

Now a man who may be innocent is under sentence of death. If the Israelis execute him, Hitler will have had the last laugh."

She concluded by saying that the Demjanjuk case is one good argument against legislating a new "war crimes bill" in Britain, and expressing the hope that the House of Lords will vote down such a bill.

The May 27 *Sunday Times* of London published a similar commentary, written by senior editor and noted Oxford historian Norman Stone. Without directly referencing the ITV show, Stone stated that the Demjanjuk case in Israel should only reinforce the argument against having war crimes trials in Britain. The evidence used against Demjanjuk, Stone noted, is "mostly Soviet, coming from people who are skilled in forging evidence," while the chief informant on the Soviet side was "the man who tried to make out at Nuremberg that Stalin's killing of Polish officers at Katyn was really a German atrocity." With such miscarriages of justice in mind, Stone advised: "British legislators should think carefully of the consequences of their actions: they are not in business to discredit the law." To legislate war crimes trials in Britain would be "counterproductive."

Stone affirmed: "And I do not believe that war crimes trials would do anything to improve the position of people of Jewish origin in Europe. Yes, there is still anti-Semitism. Most of it is harmless—a matter of sniggering at the preponderance of Jews in showbiz—and some of it is just a matter of clumsy phraseology. But relations between Jews and non-Jews are better than they have ever been, and that is also true of Eastern Europe. . . . Scares about a rise of anti-Semitism are overdone; there is now a serious chance, in Eastern and Western Europe, for Jews and non-Jews to work together, and I doubt if the spectacle of some old men, of doubtful identity, brought before the wrong courts in the wrong country, will do any good to that cause. . . . We could do without the whole wretched thing."

'From the prison in which the politician's career expires, the influence of the statesman is raised toward the summits of his life's providential course. Since Solon, the Socratic method has become the mark of the great Western statesman. Without the reemergence of that leadership, our imperiled civilization will not survive this century's waning years.'

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

IN DEFENSE OF COMMON SENSE by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Available for \$5 from:
Ben Franklin Booksellers, 27 S. King St., Leesburg, Va.
22075. Telephone (703) 777-3661.

Postage & Shipping: U.S. Mail: \$1.50 + \$0.50 each additional book.
UPS: \$3 + \$1 each additional book.

Presidential Elections in Colombia

Gaviria gets mandate

by José Restrepo

Despite the environment of wholesale terror created by the drug cartels in an attempt to sabotage Colombia's presidential elections, millions of Colombians braved the terrorists' intimidation on May 27 to vote into office the one presidential candidate who has pledged to continue the country's war to the death against the drug cartels.

"We will defeat narco-terrorism," said Liberal Party victor César Gaviria Trujillo in his first statement to the nation after learning the election results. The battle against the drug trade "will be fought in defense of our fundamental principles," he pledged, adding that his victory was also the victory of his predecessor Luis Carlos Galán, murdered by the drug mafia in August 1989. It was Galán's son who called on Gaviria to take up his father's banner and carry it into the presidency.

In pre-election campaign speeches, Gaviria told foreign correspondents, "No society can lose the fight against terrorism without risk of dissolving. I am in favor of facing up to terrorism, without making concessions to it."

The drug mafia's number-one enemy

As the number-one target of the mafia's assassin teams, Gaviria was forced to campaign under brutal conditions. Perpetually surrounded by an army of bodyguards, always accompanied by an ambulance, he could not make public appearances. Since last fall, three presidential candidates have been felled by mafia bullets. Gaviria's own campaign manager in the city of Medellín was slain just two weeks before election day. The remaining candidates—Alvaro Gómez Hurtado, Rodrigo Lloreda Caicedo, and Antonio Navarro Wolf—had all offered negotiations with the cartels, suspension of extraditions, and legalization of the drug trade as their campaign promises.

In the week prior to the election, car-bombs had been triggered in at least three major cities, killing 40 and injuring scores more at randomly chosen populated areas. The traffickers had threatened to bomb voting booths, and pledged to wipe the city of Pereira—Gaviria's hometown—from the map should Gaviria win the presidency. Rumors of mafia hit-teams roaming city streets began to circulate. People were terrified to leave their homes.

But on May 27, some 6 million Colombians went to the

for war on drugs

polls, with 48% of those giving Gaviria a clear mandate to wage total war against the traffickers, and against the “narco-tolerants” who have aided and abetted the cartels in their drive for political and economic power.

The threats of the narco-terrorists to sabotage the voting were thwarted in part by the creation of a highly effective joint security command force made up of army, police, and other security agencies. Some 250,000 troops patrolled the country. The government had promised to cover the costs of medical and hospital services in the event of terrorist incidents on election day. Curfews and alcohol bans were strictly enforced.

Gaviria has already taken some well-aimed swipes at the advocates of appeasement, saying that while tolerance was usually a laudable liberal attribute, he could not understand an attitude of tolerance “as a means of accepting the practice or preaching of violence.” He added, “The most valuable gift Colombia could receive is peace. We will fight relentlessly for it,” but not at the cost of “delivering our institutions in shreds.”

Gaviria has also issued a call to the developed nations to take up their part in the war on drugs. He argued, “The drug trade is a multilateral problem, and the industrialized countries are doing little to confront the problem of consumption. If they do not, it will become increasingly difficult for the Colombian people to understand that their sacrifice has no counterpart, and could be in vain. Rhetorical support, recognition that we are not a complicit country but a victim of the drug trade, is not enough. . . . [The consumer nations] have the historic commitment to work to reduce the consumption of drugs, to control arms trafficking and money laundering.”

In his victory speech, Gaviria said he would seek out dialogue with all political forces of the nation, since “this is not the victory of a single man or a single party. It is the victory of a nation. Today I am the President of all Colombians and, as such, I represent the desires of every citizen.”

Dialogue, or accommodation?

With Gaviria now President-elect, the campaign of the drug lobbyists has been launched to force him to “strike a deal,” to “make concessions,” and to “be flexible” with the

enemy. While the Colombian Constitution obliges Gaviria to proportionally represent the runner-up—in this case, Alvaro Gómez Hurtado (24%)—in his cabinet, Gaviria is in no way required to share power with those political forces who have opted for appeasing the narco-terrorist enemy. And yet the U.S. news media have pushed Gaviria in precisely that direction, falsely characterizing Gaviria’s victory as “a diminished mandate,” and claiming that the 55% abstention rate on election day had “weakened his authority” and would force him to turn to other political forces.

Among those other forces is the corrupt former President Alfonso López Michelsen, who hopes to force Gaviria into an accommodation with his associates among the cocaine cartels, and who is already maneuvering to capture key posts in the new government. Also waiting in the wings for such an opening is the narco-terrorist M-19, which won legalization as a political party from the weakened government of President Virgilio Barco. The M-19’s media-puffed image as “repentant guerrillas” and “peacemakers” lured nearly 13% of the vote to its candidate, putting former terrorist commander Antonio Navarro Wolf in third place. Just before the election, Navarro Wolf had publicly confessed his friendship with the fugitive leader of the Medellín cocaine cartel, Pablo Escobar.

U.S. media promote terrorists

The M-19 and its spokesmen have been extensively quoted in the U.S. media warning against Gaviria’s hard-line stance against the drug cartels and terrorists. The *Christian Science Monitor* of May 25 ran a display quote from M-19 candidate Navarro Wolf, describing Gaviria’s “two options: either fall back toward authoritarianism, or advance toward change.” Navarro is hinting that if Gaviria does not turn in the M-19’s direction, the “former” narco-terrorists might just have to return to the mountains to fight a new “authoritarian” regime. Also on May 25, the pro-drug *Washington Times* warned that “Gaviria’s strong position [against drugs] may mean that many Colombians could lose their personal liberties in the war against the drug traffickers.”

Gaviria is also under intense pressure to make liberal “reform” the watchword of his presidency. Both the López Michelsen and M-19 forces are clamoring for a “reorganization” and “reform” of Colombia’s security forces, many of which are in the vanguard of the anti-drug fight. This campaign has not surprisingly dovetailed with charges emanating from the drug lobby in both Colombia and the United States, that the Colombian armed forces are waging a “dirty war” against the population—with U.S. money and materiel—in the name of fighting drugs.

In the face of universally acknowledged corruption throughout Colombia’s political and economic circles, Gaviria’s task is indeed one of reform. A good place to start would be with a series of indictments against Colombia’s treasonous “narco-tolerants,” for aiding and abetting the enemy.