

or "painted faces," a term which refers specifically to Argentina's nationalist military, and more broadly to anti-IMF military forces on the continent. A "*carapintada* international" is about to be formed, Helfgot shrieked, "financed by LaRouche."

But Helfgot's real concern is revealed in his assertion that regional intelligence services think that the alleged *carapintada* international "is a threat to the stability of democratic governments."

Apart from Helfgot's lying fabrications, the truth is that the Anglo-American establishment is very worried about the emergence of anti-IMF civilian-military forces in several Ibero-American countries and the potential they represent for overturning the international banking community's policy of "democracy" based on usury. One day after Helfgot's article appeared in *Clarín*, excerpts were published in newspapers in Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela.

LaRouche and *EIR* have repeatedly exposed the fact that the Anglo-American establishment is committed to the destruction of Ibero-America's armed forces, in its drive to eliminate national sovereignty. Thus Helfgot's compulsion to identify *EIR*'s Buenos Aires correspondent Gerardo Terán as the "link between LaRouche and Seineldín," and lie that *EIR* is the means by which LaRouche is organizing the alleged *carapintada* international. He worriedly reported that *EIR* was planning an April 22 seminar entitled "The Russian Crisis, LaRouche, and the Strategic Defense Initiative: How to Save the World from World War III."

Helfgot's publicity helped ensure a very successful seminar in Buenos Aires, attended by 80 people. Similar seminars were held the same day in Lima and Rio de Janeiro, all attended by foreign diplomats, military officers, scientists, political and labor leaders, students, journalists, and even intelligence "spooks."

Aside from presenting details on the implications of the Yeltsin proposal, speakers at these events emphasized the urgency of freeing LaRouche from federal prison in the United States, to make possible his crucial input into defusing the present dangerous strategic crisis.

On the same day as *EIR*'s seminar in Rio de Janeiro, the daily *Jornal do Commercio* published an article by Lorenzo Carrasco, *EIR*'s correspondent in Brazil, commenting on the Russian offer. The proposal, Carrasco emphasized, "has the obvious backing of the powerful Russian military-industrial complex, which means that it is serious and transcends any eventual governmental changes which might derive from Moscow's volatile internal political situation."

The Russian proposal, he explained, nullifies the insane doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction which dominated the Cold War era, and makes obsolete the strategic nuclear weapons on which the doctrine is based. "What then is the argument for continuing to impose a 'technological apartheid' on the developing nations, if the excuse of proliferation no longer exists?"

## State Dept. grooms S. American leftists to be Presidents

by Peter Rush

Five high-level officials of the U.S. State Department and National Security Council, along with a World Bank vice president and others, met on April 22 with three leftist contenders for the presidencies of Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela, respectively: Luiz Inacio "Lula" da Silva, head of Brazil's Workers Party (PT); Antonio Navarro Wolff of Colombia's M-19 Democratic Alliance; and Pablo Medina of Venezuela's Causa-R party.

Making the meeting more remarkable was the fact that Navarro Wolff is a "former" narco-terrorist involved in the cold-blooded murder of 12 Colombian Supreme Court justices in November 1985, among many other atrocities committed by his guerrilla group, the M-19. "Lula" da Silva is an ignorant but dangerous demagogue trained in the school of "Liberation Theology" based on preaching Marxist "class struggle." Together with Medina, all three are leading members of the São Paulo Forum, an organization founded in 1990 under the auspices of Fidel Castro's Cuba to try to "regroup" the communist and radical parties of Ibero-America under Cuban leadership, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

### On parade at Princeton

Just six days earlier, on April 16-17, the same three, joined by Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas of Mexico's Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD), Rubén Zamora of El Salvador's Farabundo Martí Liberation Front (FMLN), and Luis Maira, secretary general of Chile's Socialist Party, took part in a public relations show held at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, a training ground for State Department officials. The affair, designed to boost the credibility of all six candidates, both back in their own countries and in policymaking circles in the United States, was entitled "Alternatives in Latin America: A Panel of 1993-1994 Latin American Presidential Candidates."

Cheered by a partisan audience of leftist students and professors and fed pabulum questions by a panel of academics and journalists, the six used the occasion to assert their strong support for ill-defined concepts of "social justice," "democracy," and "helping the poor," while saying absolutely nothing about how to reverse the deepening poverty and economic crisis afflicting every country. Although they rant-

ed about “human rights,” when asked by *EIR* to take a stand on the case of jailed American statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., not one of them would denounce this violation of human rights. Television cameras were on hand from stations in each of the six countries, plus Cable News Network’s Ibero-American division, to make sure that the folks back home saw the candidates being welcomed and cheered in the United States.

Behind both the State Department meeting and the Princeton forum is the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD), the establishment think-tank that designed Bush’s policy toward Ibero-America, and which now enjoys excessive influence within the Clinton administration. In fact, Dialogue chairman Peter Bell was one of the Princeton panelists, as was IAD executive committee member Abraham Lowenthal.

The IAD is using all of its resources in a campaign to destroy the armed forces of Ibero-America, by attacking them first as superfluous in the post-Soviet era and as ostensibly a waste of scarce budget resources, and second as ostensibly the leading violators of “human rights” in their battles against drug mafia-backed guerrilla subversion. In this latter endeavor, the IAD has supported the terrorist FMLN in El Salvador, and supports de facto the Shining Path narco-terrorist butchers of Peru.

The April 22 meeting with the State Department in Washington was set up by the IAD, and was attended by Peter Hakim, a leading Dialogue member. Richard Feinberg, the National Security Council’s Latin American specialist who attended the Washington meeting, is the former chairman of the Inter-American Dialogue. Also attending that meeting from the State Department were: Harriet Babbitt, U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS); Luigi Einaudi, the outgoing U.S. ambassador to the OAS and a decades-long State Department operative for Ibero-America; former Sen. Tim Wirth (D-Colo.); and John Shattuck of the State Department Office of Human Rights.

### **Alternatives or enforcers**

The inclusion of the unrepentant terrorist Navarro Wolff in the meeting is particularly shocking. Speaking in December 1985 about the Nov. 6, 1985 armed assault on the Supreme Court by his M-19 group, Navarro justified the attack by saying its purpose was to “destroy one of the last, if not the last, respectable institution which the country has.” And in 1986, even the State Department’s counterterror chief Robert Oakley testified before the U.S. Congress that the M-19 had been paid \$5 million by the Medellín drug and terrorist cartel for the assault, which burned most of the legal records on the drug traffickers, who were also wanted in the U.S., and intimidated judges throughout the country. It hardly came as a surprise that this ally of the Medellín Cartel argued, in an interview with this reporter, that drug trafficking should be decriminalized in the developed countries.

In publicly promoting leftist presidential candidates, the

Washington establishment is preparing for the presidential elections slated over the next two years in a half-dozen Ibero-American countries. Washington is well aware that the governments of Carlos Salinas in Mexico, César Gaviria in Colombia, and Carlos Andrés Pérez in Venezuela have all implemented the International Monetary Fund’s (IMF) policies faithfully, and that their parties will all likely be swept aside in massive popular outpourings against these policies. Thus the need for *controlled* “alternatives”—which in no way threaten the existing framework of international usury.

The content of what all six presidential aspirants had to say over more than eight hours of panel discussion, established that not one of them has an economic program significantly different from IMF programs now in place. Nonetheless, given the increasing likelihood of a popular revolt in several countries against the existing ruling parties, fueled by economic hardship, Washington is grooming these candidates rather than risk having real anti-IMF nationalist forces come to power and overturn the apple cart.

### **No to protectionism**

Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas of Mexico, who almost certainly won the Mexican presidency at the ballot box in 1988, only to have it stolen from him by vote fraud by the ruling PRI party, portrayed the disaster that President Carlos Salinas de Gortari has created by his free market economic program, especially noting the more than \$20 billion trade deficit, but presented nothing at all as his economic alternative. Pressed by this reporter in an interview as to whether he would consider any restriction of free trade which has flooded the country with imports, wiped out whole swaths of domestic industry, and created the trade deficit, Cárdenas answered that under no circumstances would he return to protectionism of any sort.

Lula of Brazil answered this reporter’s question from the floor on what alternative he had, by saying his party is still working on one, and blustering that he couldn’t be expected to present an alternative “in only five minutes.” But he had previously claimed that Brazil needs no economic program, only a social program to better distribute the wealth already produced—a measure guaranteed to cut existing production in half.

That these leftists actually represent a continuation of Anglo-American policy was revealed most explicitly by FMLN leader Rubén Zamora, who boasted that he supported the United Nations’ imposition of limited sovereignty on his nation through phony peace accords. “A part of our sovereignty has moved to international bodies like the United Nations,” he said, “and we support that. This is more fair” for El Salvador. Stating that any “autonomous, national economic project” was “unviable,” Zamora explained that Ibero-America has no choice but to “integrate itself” into a U.S.-led economic bloc, or “be integrated” into it willy-nilly. “We are superfluous to the rest of the world economy,” he added.