

me additional hope, that I must not get weary on that “shooting range” in Bosnia and Hercegovina. An English diplomat told me: “How did you manage to stay there [Banja Luka]? It was not meant for you to remain there; by remaining there, you have thwarted many plans” [laughter]. I hope I did not thwart them in the negative sense, but you are here to assess the value of this; I stand before you in judgment.

Q: What has been the personal toll on you, how did you maintain your equilibrium, between your faith and your daily life?

Komarica: I am sure I look very strange to you, one could say as one who has lost his marbles. This is a consequence of a horrible terror, psychological terror, and I can truly only thank my spiritual life, my faith, the power of faith, that I did not lose my mind. And I have a personal experience: From the time that I consciously crossed out the importance of my life, that the importance of my life is greater than any other person’s life around me, I felt miraculously free. I was no longer aware of the dangers I was exposed to every day. I simply did not register them, I did not want to pay attention to them, literally I took every day as the day I was going to be killed. I wanted obstinately to confront the evil that was spreading like magma to crush us all, for I considered that to be my duty. I wanted to go and see my priests, my nuns, members of my congregation, and whenever the churches were being destroyed, whenever they were terribly maltreated, I went right into the hands of criminals. I was kidnapped many times, and from a human standpoint I had no chance to save myself. I tried talking to the people that were hitting me, abusing me, beating me, in front of whom I was forced to lie down, I tried talking to them like human beings, “Don’t do this, folks, this is a crime, it is no good.”

It is not proper to talk about oneself, but I remember a scene when they ordered me to stand as they were about to shoot me. There were 10 of them, ready to shoot. I told them: “Aren’t you men sinning against your soul? One day you will reach this moment of death, and you will have to go before God.” “Why would you care about us? Your time is over.” “Good,” I told them, “I will pray now for you, so that God can forgive you, to bring a change to your hearts, but you must tell me how I should behave, should I stand facing you or turn my back to you.” I saw that the situation was hopeless, they were going to kill me. They said: “You are just joking with us.” “Good and well,” I said. “I ask you to take good care of yourselves, if you are going to kill me, let God forgive you, but I ask you again, don’t do it, for your sake, not mine. You will bring trouble on yourselves, for one cannot play with God, a man ought not play with God.”

But I have also seen magnificent examples from simple believers, the way they behaved in these terrible moments, when they were horribly maltreated physically, when they were being murdered, or about to be murdered, but survived. . . .

Jacques Chirac and the Menchurian Candidate

by Katharine Kanter

In mid-June, several hundred Indians from virtually every nation in the Americas descended for a week upon the National Assembly in Paris. They had been called together by the French government for a meeting on “indigenism,” ostensibly under the aegis of Philippe Séguin, president of the Parliament; however, according to what one might describe as well-founded rumor, M. Séguin was quite literally coerced by President Chirac into sponsoring the gathering, to the extent that he did not turn up at the plenary session where he was to be keynote speaker. Among the scenes of absolute madness over which Séguin was expected to preside, was an *animist ceremony* in the state apartments of the Assembly, and a *raising of totems* in the gardens. A note in the gossip column of the weekly *L’Événement du jeudi* recalled that in 1992, the 500th anniversary of Columbus’ arrival on American shores, M. Chirac refused to allow the City of Paris, of which he was then mayor, to take part in any celebration because he believes that Columbus et al. were a “misfortune.”

Double-take. Chirac? Friend of the Indians? The man who told a gathering of top French military brass but two months before, that his experience as a colonel in one of the most savage colonial wars ever fought, the Algerian War (1.5 million dead), was “by far my greatest experience as a human being,” the man who said 18 months ago, that he quite understood that French people worry about African immigrants because of the “smells and cooking odors” in tenement housing? The man who has just abolished conscription in favor of an all-volunteer army for out-of-area deployments?

Friend of the Indians?

Be that as it may, here we have Chirac, in his new incarnation as Friend of the Indians, sending messages to the French embassies all over South, Central, and North America, that they search out and rope in Indians suitable for a conference in the City of Light.

Sources at the conference told this news service that although UNESCO and other communitarian-indigenist

groupings in each country were involved in the selection process, the French embassies fine-combed the delegates. Then, to top off his edifice, like a gigantic sour cherry on a custard, Chirac had rotund Rigoberta Menchú flown, or rolled, in from Guatemala, as Conference Convenor. This woman won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1993 for being a terrorist. (Rumor has it that Rigoberta is actually Guatemalan slang for Rigor Mortis.)

Soustelle, France's answer to Columbus

The gathering got off to a particularly inauspicious start when, at the opening press conference given by Rigoberta Menchú (Séguin mumbled an inaudible word or two), a Salvadoran journalist stood up and read from a leaflet which the Schiller Institute had made available to the press corps at the National Assembly. The leaflet, entitled "Mr. Séguin's Little Indians," reproduced passages from Rigoberta's autobiography, notably the bits where she boasts of having thrown quicklime into the face of policemen.

At the following day's press briefing, the vice-president of the Assemblée, Nicole Catala, standing in for an "indisposed" Séguin, shredded, when shown, a copy of the same Schiller Institute leaflet. "I refuse to believe that Rigoberta could do such things. She seems like such a wonderful human being," she said.

Another wonderful human being, to Miss Catala, is Jacques Soustelle, upon whose memory she showered effulgent praise as the greatest of all French indigenists, apologist to the Aztecs, and, in her view, France's answer to the Original Sin of Christopher Columbus.

Soustelle, Friend of the Indians? During the Algerian War, Soustelle, a stringer for British Intelligence, ran the OAS, the Organization of the Secret Army, a savage terrorist group involved in several putsch attempts against then-President Charles de Gaulle.

Customary Law for the Indians

So, all this being said, what happened at the conference itself?

Well, it went on behind closed doors. Guyanese Deputy Léon Bertrand, an oily businessman who brought along a 20-man delegation of Guyanese Indians, and Bolivian Vice President Carvajal were its Lictors. The central issue discussed was Customary Law versus Domestic Law. The French brought in their best legal brains, to examine the finer points of customary law in each Indian area, in the light of how this might be used as a weapon against the domestic law of each American nation.

The concluding document states that from now on, Customary Law should be held to be on the same level as Domestic Law.

In other words, say there are a few Indian tribes dotted about a large territory. First, you build up among the Indians there, a sentiment that Customary Law has given them some

sort of divine right over the entire territory. Then, you make sure that there are plenty of arms among the Indians. You have a government soldier go crazy and kill a couple of Indians. Then you launch an uprising against the domestic government, secede from Bolivia, or wherever, and put the Indians' territory under UN or World Wildlife Fund protectorate. For their own good, of course.

Can a gunship be a totem, Virginia?

This correspondent wandered about the National Assembly, chit-chatting with delegates during the breaks. It transpires, that *EIR* is not alone in questioning the purity of motives of the French government. A group of South Americans told *EIR*: "France is strong. England is strong. Our countries are weak. If we go against our country, our new ruler will be France. Look what they did in Algeria. The French are a grasping people. Why did they invite us here?"

On June 29, shortly after the conference ended, the French daily *Le Monde* published a full-page, gushing, promotional for the Zapatista National Liberation Army in Chiapas, Mexico. A gaggle of radical chic theater and film people, all fresh back from Chiapas, the most important being Patrick Grandperret, the sociologists Alain Touraine and Gilles Perreault, and anthropologist Jean-Hubert Martin from the Museum of Arts of Africa and Oceania, called upon the French, or better said, Parisian cocktail party circuits, to support the uprising. Alain Touraine, one might add, was among the pontiffs at the Communitarian Network gathering in Switzerland on July 12-14 (see *EIR*, Aug. 2, "New 'Universal Fascist' Movement Is Formally Launched in Geneva").

Is all of this wishful thinking by a bunch of has-been, washed-up old colonialists in the President's entourage? Or is there not a gunship component to all this indigenist blather?

In the month of May, *Le Monde* published an op-ed by a French "strategist," Gen. Bernard de Bressy, president of the defense debate group "Athena," under the title "Wars of the Fourth Generation." The general believes that any future conflict France may become embroiled in, will be *colonial* in nature. The adversary, he writes, "will no longer be a state, but armed extremist groups, even narcotics cartels, crime syndicates, *ideological revolutionists, religious fundamentalists and all kinds of other things*" (emphasis added).

Putting General de Bressy's remarks in the perspective of Chirac's recent strategic briefings to his top military brass on "*projection extérieure*" (out-of-area deployments) as the cornerstone for the presently ongoing, sweeping reorganization of the French Armed Forces into an all-volunteer "*armée de projection*," or as the daily *Libération* puts it, "a gigantic Rapid Deployment Force" for foreign wars, the day may not be far off—at least in Chirac's dreams—that we shall see French troops deployed in the Americas.