

Coca: The Sacred Leaf Of British Imperialism

by Luis E. Vásquez Medina

This article was translated from Spanish.

Wall Street and the City of London must have burst out laughing when they heard the “revolutionaries” Hugo Chávez and Evo Morales at the opening of the Fourth Summit of the Bolivarian Alternative for the Peoples of the Americas (ALBA) in January 2008. There, Chávez, the Venezuelan President, clarifying that he was no drug addict even though he was in the habit of chewing coca leaves in the morning, defended his consumption by publicly chewing some, while asking his Bolivian counterpart, Morales, to explain the plant’s beneficial properties. Morales obliged, saying that “after extensive research, Harvard in the United States has affirmed that the coca leaf is the best food in the world. . . . In sum, the coca leaf in its natural state . . . is beneficial . . . it has proteins, vitamins . . . the United States is a winner with Coca-Cola. The essence of the coca leaf was part of Coca-Cola.”

Coca Is Not a Food

Historically, Anglo-Dutch imperialism has depended not only on weapons and financial warfare to impose its will, but also on inducing its victims, through psychological and ideological warfare, to accept, and even defend, their subjugation. That same Anglo-Dutch imperialism, today, called globalization, does just that with the promotion of coca by a large part of the “anti-neoliberal” opposition, those who believe and spread the historical, anthropological, and anti-scientific lie, according to which the coca leaf is the soul of the Andean nations, a wonder-food. This great lie expresses the strategic plan of the British utopian imperialists like the Huxley brothers, Julian and Aldous, who presented their battle plan in Aldous’s *Brave New World*, in which slaves will be controlled by making them feel “happy” with the cheap drug “soma”—coca.

The promotion of the coca leaf by today’s Anglo-

Dutch imperialists is not gratuitous. Ninety-eight percent of coca is used to produce cocaine, whose traffic—as was revealed in the late 1970s by Lyndon LaRouche and associates in the famous book *Dope, Inc.*—is the beloved business of the international financial banks, since it constitutes the source of that flow of money indispensable for sustaining their world financial system, which is today dying of acute illiquidity.¹

The international financial oligarchy, on the one hand, promotes the legalization of coca/cocaine, while at the same time condemns its cultivation, thereby fanning the flames for Bush and Cheney’s constant assaults against the sovereign nation-state. It is important to emphasize that the supposed “war on drugs” by the British agent Dick Cheney and his neoconservative friends is in no way intended to actually eliminate the drug traffic; that is why the financial controllers of the drug trade—Cheney and company’s bosses on Wall Street and in the City of London—are never touched.

Thus the campaigns to eradicate coca cultivation allow globalization to intervene, including militarily, against the countries of Ibero-America. Bolivia could well prove to be the first victim of this strategy, which in the end, seeks to balkanize us.

In Ibero-America, the drug trade has turned into a power above even some of our governments; it controls many of the most important communications media; it has political parties and legislators at its service; it has overthrown and imposed Presidents. It functions as the real power in many interior regions of the Andean countries, a power that is reinforced by its ties to terrorism.

Today, this supranational mafia, allied to the international synarchist banks, hopes to fulfill its old dream:

1. In June 1999, then-president of the New York Stock Exchange Richard Grasso travelled to the Colombian jungle to meet with the leaders of the narco-terrorist FARC. This unusual episode made clear the already long-standing ties of Wall Street and the City of London to the drug trade.



Creative Commons/www.benettontalk.com

The coca leaf harvest in Peru. The scientifically fraudulent argument that coca is nutritionally beneficial started—where else?—at Harvard University, in 1975.

legalization of the coca leaf, with which the transformation of the Andean nations into narco-states would be just around the corner, and a major step will have been taken toward the indiscriminate legalization of drugs on a global scale.

Thanks to the multimillion-dollar campaign, run for more than three decades by the drug mafia and international financial interests, the legalization of the cultivation and trade of coca is today a possibility. The immediate objective is to get coca removed from Schedule 1 of the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, at the March 2009 meeting of the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs; that is, to remove its classification as a banned substance, at the Vienna Convention of 1961.

Running this drive are well-financed NGOs and enraged coca-growing organizations sponsored by the financing of George Soros since the 1980s, through the Andean Commission of Jurists.²

2. The final declaration of the Coca and Sovereignty Campaign event, held in La Paz, Bolivia on July 31, 2006, organized by coca-growing groups of the Andean region with the backing of the Andean Commission of Jurists, stated: “With the 1961 UN Single Convention [ratified in 1988], and especially since 1998, with the approval of the United Nations Action Plan, the use of force was legalized and the eradication of coca bushes imposed, with its sequel of death and repression, as well as serious damage to the environment. . . . In this context, to decriminalize the coca leaf is the equivalent of removing it from the Schedule I of substances prohibited under the Vienna Convention (1961, 1988), and that goal is what the Coca and Sovereignty Campaign has proposed for the new meeting of that body in Vienna, in the year 2008.”

A key element in the campaign to decriminalize the cultivation and trade of coca has been the spread of fraudulent anthropological, historical, and economic arguments in its favor, which range from presenting coca as the basis for the national and cultural identity of the Andean nations, to claiming that it has nutritional properties and even industrial applications. This has reached the point that the National Culture Institute of Peru, under the former government of Alejandro Toledo (who is owned by George Soros), and the Bolivian Foreign Ministry under the Evo Morales government, declared the coca leaf to be the cultural patrimony of their respective nations.

The arguments for industrializing the coca leaf—for example, using it as toothpaste (!)—are so ridiculous as to require no refutation. The argument that coca is a food does require a conclusive rebuttal, since this will be the key argument put before the international community in the campaign for its legalization, even more so, given the present world food crisis, the result of economic deregulation imposed globally, but affecting, above all, the poorest nations of our continent and the world.

Harvard’s Fraud

In March 2006, the Morales government of Bolivia had barely been sworn in, when its Foreign Affairs Minister David Choquehuanca proposed that the coca leaf be included in the country’s student lunches, to take advantage of its calcium and phosphorous content. He reported that the use of these leaves as a nutritional supplement was a part of the policies the new Bolivian government was studying, to vindicate the plant’s value.

These and other arguments, such as those of the Peruvian Humala family on the “astounding” food quali-

In this same vein, an article appeared in the newspaper *Los Tiempos*, of Cochabamba, Bolivia, on Oct. 17, 2006, revealing how the Transnational Institute, one of George Soros’s multimillion-dollar-financed European NGOs, lobbied the Evo Morales government in favor of a campaign to decriminalize coca: “Members of Transnational Institute (TNI), a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), yesterday presented the Government with studies and arguments supporting the request for decriminalizing the coca leaf, a plan that is currently on the United Nations’ list of dangerous substances.”

TABLE 1

Comparison of the Nutritional Content of 100 grams of Coca Leaves with That of 50 Edible Plants

| Nutritional Elements | Units per 100 grams | Coca Leaf | 50 Edible Plants |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Calories | Cal. | 305.0 | 278.8 |
| Water | g. | 8.5 | 40.0 |
| Protein | g. | 18.8 | 11.4 |
| Fat | g. | 3.3 | 9.9 |
| Carbohydrates | g. | 44.3 | 37.1 |
| Fiber | g. | 13.3 | 3.2 |
| Calcium | mg. | 1,789.0 | 99.0 |
| Phosphorus | mg. | 637.0 | 270.0 |
| Iron | mg. | 26.9 | 3.6 |
| Vitamin A | IU | 100,000.0 | 135.0 |
| Vitamin (B-1) | mg. | 0.58 | 0.48 |
| Riboflavin (B-1) | mg. | 1.73 | 0.16 |
| Niacin | mg. | 3.73 | 2.25 |
| Vitamin C | mg. | 1.40 | 12.96 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Vitamin E | IU | 43.5 | — |
| Vitamin B-5 | mg. | 0.308 | — |
| Folic Acid | mg. | 0.13 | — |
| Vitamin B-12 | mg. | 1.05 | — |
| Biotin | mg. | 0.0865 | — |
| Pantothenic Acid | mg. | 0.684 | — |
| Iodine | mg. | 5.0 | — |
| Magnesium | mg. | 213.0 | — |
| Zinc | mg. | 2.7 | — |
| Copper | mg. | 1.21 | — |
| Sodium | mg. | 40.6 | — |

Source: James Duke, David Aulik, and Timothy Plowman, "Nutritional Value of Coca," *Botanical Museum Leaflets* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1975).

ties of the coca leaf, have become commonly accepted in our countries. The infamous "Harvard Report" has provided a supposed scientific underpinning to such lies.

Harvard University, a nest of synarchists, published a fraudulent report in 1975, in which it stated that the coca leaf has nutritional properties. It was prepared by the Harvard's Botanical Institute, by James Duke and collaborators,³ who declared that their goal was to justify coca-chewing.⁴

3. James A. Duke, David Aulik, and Timothy Plowman, "Nutritional Value of Coca," *Botanic Museum Leaflets* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1975).

4. Coca-chewing is the traditional way in which the coca leaf is consumed in the Andes. It involves chewing the coca leaves, and mixing the resulting pulp with saliva and some alkaline substance—ashes or chalk, for example—keeping this tucked for a long time between the molars and the cheek, where the juice of the coca is extracted; the cocaine

But this research and other examples in the same vein were not guided by the laudable intention of using coca flour as a solution to the hunger problem; on the contrary, all the "scientific" papers are fraudulent propaganda pieces prepared *ex profeso* to promote the legalization of coca on the South American continent. The same arguments and anti-scientific methods of Harvard were used in 1986 by William E. Carter, Mauricio Mamani, et al., in a book that has been given widespread distribution, *Coca en Bolivia*.⁵ The book states that coca is the best food available to Bolivians.

Since 1975, Harvard has been turned into the "scientific authority" that is cited by pro-legalization lobbyists worldwide. There are at least three bills to legalize the coca leaf pending before the Peruvian Congress, which explicitly base themselves on the Harvard Report.

What Is Harvard's Trick?

Violating all the rules of serious research, the Harvard Report presents the results of a chemical analysis of the coca leaf, in which the presence of numerous proteins, vitamins, and minerals is cited *as definitive proof of its nutritional value*.⁶ Based on these chemical analyses, the authors conclude that coca "surpasses 52 of the vegetable species, that feed all of Latin America, in nu-

passes into the blood through the mucus lining of the mouth, numbing the tongue and the cheeks. This means of consuming coca is one of the quickest and cheapest ways for the human body to absorb cocaine, even if the dose is small. Coca-chewing is considered to be a drug addiction under the 1961 UN Convention on Narcotics.

5. William E. Carter, Mauricio Mamani, José Morales and Philip Parkerson, *Coca in Bolivia*. In Peru, psychologist Baldomero Cáceres, who drugged himself in front of his students to demonstrate that coca and cocaine are innocuous, based himself on this book's arguments to claim that he was filling his mouth with the supposed "nutritional transcendence" of coca. Cáceres is a researcher for the Andean Commission of Jurists, founded by British intelligence and financed, among others, by George Soros, the biggest promoter of drug legalization in the United States.

6. Among the 50 foods used for comparison are ten grains (*Amaranthus Caudatus*, *Oriza sativa*, *avena sativo*, *chemopodium Pallidicaule*, *quinoa del chenopodium*, *Hordeum Vulgare*, *Scalle Cereale*, *Coix Lachrima Jobi*, *Zea mayos* and *triticum Aesticum*), ten tubers (*Canna edulis*, *Caapsicum*, *spp.*, *allium Saticum*, *arracacha Xanthorriza*, *batatas de Ipomoca*, *Cyclanthera Pedata*, *máximos de Cucurbita*, *Allium Cepa*, *Brasica Oleracea* and *Tropacolum Tuberosum*) and ten fruits (*Persea americana*, *pin'a Cosmosus*, *Musa Sapientum*, *Cocos Nucifera*, *passiflora Mollissima*, *Annona Cherimolia*, *Prunus Persica*, *Fregaria spp.*, *Annona muricata*, and *Ficus Carica*). That is, the greater part of the foods that are currently consumed in the Andean region (see Table 1).

tritional value,” and that “ingesting 100 grams of coca leaf surpasses the daily needs of calcium, iron, phosphorous, vitamin A, vitamin B2, and vitamin E, as recommended by the World Health Organization for a single person.”

However, as any competent biologist or nutritionist knows, the food value of a plant or animal does not lie solely in its nutritional content, but also in the state and manner in which they present themselves for assimilation by the organism.

In the case of human beings, although the presence of nutrients in some animal or vegetable product, as revealed by a simple chemical analysis, could surprise the naive, the fact is that many vegetable and animal products (grass, leather, etc.) contain proteins, carbohydrates, vitamins, and mineral oils, but cannot be absorbed by our bodies, and therefore are not food. In the case of the coca leaf, the macronutrients (proteins) present in the leaf cannot be absorbed by the human organism, and the micronutrients (minerals and vitamins) that it contains, in small quantities in comparison to other plants, make its potential contribution to the human diet negligible.

As the Center for Information and Education on the Prevention of Drug Abuse (CEDRO)⁷ declared in De-

7. In 2002, Adriana Cordero published her thesis in pharmacology, in which she presented her results on the nutritive value of the coca leaf. The study worked with groups of six to nine male rats, over five weeks, each with a starting weight of around 50 grams. The rats were fed without any protein and lost weight. Some who were then fed with casein (milk protein) for ten days, recovered the weight (31.22 grams). Those fed with four different kinds of protein from the coca leaf (without the alcaloid) during the same ten-day period, gained practically no weight (4.5 grams). Further, it was proven that the weight of various organs was less in the group that consumed coca protein.

Dr. Cordero refers in her conclusions to the fact that food containing different levels of coca-leaf protein, consumed by rats during their growth process, produced a lesser development of vital organs and a lower weight increase, compared to the animals which received a diet of casein. All the rats that were fed coca-leaf protein died.

Ramos Allaga and colleagues published (2004) their findings from a study of the nutrition of rats fed coca leaves that had been de-cocainized (without the cocaine alcaloide) and without colorants. There were four groups: a control group fed only casein (CAS), and three experimental groups fed with different kinds of prepared proteins—free of alcaloides—obtained from the coca leaf. The results showed that the rats fed casein gained significant weight (approximately 60 grams), while those supplemented with coca-leaf proteins increased only a little (5 grams, that is, just 9% of the increase of those fed the casein).

Another recent study, performed at the University of San Martín de Porres, showed that when laboratory rats are fed with dietetic supplements based on coca leaf, they die in the first nine days of treatment. A food supplement containing 10% coca leaf produces mortality in 37%

December 2006, “The publicity campaigns of the previous three months by the promoters of coca flour and nutrition with coca-flour bread, have based their possible nutritional uses, among other things, on ‘the nutritional value of the coca leaf proteins,’ which is not supported by the scientific literature. Apparently, they haven’t read the scientific studies published in the country in the past fifty years on nutrition and the coca leaf. The results of those studies do not support the hypothesis of nutritional use of coca leaf proteins. Laboratory animals (mammals) nourished by coca leaf protein lose weight, and at higher doses . . . die.”

The Harvard Report is a fallacy of composition, in that it presents information in a partial way, with the purpose of deceiving the ingenuous, who abound on our continent, as we have seen, especially among our Presidents.

Harvard’s “scientific” method is surpassed in its stupidity only by the research of the so-called “participant observer” anthropologists, who base their studies on polls, in which they ask the Andean farmer or miner why they chew coca leaf. The predominant and expected answer is: “Because it relieves hunger.” These social “scientists” therefore conclude that coca is food.

As we shall see, the coca leaf’s property of assuaging hunger without nourishing the body, has turned it into one of the principal tools of imperialism since the Hapsburgs first colonized the Americas.

The scientific proof that the coca leaf is not a food is really very simple, and easily understood by any university undergraduate.⁸ When laboratory animals are exclusively fed with coca flour, they all die within a short period of time, not merely from malnutrition, but because the cocaine affects the animal’s liver; when rats are fed with de-cocainized coca flour, while the toxic effect against the liver disappears, no nutritional property is demonstrated.

With these results, which can be proven as many times as necessary in a laboratory, one could shut up all

of the animals. With 20% coca leaf, the mortality rises to 75%, and with 40%, all the animals die. All the rats that did not receive coca leaf supplement survived.

All the studies carried out experimentally, using recognized methods to demonstrate the nutritional value of coca leaf preparations for laboratory animals, have shown unsatisfactory results and a low level of nutritional value and incapacity to sustain mammals.

Source: *La hoja de coca en la alimentación (The Coca Leaf in Nutrition)*, (Lima: CEDRO, 2006).

8. *Psychoactive*, No. 22, magazine of CEDRO (Lima: 2006).

those speakers who travel around our Andean countries praising the nutritional benefits of coca, with the simple challenge: “To be consistent with your own arguments, you should subject yourself to a diet consisting exclusively of the super-nutritious coca leaf for a few weeks!”

Pervian Science vs. Freud

Since the beginning of the 20th Century, the founders of Peruvian psychiatry, headed by Dr. Hemilio Valdizán, warned of the noxious effects of coca-chewing by the inhabitants of the South American Andes.⁹ They vigorously opposed the pro-coca current set in motion by the Nietzschean psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud.

Coca was brought to Europe almost immediately after the Conquest of the Americas, but it wasn't until chemistry had developed so as to be able to analyze its active ingredients, that chemist Albert Niemann, in 1860, isolated the primary alkaloid of the plant: cocaine. Freud, who experimented with all kinds of drugs (and died as a result of oral cancer from his addiction to tobacco), was effusive in his praise for cocaine. He wrote that with cocaine, “one feels an increase in self-control, greater vigor, and more capacity for work. On the other side, if one works, the volatility of the mental forces caused by alcohol, tea, and coffee, is lost. Simply, one is normal, and in a short time, it becomes difficult to understand that one is under the influence of a drug. One can carry out physical or mental labor for a long time, without fatigue; it is almost as if the need to eat or sleep vanishes, which otherwise one would feel at certain hours of the day.”¹⁰

For more than 12 years, Freud consumed cocaine intravenously and prescribed the drug for practically every complaint of his patients: depression, stomach ailments, insomnia, weakness, sexual impotence, as an aphrodisiac, and to cure drug addiction (!) and alcoholism.

9. Hermilio Valdizán, *La alienación mental entre los primitivos peruanos (Insanity Among Peruvian Primitives)* (Lima: 1915). “With regard to the harmful qualities of coca, to Peruvian cocaine use, it is not without a certain bitterness that we must state that our call to study the problem, our recommendation on this to government branches, men of science and goodwill, and even to those who for years have been defending our Indians from the mistreatment of unscrupulous shysters and still less scrupulous government officials, have all been ignored. All that merits the deepest disdain.”

10. Antonio Escohotado, *pía de drogas (Drug Guide)* (Spain: Omnibus Mondadori, 1990).

His criminal behavior—added to the promotional campaign run by Parke & Davis and other laboratories interested in distributing cocaine worldwide, which used slogans like “Don't waste time, be happy,” and “If you're feeling down, ask for cocaine”—produced a pandemic that rapidly spread among the wealthier classes of certain European countries.

It reached the point that Viennese doctor Emil Erlenmeyer accused Freud of having unleashed “the third scourge of the human race,” after alcohol and morphine. In Great Britain, cocaine became so popular that by the end of the 19th Century, it was said that not a single writer in the Empire did not resort to cocaine to sustain his efforts. This is reflected in their literature. Robert Louis Stevenson conceived the novel *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* under the influence of cocaine, which his doctor had prescribed to treat his tuberculosis. Arthur Conan Doyle, the creator of Sherlock Holmes, was a frequent user, and described as cocaine addicts several prominent characters in his novels.¹¹

British imperial interests immediately saw how useful coca could be, and wasted no time in bringing it to their colonies, with the intention of extending its cultivation. It was sown in India, where it is still consumed by eating it, and in Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) and Malaysia, as well; however, their plans were frustrated because the coca cultivated in those regions had very low cocaine content. Their vision of a world in which a small handful of oligarchical parasites were served by subhuman servants kept “happy” through consumption of a cheap drug, was described in *Brave New World* by Huxley, who years later revealed that he had used coca as the model for his “soma,” the drug that kept his novel's slaves happy and docile.¹²

Dr. Hermilio Valdizán published his fundamental contribution to the modern condemnation of coca in Lima's *Crónica Médica*. In his article, “Cocaine Use and the Indian Race,” he attributed to coca part of the responsibility for “the indigenous degeneration.” His legacy was taken up by Peruvian doctors and scientists


11. In *The Sign of the Four*, a novel published in 1890, Arthur Conan Doyle provides a detailed description of the habits of a cocaine addict. At the end of the novel, a resentful Sherlock Holmes tells his companion Dr. Watson, “For me . . . there still remains the vial of cocaine.”

12. “‘Glum, Marx, glum.’ The clap on the shoulder made him start, look up. It was that brute Henry Foster. ‘What you need is a gramme of soma. All the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects.’” Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1932).

who followed up his research, primarily at the Medical School of the Greater University of San Marcos. In the early part of the 20th Century, Carlos Paz Soldán, Carlos A. Ricketts,¹³ Carlos Gutiérrez Noriega, Vicente Zapata Ortiz (1946) and García Giesman (1950), among others, established the scientific basis for banning coca. These studies led to the United Nations' decision in 1961 to classify coca as a substance harmful to human beings.¹⁴

All the praise and so-called arguments in favor of the nutritional power of the coca leaf put up during the colonial and republican eras, until the beginning of the 20th Century, were based on subjective judgments, which, in good measure, responded to the colonial criteria of the *encomenderos*—the Spanish colonialists granted control of the Indians by royal decree—and the large landowners who enjoyed having semi-enslaved Indians to do their work for them, without having to provide them with food, while keeping them “happy” with coca. Even today, this can be found.

The most important and serious research demonstrating that the custom of chewing coca was harmful to the inhabitants of the Andes, was carried out by Peruvian



In Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, coca was the model for the mind-numbing drug soma.

vian doctors Carlos Gutiérrez Noriega and Vicente Zapata Ortiz. Their research was published in 1946 with funding from the Fostering Peru's Culture Award, under the title *Studies on Coca and Cocaine in Peru*.¹⁵ Dr. Gutiérrez was mysteriously assassinated in Europe not long after his work was published, and Zapata Noriega was the Peruvian delegate to the UN Economic and Social Council, where he urged the condemnation of the coca leaf on the part of that institution.

In its introduction to the book, its publisher, Peru's Education Ministry, wrote: “...*Studies on*

Coca and Cocaine in Peru is a true revelation about a vital aspect of our reality. We have reason to hope that its presence will destroy the errors that still predominate, and that it will begin the social reconstruction of those regions which suffer the ravages of cocaine use. For freeing a people from enslavement to a radical drug which, by unimaginable error, has enjoyed for several generations the good opinion of many men of science and government, would be, to our mind, the greatest reward to which the authors of this book could aspire. The nature of its content, the transcendence of the theme addressed, and the clarity of its presentation, as well as the valuable conclusions and intellectual prestige of its authors, calls for the beginning not just of a new era in the history of coca use, but in the very history of Peruvian medicine and the social well-being of the Andean Region.”

Unfortunately, in the mid-1960s, the international financial oligarchy, with a vast flood of financing directed through NGOs, launched the campaign to eliminate this condemnation of coca and cocaine, a condemnation that had stood as a cultural paradigm in all of our Andean countries until the end of the 1960s, a paradigm which Gutiérrez and Zapada had helped create. Their work summed up the experimental research that the Medical School of the Greater University of San Marcos had begun in 1936, and was based on meticulously pre-

13. C.A. Ricketts, father of Dr. Patricio Ricketts, who was President Leguía's doctor, a Congressman from Arequipa, and the leader of the fight against the addiction involved in coca chewing; a great defender of Peruvian Indians. See his *Ensayos de la legislación pro-indígena (Essays on Pro-Indian Legislation)* (Arequipa, Peru: 1936).

14. Recently, the UN body charged with overseeing compliance with international drug treaties, the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), urged “the Governments of Bolivia and Peru to adopt measures without delay, with an eye to abolish those uses of the coca leaf which contradict the 1961 Single Convention, including the practice of chewing it.”

In its 2007 *Annual Report on Drugs*, the INCB also criticizes the fact that those two countries are planning the industrialization of coca leaf, as in the production of coca tea, which goes beyond the medicinal use that international treaties assign to that plant. And it asks that those countries think about a legal change to “abolish or prohibit” the practice of coca chewing, as well as “the fabrication of other products that contain coca alkaloids for the purpose of domestic consumption or export.” Philip Emafo, president of the INCB, recently declared that chewing coca leaf is “harmful or could be harmful, and I believe that the people who drafted the [1961] Convention believed it to be harmful, that it should not be practiced.”

15. Carlos Gutiérrez-Noriega and Vicente Ortiz, *Estudios sobre la coca y la cocaína en el Perú (Studies on Coca and Cocaine in Peru)* (Lima: 1946).



StoptheDrugWar.org

Coca leaves are set out to dry alongside a highway in the Chapare region of Bolivia.

pared experiments with laboratory animals, and observation of coca-chewing habits among populations in the mountains and in Peruvian prisons.

Their conclusion was overwhelming: Coca-chewing is a drug addiction. Gutiérrez and Zapata determined that “daily ingestion of 100 grams of coca leaf represented the ingestion of 0.2-0.3 grams of alkaloids per day,” a significant amount of cocaine.

This proof was admitted by some of the more cynical defenders of coca-chewing. One was Anthony Henman, a British anthropologist who works with the Transnational Institute, one of the most powerful of George Soros’s pro-legalization NGOs in the world. Henman recently said: “Using coca as a food would be a waste, since coca’s value lies in its cocaine, [and] chewing the coca leaf provides the perfect dose of cocaine.” Thus, he admitted what Gutiérrez and Zapata’s study had established more than five decades earlier, but he uses this knowledge to promote his perversion. There exists no qualitative difference between the chewing of coca in the Andean world, and the use of cocaine in the Western world. The difference between the two is merely a question of dose.

Gutiérrez and Zapata’s book points out, “From an historic viewpoint, it is nearly certain that coca was prohibited during the era of the Incas, probably for religious reasons, and that the practice of coca-chewing spread after the Conquest, until acquiring its current proportions.” It then concludes:

1. Cocaine is one of the most dangerous drugs, due to the rapidity and intensity with which it produces addiction, which has been experimentally demonstrated in animals, in which the habit is more easily induced than with morphine.

2. Coca chewers habituated to large doses of coca present sharp changes, similar to those of cocaine addiction. Habitual coca use or coca addiction has a slower course than cocaine addiction, and its symptoms are less intense. We do not generalize this concept to coca users habituated to moderate doses.

3. When the drug enters the organism orally, as with coca chewing, the symptoms of addiction are less intense than when the drug is administered by other means. For this reason, the physiological and psychological changes observed in coca users are nearly always less severe than the changes that cocaine addicts present.

These conclusions, among others of Gutiérrez and Zapata’s book, were abundantly confirmed by later scientific studies. Coca/cocaine constitutes the most powerful natural stimulant known. Unlike psychotropic drugs (opium, heroin, LSD, etc.), which make users useless for physical labor, coca/cocaine promotes the exploitation of the labor force, above all in forced labor, where man without the aid of machinery and technology, is used as a beast of burden.

It is the ideal drug which the oligarchy has long dreamed of. With coca/cocaine, one produces a human being degraded to the condition of a “happy” slave, without the need to provide adequate nutrition. This was the history of the colonial slavery of the Hapsburgs in South America. How true were the words of the famous Peruvian writer Enrique López Albújar—father of a Peruvian Army general assassinated by the narco-terrorist MRTA—who wrote in the mid-20th Century:

“Possibly it is coca that makes the Indian appear like a donkey; but it also makes this human donkey work our mines in silence; resignedly cultivate our cannibalistic mountains; carry burdens where machines and beasts have yet been able to pass. Such a donkey deserves to enter the ranks of man and to participate in all the advantages of citizenry.”

These phrases synthesize the shameful inheritance that our Andean countries have suffered since the colonial era of the Hapsburgs, and make clear that the great republican desire has yet to be realized.