

is to say, the FBI is still at this time involved in a coverup of the Hashemi matter and particularly Stanley Pottinger's involvement in it. A number of persons associated with *EIR*, including myself, filed a series of FOIA requests in 1985 concerning the Hashemi matter. One of these requests was to the FBI. In the court case involving this FOIA request, a few months ago, the FBI filed a declaration saying that they had no record whatsoever of wiretaps involving Hashemi, Hashemi's First Gulf Bank and Trust, and Stanley Pottinger. You should know that the existence of these wiretaps is very well known: It's not only been published in virtually all the major news outlets, but in a court proceeding in New York, there is a court order which discusses the fact that there was a court-ordered wiretap on Hashemi's offices during late 1980 and that these wiretaps were ordered by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Board, but despite the fact that it is on court record that these wiretaps existed, the FBI is denying in a sworn affidavit that they have any record of electronic surveillance of Hashemi.

The story going around for a number of years was that Stanley Pottinger was overheard on these wiretaps advising Hashemi how to circumvent the arms embargo and ship arms to Iran. Stanley Pottinger, you may recall, was an Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department in the Nixon administration. He also was reported to be a CIA operative and, in fact, was reported to be Hashemi's CIA controller for many of these purposes. The story that was going around—and this was broadcast and published in a number of places—is that Stanley Pottinger narrowly escaped indictment because the FBI had lost the wiretaps, and the overhears of Pottinger which apparently the Justice Department claims were necessary to indict him were lost, therefore he couldn't be indicted.

What is even more interesting about this is that these wiretaps may well be one of the smoking guns on the October Surprise. The time period of the wiretaps was November 1980 through January 1981, which is precisely the transition period between the elections and the inauguration of Reagan and Bush in January 1981. These wiretaps were of Pottinger and Hashemi: It is quite possible that if these tapes were to be located, they would shed a great deal of light on what was going on in this period and the October Surprise which is now coming back into public controversy.

EIR: Does this whole story and your direct and personal involvement over the last decade in the issue of the October Surprise, have anything to do with why you're presently sitting in a federal prison?

Spannaus: I have no proof, but I have suspected it might have something to do with it. The first time I was indicted was in December 1986, just as the Iran-Contra story was breaking, and I happened to know, at the time, more about Cyrus Hashemi than just a handful of people did, but I have no direct proof that that was involved.

Why is publisher Catholic magazine

by Umberto Pascali and Michael Maddi

In the month of May, the 30,000 American readers of the international Catholic journal *30 Days* may probably not be able to read their magazine. The U.S. publisher, Father Joseph Fessio, S.J., has declared war on the magazine's Rome-based editorial staff. At issue are two of the hottest topics you can find today: the magazine's opposition to the Gulf war, and its attack on Freemasonry.

Father Fessio announced in the April issue that "either the editorial staff in Rome will be effectively internationalized . . . or [his publishing company] Ignatius Press will join with the publishers of other disaffected national editions to produce an international Catholic magazine that will correspond to the intentions and aspirations of the original *30 Days*."

30 Days is published in Italian, English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and German. The magazine's style is extremely polemical and outspoken on social, political, and strategic issues, and it is rumored to be very close to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the Vatican's Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

The peregrinations of Father Fessio—an anti-liberal Catholic leader who worked hard to circulate *30 Days* in the United States and then ended up censoring four major articles in the last issue—reflect well the problems of certain "conservative" intellectuals. These problems exploded when George Bush's pro-war campaign counterposed the words "conservative" and "patriotic" to the teachings and the tradition of Christianity. No matter that this counterposition was purely nominalist; the social pressures on "conservatives" worked anyway.

'The war-mongering chorus of consensus'

Fessio admits as much, when describing how a group of his fellow conservatives stopped supporting the magazine. "Perhaps the best evidence is the letter which I received from Dale Vree, the editor of the *New Oxford Review*. Dale is a zealous, orthodox convert to Catholicism, who, like Joe Sobran and Pat Buchanan, opposed the war before it began, while it was in progress, and after it was concluded. And yet Dale asked me both by phone and by letter to have his name removed from our advertisement."

Already in the March issue, Fessio declared: "We are not against criticizing the U.S., President Bush or the Gulf war.

censoring in the U.S.?

... But the presentation here is markedly one-sided. The serious reasons some Americans, including American Catholics, have for supporting President Bush are not represented." As an example, he quotes the report by the Vatican paper *Osservatore Romano* that there were "100,000 dead in Baghdad" by day four of the war, saying that this was a totally false statement. Why? Because "the Iraqi foreign minister claimed only 23 civilian casualties." Besides "the only evidence we have of weapons being used in a way that violates *jus in bello* is the repeated Scud attacks on Israel and Saudi Arabia."

The fact that many independent international observers are reporting as many as 500,000 Iraqi war deaths, civilian and military, and a genocidal U.S.-led bombing campaign against civilian infrastructure, seems to have escaped Father Fessio.

Fessio continues: "The question is asked: 'Can the war be just if it fosters U.S. oil interests?' Why not? . . . But perhaps the most ludicrous bombast of all is from the Italian professor who claims that the U.S. has entered this war 'to avoid falling into a decline' because we cannot accept a more geopolitically important Europe that does not need the U.S. . . . Governments do not fight wars. Men fight wars, and I defy anyone to find a single American troop who is there so that the U.S. will not decline in its international prestige. . . . Perhaps the sheikh of Kuwait is a dictator. But even if he is, he is a little dictator. And the Americans do not like to see the little guy, even if he is a little dictator, have his country annexed. . . . Saddam Hussein has now given ample evidence available to anyone with a radio or a television set that he is a barbarian, a liar, and a terrorist."

This is why, in the next issue, Fessio made the decision to substitute four articles with which he disagreed, with letters sent by readers supporting his position (with a "93% approval rating").

He explains: "You will be missing 1) one editorial which begins: 'The strategy of international Masonic power. . . ' and more than implies that the editorial interpretation of the Pope's position on the Gulf war has the same binding force for Catholics as dogmatic definitions of the faith; 2) an interview with a Jewish German philosopher who accused the U.S. of imperialism and—two sentences later—of isolationism; 3) an interview about the 'war-mongering chorus of

consensus' among the 'warlords'; and 4) an introduction to episcopal views on the war accusing Billy Graham of 'anti-Roman spite and Yankee ideology,' *The Economist* of a 'hysterical pro-war campaign,' and 'the powerful of the world' of 'inventing wars or religions.' "

Father Fessio also cut the last part of an interview with the Ibero-American theologian Alberto Methol Ferré on how the Anglo-Americans are "balkanizing the Arabs," solely because it ended on a page that Fessio was replacing *in toto*. The censorship was a shocking decision, especially because the magazine is prepared entirely by the editorial board, including the translations, and because people read it precisely because of its refreshingly polemical and controversial style and content.

What was censored: Masons vs. the Pope

What was it exactly that the U.S. readers of *30 Days* couldn't read? First of all, the editorial, "Wordly Power Against the Pope." It explains that the Pope, resisting pressures from both inside and outside the Church, had prevented a historical tragedy even greater than the war in itself: the endorsement by the papacy of the Gulf war as a war of religion!

It reads in part: "The strategy of international Masonic power aims at destroying the core of the Catholic faith and the Church by means that are sometime declared and sometimes devious. During the bloody war in the Gulf, it made every effort to transform the Catholic Church—and especially the Successor of Peter—into the chaplain of the West, as well as Western values and its bellicose enterprises. Miraculously, the Apostolic See in Rome avoided the threat inherent in such submission, which would have relegated it to playing a base role as guardian of the 'new moral order' imposed by Western weapons.

"As *Osservatore Romano* wrote last Feb. 11: 'In terms of independence and authority, the service of the Apostolic See in the promotion of peace is undoubtedly favored by its sovereignty.' . . . In the face of the 'absolute dominion' of the one worldly power, this international treaty [the Italy-Vatican concordat] proved to be providential in holding back the tide of pressure and threats that had inundated Rome. . . . But a new and more insidious danger emerged immediately after the war [in the form of a media campaign pushing a line of separating the position of the Pope from that of the Church]. The notion these headlines would like to disseminate is that the Apostolic See's action against the futile massacre in the Gulf can be traced back to the individual, the protagonist himself who is all of a sudden seen as a fascinating figure—John Paul II. 'The Pope is pursuing *his* line of reflection, *his* line of preaching,' said the Italian Communist philosopher Massimo Cacciari. . . . It could be said that where the 'pride of the powerful' did not succeed with pressure and threats, the assault was renewed with the more diabolical weapon of flattery."

The editorial concludes demonstrating how this is unacceptable to the Church.

A media 'opera'

Another example of egregious censorship was against the editor of *Osservatore Romano*, Mario Agnes, whom Fessio did not even mention by name, but who is clearly the number-two target of his campaign. Agnes castigates the behavior of the media during the war, including those publications considered close to the Catholics that tried to black out the pro-peace position of the Pope. "What provoked more pain was to find in the war-mongering chorus also media from which we had the right to expect more objective information. . . . The mistakes of the media were first of all pedagogical. A devastating 'opera' was directed against thousands of young people, who were subjected to disastrous 'pro-war euphoria'. . . ." Agnes does not hesitate to compare this atmosphere to that of fascism in Italy. "A climate was created that really reminded us of methods, themes, and regimes that we hoped were definitely over. Look at the wrong forecasts, the lack of information on the effects of the war, stupid and false slogans like 'surgical operation' continuously repeated." Referring to the very powerful pressures on the Vatican, Agnes insists: "The Church doesn't have to ask anybody's permission to speak about the war and to pursue all the roads and means to reach peace. . . . One thing anyway is certain: *Osservatore Romano* will never be part of the 'chorus,' neither in the large matters, nor in the small."

No to fundamentalism

Next to fall under Fessio's scissors was a long article by the editor of *30 Days*, Antonio Socci: "Bush and *The Economist*, *Time* and the Masons. Everybody Suddenly Is a Fundamentalist." Socci notes how suddenly all the sponsors of the most advanced and far-reaching ecumenicism converted to hatred against Islam in order to serve the aims of the Anglo-Americans. "Suddenly the stocks of anti-ecumenical fundamentalism soared on all the religious 'stock exchanges.' It is not by chance that the famous televangelist Billy Graham oversaw the 'spiritual retreat' of President Bush the day before the war. The Episcopalian bishop of Washington, Edmund Browning, however, refused to justify his war theologically.

"Graham is part of a large group of televangelists who have never hidden their anti-Roman spite and their Yankee ideology. 'From this war a new peace will be born and—as the President says—a new world order,' he announced on Jan. 17, comparing the 'material Babylon,' i.e., Baghdad, with the 'spiritual Babylon,' i.e., the Roman Church. Suddenly the fundamentalist fever exploded. A super-ecumenicist such as Dr. Robert Runcie, the former Anglican primate, surprisingly takes a strong position in favor of the war of religion. His successor, also a progressive, Dr. George Carey, on Feb. 13 blocks a peace resolution at the World Council

of Churches. *HIRAM*, the magazine of Italian Masonry, calls for a 'just war' and attacks the 'clumsy' '70s-style ecumenicism of the Vatican. . . . Even *The Economist*, which had never before shown itself to be worried about the destiny of Christianity, writes: 'The next big battle is between Islam and Christianity.' . . . *Time* magazine published a picture of Saddam Hussein accompanied by Biblical quotes to show that he is the Antichrist. . . . But the president of the Italian Catholic Workers, Giovanni Bianchi, says: 'If Bush wanted a crusade by the Vatican, he was mistaken.' . . . And the bishop of Algiers: 'The tensions are not coming from the Muslims and Christians, but from the decision to start this war.' . . . 'The Arab world,' wrote Bruno Etienne, an authority in the field, 'knows unrest due to hunger that I call IMF unrest and which is attributed by Western media to the Muslim Brotherhood rather than to the World Bank and the carelessness of the local leaders.' On the other side, it is precisely Saudi Arabia, the most 'moderate' and pro-American of the Arab states, which finances everywhere the organization of Islamic fundamentalism—in agreement with Washington. . . . The Algerian Bechir Boumaza said: 'The way that King Fahd understands Islam is analogous to the way Bush understands Christianity' ."

Finally, Socci explains that while John Paul II is preparing a social encyclical to celebrate the 100th anniversary of *Rerum novarum* of Pope Leo XIII, he stresses that the people of the Third World today are like the proletariat in whose defense *Rerum novarum* was written. That encyclical not only condemned the exploitation of the workers, but more deeply sought to free them from the "pseudo-social demagog" of the Masons.

A 'dissident' view from Germany

The final victim of Fessio's censorship was the Jewish-German philosopher Ernst Tugendhat, of Berlin University, who writes that he fears the Pax Americana in the Gulf and is disappointed with the Europeans. "Maybe it was too early to expect something autonomous from Europe already. The Americans sped up the time of intervention because they feared the so-called Bonn-Moscow axis. The Western European countries supported the U.S. option so rapidly because the U.S. said clearly what was at stake in the Middle East, and so the individual countries were afraid of losing their influence if they did not participate."

Commenting on the position of Israel, he writes: "As I said already elsewhere, the Israelis are playing on German guilt feelings like on a piano. It is of course right that Germany says: We are in favor of Israel. But this does not mean to approve everything the Israeli government thinks right. The Israelis, by oppressing the Palestinians and lacking absolutely any perspective of coexistence with the Arabs, are pursuing a policy that is very problematic also for them. The Germans should contribute to a different and broader perspective."