A 'Plan' for disaster

From President Pastrana's standpoint, the FARC tour of Europe was designed to convince the governments there that his so-called "Colombia Plan" is worth the billions he is asking them to commit to it. The plan, which few Colombians have been privy to, is a hodge-podge of proposals for stabilizing the country, anchored around a so-called anti-drug strategy which pledges to slowly reduce the country's vast acreage of drug crops by 50% over the next six years, and completely over the next 12 years—as if the country could possibly survive the political, economic, and social mayhem that long. Nowhere does it mention that drug production in Colombia is meanwhile doubling every four years.

The Colombia Plan also makes no mention of recovering the land currently under FARC domination, revealing that it was, in fact, designed for another purpose entirely. Rather than fighting drugs, Pastrana's Wall Street-endorsed Colombia Plan is a scenario for channeling international investment funds into so-called "alternative development" projects, which, in Colombia, are a euphemism for drug cultivation. A pilot project for the Plan is already under way inside the FARC-controlled territory, under the auspices of the Pastrana government and the United Nations, where millions are being channeled through the "authorities"—that is, the FARC supposedly for road-building and "crop substitution." As former Armed Forces commander Gen. Harold Bedoya (ret.) told a Washington, D.C. press conference on Feb. 23, this is like handing Marshall Plan funds directly to Hitler and Mussolini, in the middle of World War II! (See "LaRouche, Bedoya, in Washington, Urge Defense of Nation-State, War on Drugs," EIR, March 3.)

Not only will drug cultivation *not* be eliminated this way, but the involvement of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and foreign investors is a guarantee that the FARC will be protected from any attempts by the Colombian military and police to stop the kidnapping, blackmail, and drug trafficking which are the *raison d'être* of the narcoterrorists. This will mean the virtual legalization of the drug trade.

Anticipating such a scenario, President Pastrana has already agreed, under pressure from the international human rights lobby, to eliminate whatever resistance to this plan that might emerge from military ranks. Immediately following last month's release of a document by the non-governmental organization, Human Rights Watch, condemning the Colombian Armed Forces for alleged links to death squads, Pastrana announced that any member of the military against whom evidence—or even suspicion—of collaboration with so-called "paramilitaries" is alleged, will be automatically booted from the Armed Forces, without even benefit of an investigation. Analysts consider such a move, taken on the basis of the President's own discretionary powers, to be the death knell of the Colombian military as an institution defending a sovereign nation.

Continental Europe steps into the British trap

by Rainer Apel

Over the last three months, Germany most of all, but also France and Italy have been destabilized by "corruption" charges and other scandals directed against national political institutions. "Revelations" by the German-Canadian arms dealer Karlheinz Schreiber, a fugitive from German and Swiss prosecutors who lives in a comfortable exile in Toronto, played a crucial role in generating the scandals that have primarily paralyzed the Christian Democrats of Germany. But some aspects of Schreiber's insinuations have also re-opened investigations in France, into charges of embezzlement linked to the Elf-Aquitaine oil company, with which Schreiber did business in the 1990s.

In both France and Germany, the destabilization began in the first days of November 1999. On Nov. 2, French Finance Minister Dominique Strauss-Kahn was forced to resign over a relatively minor affair involving charges of embezzlement, during an earlier affiliation he had had with student insurance funds. And on Nov. 4, the German media reported charges of a conspiratorial transfer of 1 million deutschemarks in 1991, involving Schreiber and Walther Leisler Kiep, then party treasurer of the German Christian Democratic Union. This opened a big can of worms on illegal party-funding methods of the CDU.

What was the political context for these developments? Well, by late October, the governing Socialists of France and Germany were on the brink of breaking not only with the "Third Way" of Britain's Prime Minister Tony Blair, but the Germans and Italians were also about to join with the French in a united thrust for reform of the International Monetary Fund. This is not to say that those reforms would have solved the fundamental problem with the IMF's freemarket austerity conditionalities, but what the French, in particular, had to say about the priority of state-run economies over the free market, has been a red flag for the hardcore monetarists of the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) faction. The scandal-mongering campaign which the BAC launched, particularly against Germany, has now alienated the German Social Democrats from the French Socialists, such that the French find it impossible nowadays to discuss economic issues with the Germans, who seem obsessed with their domestic scandals. Phase One of the destabilization of France and Germany, through the paralysis

EIR March 10, 2000 International 63

created in Germany, has worked rather successfully for the BAC crowd.

The second phase of destabilization was launched with the artificial, Europeanwide controversy over Jörg Haider, a right-wing populist, whose party became part of Austria's ruling coalition. When, more than three months after the national elections in October, coalition talks between the Austrian Christian Democrats and Social Democrats broke down in mid-January, the former decided to form a coalition with Haider's Freedom Party, instead. This provoked what commentators in the British press, such as Lord William Rees-Mogg of the Times, have slyly but appropriately described as "hysteria" on the European continent, resulting in a joint resolution of 13 European Union governments, backed by the British, to boycott Austria politically, as long as Haider's party, being pilloried as a "neo-fascist" party (although it is actually Thatcherite in its policies), stayed in the government. And the EU's General Administrator of Security Policies, Javier Solana, went beyond that, in a Feb. 17 interview with Germany's Die Woche weekly, when he called for the overthrow of the Austrian government: "There are only two consequences to be drawn: that the Austrians act, and that Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel act by returning to the coalition" with the Social Democrats.

Schröder lashes out

It was German Chancellor Social Democrat Gerhard Schröder, however, who expanded the EU conflict with Austria into a new round of squabbling among the 14 anti-Austrian EU members themselves. In an interview published on Feb. 17 by the German weekly Die Zeit, which caused a uproar in Italy, Schröder said, in response to a question about whether he would call for the same kind of EU sanctions against Italy, should the Haider phenomenon emerge there, that the EU "would have to, if neo-fascists sat at the government table, there, again. . . . The new policy does not stop at [the borders] of states with a large population and great economic power." Schröder said that western Europe had gone through a profound transformation, with its single currency, its coordinated foreign and security policy, which was made possible by the sacrifice of national sovereignty. This implied a right to intervene in any nation's affairs: "Values and criteria do exist here, which set the standard for all members."

Schröder did not specify whom he meant to address, when talking about "neo-fascists" who might enter an Italian government, "again"; it may be assumed that he, like other commentators on the matter, was referring to the National Alliance party (AN). (Strangely enough, no reference is ever made to the Forza Nuova, the real neo-fascist party.) And, although a conservative party, the AN cannot be accused of xenophobic remarks of the kind that have been a trademark of Austria's Haider, which earned him the label "neo-fascist." What the AN has made its trademark these days,

is rather its vigorous campaign for a New Bretton Woods financial system—and the only ones that can criticize the AN for that, are those BAC/City of London circles that hold onto the ailing IMF system—the same circles that are orchestrating the destabilization of Germany and France, as the two other potential supporters, in Europe, of a New Bretton Woods arrangement.

Italians react

Schröder's blast did not go uncontested: Italian Prime Minister Massimo D'Alema announced that his government would make a formal protest to Berlin, while President Carlo Azeglio Ciampi asserted: "All Italian parties are democratic." Former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, who had brought the AN into his government, called Schröder's remarks "an unacceptable interference into Italy's internal affairs."

Last November, when Schröder and his Socialist colleagues of France and Italy met in Florence, they agreed to oppose the economic policy of Tony Blair. What prompted Schröder, three months later, to threaten the Italians over the potential entry of a party like the AN into the government, if that same party featured a strong anti-Blair policy? Making the AN issue one of phony "neo-fascism in Italy," Schröder is doing the dirty work of the City of London, which wants the campaign for a New Bretton Woods and the debate about its original author, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., to be firmly suppressed. A situation is being orchestrated in Europe which makes it a taboo for Europeans to look at proposals for an overhaul of the IMF system, because the Europeans are being told that it is politically incorrect to study initiatives that come from "such a party" as the AN.

Since all European governments will remain unstable, as long as they are unable to create a viable alternative to the ailing world monetary system, the cohesion of the European Union is now placed in question. If 13 EU governments could be so easily manipulated by Britain into a conflict with Austria, and when the German Chancellor threatens the same kind of action against the Italians, more such conflicts seem pre-programmed.

To reach us on the Web: www.larouchepub.com

64 International EIR March 10, 2000