidates who have not yet submitted the signatures necessary to qualify, and who may not succeed in doing so at all.

But Cheminade is not relying on the Parisian press to get his message across. Immediately after filing his candidacy, he embarked on a national tour that will take him to the cities of Lyons, Grenoble, Nancy, Metz, Strasbourg, Marseilles, Nice, Montpellier, Toulouse, and Rouen. He will be meeting with supporters and the press, and addressing constituency groups, city councils, and other groups. On March 29, he will lay flowers at the tomb of French Resistance fighters near Grenoble, at the invitation of the town mayor.

His campaign is preparing a poster for national distribution, with the slogan, “A France to Rebuild the World.” It is also circulating a pamphlet on agricultural policy, and will issue another on the need for reviving the space program, as well as a mass-circulation run of Cheminade’s campaign platform.
Azerbaijan coup attempt endangers region

Azerbaijan President Haidar Aliyev, following a reported coup attempt by Interior Ministry forces, warned on March 15 that the country could plunge into civil war. Aliyev, a former Communist Party leader, vowed to crush the "putsch" and called on Deputy Interior Minister Rovshan Javadov and his rebellious OPON police force to lay down their arms.

According to the local Turan news agency, dozens of people had been killed in fighting between OPON and government forces on March 15.

The internal crisis in Azerbaijan, and the Russian-orchestrated war between Armenia and Azerbaijan, make the prospects for the $7.1 billion oil deal signed with western oil firms, called the "deal of the century," look rather bleak. The oil would have been piped south, via Armenia and Turkey. An alternative proposal to pipe Azeri oil north into Russia has been checked by the war in Chechnya.

Ugandan civil rights movement formed

Godfrey Binaisa, the former President of Uganda, announced on March 12 in Stockholm, Sweden that he had, in discussions with fellow countrymen, initiated the formation of the Ugandan Civil Rights Movement. Motivated by the deteriorating economic and social situation of the people of Uganda, who, he said, have suffered under the austerity policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, Binaisa called on all Ugandans of good will to unite and work for peaceful change.

The policy of liberalization and privatization of the economy, which British Minister for Overseas Development Baroness Lynda Chalker convinced the Ugandan government to adopt, only benefits the small layer of wealthy people, whereas the 95% majority of the Ugandan people are faced with hunger, mass unemployment, and a breakdown of the health and education systems. In the last few years, no significant amount of money has gone into the repair and expansion of roads and railway infrastructure of the country.

Faced with a subculture of corruption, Binaisa called on the young generation of Ugandans to regain the moral high ground and look at the fate of Africa over the last 30 years. The dreams of the independence fight were never realized, because the old colonial system was replaced with a new one called the IMF and the World Bank. Those dreams, which envisaged the formation of a prosperous African Economic Community by the year 2000 and eventually the establishment of the United Sovereign States of Africa, were, during the 1970s and 1980s, crushed by the burden of foreign debt and the murderous austerity of the IMF's structural adjustment programs.

The Ugandan Civil Rights Movement, he said, will work under the banner of "Peace Means Development," for realization of an ambitious regional development plan for infrastructure, agriculture, and industry encompassing the entire region bordering the Great Lakes area in East and Central Africa.

Binaisa was the keynote speaker at Schiller Institute conferences in Copenhagen and Stockholm in March.

Did London get a tip on Tokyo nerve gas attack?

International analysts are puzzling over the "coincidence" that the London Sunday Times published an article headlined "Did Terrorists Kill with Deadly Nerve Gas Test?" in its March 19 issue, one day before the terrorist attack in Tokyo in which sarin nerve gas was released on a crowded subway killing eight and sending 1,000 to hospitals.

The Sunday Times article reported on an event that occurred on June 27, 1994, in Matsumoto, Japan, in which eight people mysteriously died from a dosage of sarin leaked into the atmosphere.

According to reporters Jonathan Annells and James Adams, "western intelligence agencies" looking into the deaths "are convinced it involved terrorists. They fear that sarin, a chemical weapon described as the 'poor man's atomic bomb,' is in the hands of a terrorist group, presumed to be the Japanese Red Army Faction. . . . Japanese police and security services are racing to catch the killers before they commit mass slaughter." Annells and Adams report that the Japanese police have created a "special sarin unit," which is involved in an "intensive investigation," as they believe the Matsumoto attack "was a trial run by terrorists."

Commenting on the timing of the Sunday Times article, an informed Moscow strategist told EIR that the Tokyo atrocity was receiving very wide coverage in Russia. "But of anything I've heard, this Sunday Times angle is the most interesting; it is an extremely interesting lead to follow up."

Turkish troops pursue Kurds into Iraq

Up to 35,000 Turkish troops, backed by tanks and artillery units, crossed three miles into northern Iraq on March 20 to attack Kurdish guerilla bases.

"From the early hours of March 20, under orders from the government, the Turkish Armed Forces began an operation against many PKK [Kurdistan Workers Party] camps in areas adjacent to our country," Anatolian news agency quoted Prime Minister Tançu Ciller as saying.

The Turkish forces plan to push 25 miles into Iraq along a 150-mile front, a military spokesman told a news conference in Ankara. According to the spokesman, between 2,500 and 2,800 PKK guerrillas are believed to be in camps on the Iraqi side of the border.

Several days before, Turkey had warned that the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) was involved in recent provocations against Iraqi troops. "We have reports that local [Kurdish] forces in northern Iraq are opening harassing fire on Iraqi troops permanently positioned south of the 36th parallel," Foreign Ministry spokesman Ferhat Ataman said. The spokesman praised the "cool attitude of the Iraqi side in the face of such harassment."

Turkey also warned the PUK against any
They are stationed in barracks, ready to car­

High Council for Civil Defense named in Sudan

Sudanese Interior Minister Brig. Al-Tayeb Ibrahim Mohammad Khair on March 18 decreed the formation of a High Council for Civil Defense.

No reasons were given for the formation of the council; however, the British-backed Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) said it would strike at targets in northern Sudan, including in Khartoum, in coordination with banned political parties in the north, to overthrow the government of Lt. Gen. Omar Hassan Al-Bashir. London is the staging ground for this “coalition government in the wings,” between the SPLA and the banned political parties in northern Sudan.

Due to fighting in southern Sudan, a steady influx of Sudanese refugees (some 150 a day) continues to arrive in the Kokobo area of northern Uganda. Most of these refugees are below 15 years of age and 10% suffer from malnutrition.

Bosnian Army is stronger, says general

Bosnia’s Army Commander Gen. Rasim Delic said that his army has made use of the cease-fire, which began on Jan. 1, to train and reorganize its units. In an interview published on March 16 in the Sarajevo daily Oslobodjenje, Delic said that the govern­ment now has 200,000 men under arms, and a new command structure making field units more flexible. “We have created a large number of maneuver brigades without specific [geographic] zones of responsibility. They are stationed in barracks, ready to carry out assignments on any part of Bosnian territory,” Delic said.

“The probability the war will continue is greater than the possibility there will be a just solution for Bosnia,” General Delic said. “It is realistic to expect the war to con­tinue. We are prepared for that.”

According to a Reuters account of the interview, Delic said he doubted that a wider Balkan war involving Croatia or Macedonia was in the offing, but he suggested that such a development would work in favor of the Bosnian Army. “I think it is exaggerated to expect a wider war on a Balkan level,” he said. “As a soldier I’d like that to happen because it would be a relief to the Bosnian Army. The aggressor would be stretched out and could not expect to bring new arms and soldiers in from Serbia and Montenegro whenever they wanted.”

Algerian conflict set to escalate

The decision on the part of the Algerian government to re-arrest two leading members of the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) has created an increasingly tense situation in the country, as the government has announced plans to mobilize the population in the armed struggle, through the creation of militias. The French daily Libération on March 20 quoted Algerian Interior Minister Mezi­ane Cherif saying that the number of “communal guards” would reach 40-50,000. Though denying that these constituted militias, he stated that citizens should be encour­aged “to defend themselves in cases in which the security forces are not present. . . . It is not a question of having the anti-terrorist fight assumed by forces other than those of the security services.”

The conflict in Algeria has heated up over the past month, after 200 prisoners were killed in a mutiny at Serkadji Prison, believed to have been organized by agents provocateurs. Both the French and U.S. governments have realized that the situation is being pushed to the brink; the French press reports that the United States and France have agreed on joint military maneuvers for evacuating civilians from Algeria, should the need arise.

BOLIVIA’S Adm. Miguel Alvarez (ret.) charged that “there is a strong plot in existence to eliminate the Armed Forces, and the targets of this new attack are civilians and military men,” according to the daily Gesti6n on March 17. “I say that this plot is being carried out in the framework of the so-called ’Bush Plan,’ a strategy attributed to the former American President George Bush to eliminate Latin America’s armed forces.”

THE MURDER of two promi­nent Burundi leaders has shaken hopes for the fragile peace in the region. The two are Energy Minister Ernest Kabushemeye, leader of the second-largest Hutu party and ally of Burundi’s moderate President, Sylvestre Nyabrantunya; and Lucien Sabuku, an Interior Ministry consult­ant and former mayor of Bujumbura. More than 100,000 people have been killed since October 1993.

PRINCE PHILIP arrived on the Indian Ocean island of Madagascar on March 15 on a five-day private visit as president of the World Wide Fund for Nature. He was scheduled to camp in protected areas where the fund operates.

THE LEADERSHIP of the Pal­estine Liberation Organization met in Tunis on March 18-19 and criticized chairman Yasser Arafat’s Gaza­based Palestinian Authority for con­ceding too much to Israel in the peace process. One of the options discussed at the meeting was the possibility of “suspending negotiations with Isra­el” until it fulfills its commitments under the Oslo Accords.

POPE JOHN PAUL II and other high Vatican officials received Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz on March 16, to review the effects of the U.N.-imposed embargo on Iraq. The daily Al-Arab reported that Aziz was as­sured that the Vatican will use its diplo­matic power in an effort to persuade the U.N. to review the sanctions.
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Is Clinton a target of Brits' 'long, hot summer'? 

by Jeffrey Steinberg

President Clinton delivered a fresh blow to the British royals and their Club of the Isles cohorts with his March 21 announcement that he would rather celebrate V-E Day in Moscow with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Russian President Boris Yeltsin, than in London or Paris. The decision reaffirmed his July 1994 announcement of a new "special partnership" with Germany to rebuild the East. Coming just three days after he hosted a White House St. Patrick's Day celebration attended by Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams and Republic of Ireland Prime Minister John Bruton (triggering a public temper tantrum by British Prime Minister John Major—who wasn’t invited—and another round of anti-American propaganda from the City of London press), the President’s decision has corroborated what more astute London establishment members have been fearing for months: that there is more to the breakup of the Anglo-American geopolitical special relationship than merely President Clinton’s personal animus toward “all things British.”

The fact that the President continues to stand up to London in the face of sometimes hysterical resistance from the State Department and treachery from within the permanent bureaucracy at the Justice Department, is sending transatlantic signals that a policy consensus is emerging inside the United States that an axiomatic break with London is overdue.

One consequence of this “new reality” is that British intelligence is working overtime to foster the preconditions for a long, hot summer of riots across America.

Declaration of war

One thing that the Club of the Isles and the British Windsors can never be accused of, is subtlety. Since the end of February, the press organs of the House of Windsor have been churning out propaganda “forecasting” civil disorders across the United States.

• The Feb. 25 London Economist featured an outrageous smear against the people and city government of Washington, D.C., forecasting race war, under the headline: “The Nation’s Capital: City of Shame.” Despite the reputation of the City of London’s leading economic organ, the story would have been more appropriate on the front page of the National Enquirer—beneath a photo of a chimpanzee giving birth to Prince Philip. The article gave the following description of America’s capital city: “Taxes are sky-high, but city services stink. The rubbish is rarely picked up. The roads are full of craters. City employees, of whom there are more per head than anywhere else in the country, are uniformly indolent. Many police officers are as crooked as the criminals they supposedly pursue—criminals who make the city the violence capital of America. And then there is Marion Barry: the mayor who oversaw the city’s decline in the 1980s while indulging a fabulous cocaine habit for which he went to jail, only to be re-elected last November.”

• The March 12 Sunday Times of London featured an even more provocative piece by Washington correspondent James Adams, headlined “Riot Fear Looms over Washington.” Devoid of a single piece of information, the article made a bold assertion: “America’s capital is preparing for a long, hot summer of violence as the city plans to make thousands of black workers redundant, cut funding to the poor in an effort to save itself from bankruptcy... . Washington is one of America’s most violent cities, and both the police and moderate city leaders fear the cuts will be used by militant black groups to mobilize the people most affected. ‘It is the radicals who will light the fire of this combustible mix,’ said Harry Jaffe, author of Dream City, the definitive study of Washington and its problems. ‘It’s an opening for the really,
Marshal [Attorney General Janet] Reno may pale in compari-
son to what has been planned for late March: a nationwide
assault on private militias as the prelude to a possible declara-
tion of martial law throughout the United States. . . . The
Army’s infamous Joint Task Force Six (which did the train-
ing for Waco) has been training BATF jackbooters with
Bradley Assault Vehicles at Ft. Bliss, Texas. Government
agents provocateurs are set to plant fully automatic and heavy
weapons, like rocket launchers, on the property of militia
leaders. Every militia in the country—and there are dozens,
many of which are well-armed and well-led by former or
even active-duty officers—is on a state of Red Alert. Should
Reno be stupid enough to actually attack them militarily,
there is going to be a lot of blood.”

Rees-Mogg continues: “The establishment media is pro-
grammed to immediately thereafter thunderously bellow for
nationwide gun confiscation and even martial law. . . .
Hopefully, Reno’s Waco 2 can be stopped in time. But that
it was plotted in the first place should be a sobering lesson as
to what a horrifying extent liberalism, the political philo-
sophy of the administration and the Democratic Party, has been
converted into a close cousin of fascism.”

The ADL war on Farrakhan and Cisneros

This British scenario of the nation’s capital razed to the
ground—in a replay of August 1812—and a rural America
revolt against the federal government triggering a new Civil
War, is not idle fantasy. As the Club of the Isles propagan-
dists were cranking out their venom, groups such as the Anti-
Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL), Conservative
Revolutionists in the new GOP-run Congress, and British
moles inside the federal bureaucracy were working overtime
to create the preconditions for the “long hot summer.”

One part in this effort was March 2 hearings by a House
Banking subcommittee into the Department of Housing and
Urban Development’s security contracts with firms affiliated
with the Nation of Islam. The ADL, the American Jewish
Congress, and other groups had succeeded in lobbying Rep.
Peter King (R-N.Y.) and others to set up the hearings,
through a months-long letter-writing and slander campaign
against Nation of Islam Minister Louis Farrakhan.

The hearings have fueled the British “strategy of tension.”

After an internal probe of the HUD contracts with the NOI-
affiliated companies, HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros deliv-
ered a strong defense of his department’s dealings with the
companies. At one point in the hearings, he equated the Nation
of Islam with other religious groups, including B’nai B’rith,
that have dealings with government agencies.

This produced a firestorm of protests from the ADL and
allied groups. ADL National Director Abraham Foxman told
the New York City-based Jewish weekly Forward that he
would personally lobby Capitol Hill for action against Farr-
akhan and Cisneros. While Foxman was banging down
doors in Congress, the ADL paid for a full-page ad in the
New York Times spewing more venom against Cisneros than
against the NOI.

On March 12, the ADL’s campaign received a boost
when the Chicago Tribune began a four-part, front-page slan-
der on Minister Farrakhan and the NOI, focusing on the
security firms and on a Washington, D.C. AIDS clinic head-
ed by NOI National Spokesman and Minister of Health Dr.
Abdul Alim Muhammed. The clinic has received grants from
the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

In the midst of this propaganda offensive, Attorney Gen-
eral Reno announced that the DOJ Criminal Division had
recommended the appointment of a special prosecutor to
probe three-year-old perjury allegations against Cisneros.

In a front-page story on March 17, Forward linked the
Cisneros probe to his refusal to dump the NOI contracts in
the face of ADL and related pressure.

The ADL has been linked to a network of corrupt career
bureaucrats inside the DOJ—including the department’s
highest-ranking civil servant, Deputy Assistant Attorney
General Mark Richard of the Criminal Division. It is the
career apparatus inside the Criminal Division’s Public Integ-
rity Section that has near-total control over department rec-
ommendations under the new special prosecutors law.

Chicago Tribune publisher Jack Fuller is himself a former
special assistant to Attorney General Edward Levi, who
served under President Gerald Ford in 1975-77. During his
tenure at the DOJ, Fuller authored the infamous “Levi Guid-
elines” that vastly expanded the power of the FBI to conduct
undercover “sting” operations and to build up an army of
well-paid informants and agents provocateurs.

This “mole” apparatus inside the federal bureaucracy,
linked to outside agencies like the ADL and to the (far more
pro-British) Bush administration, could prove to be an Achil-
les’ heel for President Clinton and his allies in the battle
against the British Club of the Isles. While there are growing
signs that British intelligence is stirring up radical elements
within the rural militias and among some black militant orga-
nizations, these problems can be contained as long as cool
heads prevail and measured actions are taken by the relevant
government agencies. Recent rumblings among the perma-
nent bureaucrats at the DOJ suggest that this situation is far
from under control.
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Dole does turnabout on affirmative action

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.) has made a repeal of affirmative action programs a key part of his election campaign for the 1996 GOP nomination for President.

Sen. Phil Gramm (D-Tex.), Dole's chief rival for the nomination, came out against affirmative action programs when he announced his presidential bid in February. Gramm said that if elected President, he would repeal all quotas and set-asides that favor minorities. Dole now says that he will do the same, but this year.

While Dole was earlier a supporter of affirmative action programs, which aim at eliminating job discrimination, a policy launched under President Lyndon Johnson and expanded during the Nixon administration, Dole has now targeted these programs for elimination. He has ordered a congressional report on all such government programs, and has asked two committee chairmen to hold hearings to examine the issue. Dole has said that he will introduce bills that would ban the federal government from "granting preferential treatment to any person simply because of his or her membership in a certain favored group."

In initial action on a related measure, the Senate Finance Committee on March 9 voted to end a tax deferral for businesses that sell broadcast licenses to blacks, Hispanics, or other minorities. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House.

Teller calls for manned lunar base

Speaking before the House Science Committee on March 16 on NASA's Mission to Planet Earth, Dr. Edward Teller made a personal plea for the development of a manned lunar base. "There are cases where man is needed in space," such as on the Moon, Teller told committee members.

Teller displayed a detailed image of the Moon recently taken by the Clementine spacecraft. "I would like to suggest a manned station of half a dozen people with the occupants being rotated every several months or perhaps longer," he said. "For the location of this station, I recommend the bottom of the deep basin near the South Pole of the Moon." Teller has proposed that the Moon's poles may contain water ice, and photographs from Clementine were consistent with this hypothesis.

Teller stated that "the final result may be that a manned lunar station would be a wonderful source of scientific information both about the Moon and about the universe. In addition, the Moon may be developed to serve as a refueling station for space exploration." Teller said he did not want to "belittle the interest in the human exploration of Mars," but pointed out that the Moon is hundreds of times closer to the Earth and the next step for a manned base. "With focused international effort commencing soon, a permanent lunar colony could be established in this decade at a total cost well under $10 billion."

Teller also advocated the deployment of "at least several hundred small satellites in near-Earth space" that would make use of the past decade's developments in electronics, and would take on-site measurements of the most important atmospheric conditions.

Little hope seen for term limits passage

House Republican leaders announced plans on March 15 for floor consideration later in the month of at least three versions of a constitutional amendment limiting the terms of members of Congress. Proponents acknowledge that they face an uphill fight to win the required two-thirds majority, and called for a grass-roots lobbying campaign.

Republicans promised a vote on term limits in their Contract with America, but delayed a vote in the face of a likely embarrassing defeat.

Majority Leader Richard Armey (R-Tex.) told reporters on March 21 that the House would debate term limits on March 27-28. Under the plan, the House will consider two proposals calling for limits of six two-year terms in the House and two six-year terms in the Senate—one of which would allow states to set lower limits. There will also be a proposal limiting House membership to six years, and possibly a Democratic alternative.

Clinton sustained on boycott of scabs

Senate Democrats successfully defended President Clinton's March 8 Executive Order forbidding federal government contracts with firms that permanently replace striking workers. Republicans fell two votes short of the 60 needed to end the filibuster against Republican attempts to kill it. The filibuster prevented a vote on an amendment offered by Sen. Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kan.) that would have prohibited the Labor Department from using appropriated money to administer or enforce the order.

Facing defeat in a second attempt to end the filibuster on March 16, GOP leaders decided to move on to other business.

Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) said, "President Clinton has a right to issue his Executive Order, and we intend to defend it in the Senate as often as we..."
have to... We’re not going to be rolled over and stampeded.” Labor Secretary Robert Reich told a local TV interviewer that “if you allow permanent replacement of striking workers... it eliminates the strike as an instrument.”

**Draconian rescissions bill passes House**

After two days of debate, House Republicans succeeded on March 17 in gaining passage of a $17.3 billion package of rescissions from the mid-year budget. In a 227-200 vote, the House approved the package of cuts over the next five years.

House Budget Committee Chairman John Kasich (R-Ohio) said just prior to the vote that he intended to use the savings to finance the GOP tax reduction plan. Some members were furious, because they had been given to believe that all the savings would go to deficit reduction. Some conservative Democrats then decided to vote against the measure.

“We've heard the same rhetoric about compassion,” said Gerald Solomon (R-N.Y.), who, as chairman of the House Rules Committee, played an important role in its passage. “If we don't make these cuts and more, we're going to add another trillion to our $4.5 trillion national debt.”

Nearly half the reductions would come from welfare programs and Medicare; $1.6 billion would come from a cut in home heating subsidies. Other cuts include foreign aid.

Before any cuts become law, the measure faces a tougher challenge in the Senate and the likelihood of a veto by President Clinton. Before a conference of state legislators, Clinton criticized the rescissions, saying that they would “cut too much people and not enough pork.”

Even many Republicans are concerned that their tax cut will backfire as people begin to feel the impact of the cuts. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Bob Packwood (R-Ore.), at a meeting with fellow committee members and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin in Maryland on the weekend of March 18, came out opposing any tax cut, saying that he wants to “make deficit reduction the first priority.” Packwood says that he wants Social Security on the table as a target for reductions.

**Line-item veto considered in Senate**

Republican senators have reached agreement on a strategy for pushing a line-item veto, and are threatening to hang the issue around the necks of Democrats if they filibuster the legislation. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a key supporter of the bill, agrees that the vote will be “a close call.”

Although the President is in favor of a line-item veto, some Democrats support a milder approach than that proposed by Republicans. A filibuster by Robert Byrd (D-W.V.), who questions the constitutionality of a line-item veto, is likely. “It would be up to the President to win Democratic votes for the legislation,” warned Majority Whip Trent Lott (R-Miss.).

Bob Dole (R-Kan.) put his own spin on the fight, saying, “I guess if it's a choice between passing something he always supported or denying Republicans a legislative victory, then the line-item veto will probably be sacrificed on the altar of politics.”

In the more radical GOP version, appropriations bills would be passed as they are now, but then broken up into each individual item. As with regular appropriations bills, it would require a two-thirds majority of both houses to override a presidential veto, a considerable strengthening of executive power.

**Republicans seek harsher measures vs. Iran**

Senate Banking Committee Republicans, in grilling Undersecretary of State Peter Tarnoff on March 16, called for harsher measures against Iran, including penalizing foreign subsidiaries of American companies trading with Iran. “How do we allow these foreign governments to think that we’re serious about this when indeed we permit $4 billion [in trade] and... we are facilitating it with U.S. companies,” complained Banking Committee Chairman Alfonse D’Amato (R-N.Y.).

When a $1 billion deal between Conoco and Iran to exploit Iran’s oil resources was made public, Edgar Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress, flew to Washington to meet with House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.), and Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A few days later, President Clinton issued an Executive Order blocking American firms from financing, supervising, or managing oil development projects in Iran, effectively killing the deal.

Tarnoff said that the deal had taken the administration by surprise. When they learned of it, they quickly moved to squelch it. D’Amato has introduced legislation that would create a trade embargo and ban the purchase of Iranian oil by American subsidiaries abroad. The moves come in the context of a British-orchestrated campaign to make “militant Islam” the West’s new “enemy image.”
First U.S. astronaut launched in Russia

In the early hours of March 14, Dr. Norm Thagard, MD, became the first American astronaut to go into space in a non-U.S. launch vehicle. Thagard was aboard a Russian Soyuz TM spacecraft launched atop a Soyuz rocket, along with cosmonauts Lt. Col. Vladimir N. Dezhurov, making his first flight, and Gennady M. Strekalov, the flight engineer, who is making his fifth space flight. Almost exactly one year ago, Sergei Krikalev became the first cosmonaut to go into space on the U.S. Shuttle.

On March 16, the Soyuz TM spacecraft docked with the Mir space station, and Thagard and his crewmates began a three-month stay aboard the Mir. On March 20, the Mir crew held a press conference, taking questions originating from both the Kennedy Space Center in Florida, and Mission Control in Kaliningrad.

Ethics charges grow against Gingrich

House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) is now the subject of a host of ethics charges in the House Ethics Committee. The scandals began during the last Congress, when Gingrich was Minority Whip, and involve a college class he taught called "Renewing American Civilization," underwritten by his GOPAC political action committee. Gingrich has used his course to promote his "Contract with America" legislative package. Worse, the course is also partly sponsored by a tax-exempt foundation, which by law cannot be involved in espousing a political view. In turn, the foundation has raised over $1.7 million from the class.

In October 1993, the scandal forced Kennesaw State College to drop the course, which was transferred to nearby Reinhardt College. On Feb. 15, 1995, the House Ethics Committee announced that it would review a complaint charging that Gingrich used GOPAC to finance the course, and that he improperly aided a donor to the course, while at Kennesaw.

On Jan. 26, 1995, House Minority Whip David Bonior (D-Mich.) filed new charges based on a complaint by former Rep. Ben Jones (D-Ga.). Jones charged that the Speaker's huge book deal with Rupert Murdoch, whose media empire is facing a challenge before the Federal Communications Commission, "could be deemed to constitute accepting favors or benefits" that might influence how the Speaker treated this issue.

Finally, on Feb. 23, Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.) and Cynthia McKinney (D-Ga.) filed charges that Gingrich had received a $200,000 gift of free cable broadcasting by the Mind Extension University, a subsidiary of Jones Intericable, Inc., to broadcast his class. Jones Intericable may be in the running to purchase the Public Broadcasting Corp., which Gingrich has said he will privatize.

Bishops take GOP welfare reform bill to task

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a statement on March 18 highly critical of House Republicans' welfare reform legislation. The bishops insisted that they were speaking in an effort to illuminate "the moral dimensions and human consequences of this debate." They said they felt a special obligation to speak out now, as Congress begins debate on the bill.

The bishops' statement stressed: "Genuine welfare reform should rely on incentives more than harsh penalties; for example, denying needed benefits for children born to mothers on welfare can hurt the children and pressure their mothers toward abortion and sterilization. . . .

"Society has a responsibility to help meet the needs of those who cannot care for themselves, especially young children. AFDC [Aid to Families with Dependent Children], food stamps and other entitlement programs provide essential support for poor children. . . . We cannot support 'reform' that will make it more difficult for poor children to grow into productive individuals. We cannot support reform that destroys the structures, ends entitlements and eliminates resources that have provided an essential safety net for vulnerable children or permits states to reduce their commitment in this area. Also, we cannot support punitive approaches that target immigrants, even legal residents, and take away the minimal benefits that they now receive."

President to attend V-E celebrations in Moscow

President Bill Clinton will travel to Moscow to attend the May 9 "V-E Day" celebrations on the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. The visit will also include a summit meeting with Russian President Boris Yeltsin covering issues such as NATO, Chechnya, and Russia's cooperation with Iran in the construction of a nuclear reactor complex.

Yeltsin called in a group of reporters on March 16 and told them that he will modify the nature of the traditional parade in Red Square, in deference to the U.S. President, who "is somewhat concerned by the planning of the event. He does not want there to be a military parade . . . I think we will comply with these preconditions." Yeltsin said he would limit the May 9 parade to war veterans without military equipment.

Vice President Al Gore will attend the V-E celebrations in London, Paris, and Berlin.

Extend NPT treaty forever, says ACDA

At a Washington, D.C. briefing on March 14, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency head John Holum said that the upcoming April 17 New York Conference on Disarmament to extend the expiring Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is "an historic moment," because signatories will vote on whether to extend the treaty indefinitely.

ACDA and the British are pushing extension of the NPT, which expires this year, not for another 25 years, but "to infinity." After "infinite extension," all NPT signers not only forswear new production of plutonium and so-called weapons-grade materi-
al, but also open themselves forever to U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) “special inspections,” putting their nuclear power programs at risk any time the one-world crowd decides to exercise its dictatorship.

A worried Egyptian reporter asked Holm whether a country such as his, which is a signatory to NPT, couldn’t just renew for 25 years, so that if a competitor, such as Israel, which is not a signer, builds the bomb, Egypt could react. “No,” said Holm. “Countries don’t have the option to choose for their own purposes, and the majority rule will be binding on all members.

“That’s why this is such an historic moment,” he gushed. “Between 25 years, and infinity, is a dramatic difference. Under a permanent extension, the non-proliferation system is secure for all time. This is the one opportunity provided by the rules in the life of the treaty under which a simple majority of the members can vote to make it permanent without the requirement to go back to parliaments for ratification.”

LaRouche discusses candidates’ movement

Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche laid out the perspective of a candidates’ movement to roll back the Conservative Revolution, during a call-in broadcast on March 15 with KMLB radio in Louisiana. One caller, who said he was “seriously considering running for state legislature” in his cotton-growing district, asked LaRouche: “I don’t even know if I can win or not, but as a state legislator, just what could I do?”

LaRouche replied: “You could do a great deal. What we need to do is to think about a movement, not just individuals. . . .”

“What’s the situation now? We’ve got this recent mid-term election in which essentially the U.S. Congress was determined by about 25% of the total eligible voters. Not an unusual thing, really, in American history in a mid-term election. So, the ‘Contract with America’ group, Gingrich and Phil Gramm, and so forth, does not represent the American people. As a matter of fact, 80% of the American people would be very badly hurt if that program were to go through.

“Now, what’s going to happen, I believe, in the coming elections during this year and next year, is that we’re going to have a reversal of that, in which a lot of very angry people—but much more sensible than they were in voting in the mid-term election—are going to try to put in the state legislatures and state offices and in federal offices, a better representation to address the crises which we’re all facing.

“And therefore, what we need, I think, is a movement of people to replace those who are a little bit off the wall, shall we say, in what they’re doing in the legislatures now. So it’s very important to have people who have given some attention to these issues . . . and who know how to find answers, which is almost as important as knowing the answers, in the legislature.”

North still raising campaign money

Oliver North, the Conservative Revolution standard-bearer who lost his bid to be Virginia’s U.S. senator last year, raised over half a million dollars in December, more than any other Senate campaign from the 1994 elections, according to an article this month in the Washington paper The Hill. According to Federal Election Commission reports, most of the money was raised through his continuing direct mail solicitation. North’s mailing list is largely derived from his legal defense fund (which raised $13.7 million over 1988-92), and his Freedom Alliance (which raised $9.2 million over 1989-92). His current political action committee, formed in 1991, is called V-FAC.

North, who just launched his nationally syndicated talk show in the Washington and Houston “markets,” is clearly keeping his fundraising apparatus in place for future endeavors, and apparently has not made his list available to any of the current Republican candidates. He raised about $20 million in legally reported contributions for his Senate campaign, but informed sources estimate that his campaign actually spent about $50 million.

Briefly

• OHIO GOVERNOR George Voinovich has come under fire for cutting the state education budget, after the state seized control of Cleveland schools under federal order, earlier in March. He is now proposing to put $117 million more into the schools, from funds he has taken out of Medicaid.

• POVERTY would be a felony in California, if an amendment to the Penal Code passes, according to a recent article in The Wanderer. Just before Christmas, according to the Catholic weekly, “an amendment was introduced to Section 638 of the Penal Code . . . which makes it a felony to have an income below the federally established poverty level. Don’t believe it? Here are the words as clear as can be: ‘A person who, intentionally and maliciously, has a yearly income below the federally established poverty level is guilty of a felony.’”

• GOP CONGRESSMAN Peter King of New York, at a hearing of the House International Affairs Committee on March 15, praised President Clinton, who, he said, “has done more than any President in our country’s history to advance the peace in Ireland, and I want to extend to you, to pass on to him, the sincere thanks he has of many members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.”

• FRANCISCO DURAN, the Colorado man charged with trying to kill the President, after spraying the White House with gunfire last Oct. 29, had left a business card at his last job reading “Death to all government officials,” a government witness testified in court. Duran’s trial began on March 16.

• ATTORNEY GENERAL Janet Reno dropped a Justice Department inquiry against Transportation Secretary Federico Peña on March 16. The inquiry could have ended with the appointment of a special prosecutor had the investigation found wrongdoing.
Editorial

Good riddance

A series of articles has hit the British press threatening an end to the "special relationship" between the United States and Great Britain. This is part of an orchestrated line targeting President Clinton, which should not only backfire, but also serve as an occasion to expose the stupid mascarade that there is some special commonality of interest between British imperialism and the American Republic.

America has had a very special relationship to Great Britain—who can deny it! First there was the Revolutionary War; then in 1812 the British burned down the nation's capital.

Beaten but undaunted, they tried again, this time using more sophisticated, Venetian tactics. Their aim was to break up the Union through secessionist movements, and to this end Britain simultaneously encouraged terrorist crazies like John Brown, and the slavocracy.

Then, of course, there is that very special relationship which the British have had to U.S. Presidents. Those like Lincoln, McKinley, and Kennedy, whom they thought to be too far out of line, were simply targeted for extermination.

And then there was World War II, which the United States fought under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The British had created and fostered the fascist movements which had come to power in Italy and Germany, as part of their global geopolitical game. Their supposedly great war leader Winston Churchill was known to all of those in the inner circle as a pompous fool—a lisping drunk whose every effort was to preserving the Empire rather than bring the war to a speedy conclusion.

Especially after the murder of John Kennedy, the United States pretty much fell into line behind the British Crown. But now there is once again an American President who is cognizant of the real conflict of interest between British imperial policy and American republican policy, and the British policy establishment cannot contain its bitterness. Thus we saw in the London Sunday Times on March 12, an article with the headline, "So Long, Nice While It Lasted."

That President Clinton would host Irish leader Gerry Adams at the White House on St. Patrick's Day, is simply not to be tolerated, so say Times authors Andrew Stephen and James Adams. "Clinton has done so much damage to the special relationship, that it is fast becoming clear that only a different President stands a chance of restoring it."

On March 19, the Sunday Telegraph, another London paper, weighed in with an article by John Charmley with the headline, "The United States Is No Friend of Britain." "America helped end the Empire, and is now scuppering the United Kingdom," according to the kicker, while a blurb quips that "As disloyal colonists, they can't understand loyalty."

According to Charmley's self-serving argument, there never was a "special relationship" in the first place, and one of the good things about President Clinton "shaking the blood-stained paw" of Adams, is that "it might finally destroy one of the most pernicious and damaging myths of recent British history," that such had ever existed.

The author complains, "In every terrorist leader the Americans have seen a dusky George Washington, or a Jefferson with an Irish accent." Charmley goes further still: The British should never have fought the Nazis, this was a mistake of Winston Churchill, he claims.

Such drivellings bolster the absurd myth that the U.S. special relationship with Britain was a giant historical fraud against the British, who were forced to become subservient to the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The openness with which Charmley and his crowd in Britain reveal their hatred for the United States, and especially for any national leader who dares to remember the republican principles on which the nation was created, is useful. He drops the British oligarchy's mask and reveals the truth of the enmity which has in fact characterized Anglo-American relations from the time of the formation of the 13 colonies to the present. Let us therefore use this occasion to root out the disgusting disease of Anglophilia from American consciousness, once and for all.
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