

ante the process," as the *New York Times* decried in its Dec. 8 editorial.

Instead, the *Times* argued the need for a new definition to the principle of non-intervention. "Compelling circumstances can justify armed infringement of national sovereignty. Those circumstances prevail in Haiti today." Accusing the Haitian government of permitting "chaos and terror," the *Times* argued, "Haiti is a special case, not one of civil war but of anarchy," and said that the country will "descend into deeper tragedy . . . without inter-American intervention."

Next target: Panama

Panama is the next target of this theory of non-sovereignty.

Speaking at a forum on the "Crisis in Panama" held at Georgetown University on Dec. 8, Panamanian opposition leader Roberto Eisenmann called for foreign intervention, not excluding a military invasion, into Haiti. The concept of "sovereignty of the State" is outdated, Eisenmann said. Today it must become subordinated to the concept of the "sovereignty of the individual." Haiti should be the test case for this doctrine, he stated.

Sharing the podium with Eisenmann was an old foe of Panama's, Dr. Norman Bailey, former National Security Council official. Bailey demanded that a similar "democracy" be installed in Panama, which, he claimed, requires both that the commander of the Panamanian Defense Forces, Gen. Manuel A. Noriega, be removed, and, "getting rid of the institution" of the military entirely in Panama.

General Noriega, a nationalist, telephoned Haitian leader Gen. Henri Namphy to express "Latin American understanding and mutual solidarity between their two armies and governments," according to the *New York Times* Dec. 5. Both referred to the "disinformation campaigns skillfully orchestrated by powerful foreign interests as well as strong internal movements of destabilization."

Signor Antonio Stradivari made instruments
Unequaled by calipers, lasers or meters.
Modern Audio is a similar artisan-form
Employing proprietary crafty skills.
Still, no one knows, how far music reproduction can go.
Money should be spent to find out: Let's
Fund a crash program of research and development,
Encase results in attractive wooden cabinetry,
Advertise our accomplishment to the world
And take the market over!

The Listening Studio

23 Stillings Street
Boston MA 02210

For the Love of Music and Technology

Runcie adversary found dead in U.K.

by Mark Burdman

An important political-theological adversary of Queen Elizabeth's beloved Archbishop of Canterbury Dr. Robert Runcie has been "removed" from the British scene. In an event reminiscent of some of Edgar Allan Poe's short stories, New College, Oxford University don Dr. Gareth Bennett, now identified as the author of an attack on Runcie in an official Church of England publication, was found dead at his Oxford home during the evening of Dec. 7. Police are claiming that "all the indications" were that Dr. Bennett had taken his life, although no suicide note was found. He was found dead in his garage, his body lying in his car with a tube leading from the exhaust to the interior of the car. Before his body was found by a friend, Dr. Bennett's cat had been found dead in his house. An inquest into his death was opened on Dec. 9.

After Bennett's death, two high-level Church of England officials, Derek Pattinson, secretary general of the General Synod and James Shelley, secretary of the Church Commissioners, held a press conference Dec. 8, and stated that Dr. Bennett had been the author of a harsh attack on Runcie's leadership, which had appeared in the church's "Who's Who" publication, the 1987-88 *Crockford's Clerical Directory*. Previously, the identity of the anonymously authored *Crockford's* article had been kept secret. Pattinson and Shelley decided to announce this, after the Oxford coroner had indicated he was going to launch a police investigation to find out the author of the *Crockford's* piece, in an attempt to discover the motives for Dr. Bennett's death.

On Dec. 4, the *Daily Mail* of London had headlined, "Attack on Runcie Upsets the Queen," noting: "The personal attack on the Archbishop of Canterbury in the preface to the new *Crockford's* has offended the Queen, who is head of the Church of England." The *Crockford's* preface accuses Runcie of elitism, of being an ineffectual leader, and of overseeing the moral decline of the church. It had been published out of the London headquarters of the church, at Lambeth Palace, and, therefore, with official authorization, even if behind Runcie's back.

According to reports from the U.K., Bennett had been coming under extreme pressure in the days before his death, from pro-Runcie liberals in the church hierarchy. The *Daily Express* reported Dec. 9 that Bennett was to "face a fierce inquisition" called by church officials for Dec. 10, to answer for his actions.

It can be surmised that the mobilization against Bennett

would have been even more intense, under conditions of the East-West "New Yalta" momentum, given Runcie's Buckingham Palace-backed status as a key figure in pro-Russian Orthodox Church "ecumenical" initiatives, and given the power of pro-Eastern freemasonic operatives within the "Runcie clique" heading the church.

It should not be overlooked that the Anglican Communion will hold its once-a-decade Lambeth Conference early next summer, and that a major topic on the agenda will be whether or not to eliminate the *Filioque* clause, identified since the 9th century with the Western conception of technological progress, from the Creed. Several national Anglican churches have already done so; and the worldwide Anglican communion is expected to vote on the issue at Lambeth.

According to several Episcopalian theologians, Runcie and his gang have been devoting tremendous energy into ensuring that Lambeth will give its imprimatur to the *Filioque*'s elimination, and were eagerly looking forward to presenting this as a "gift" to Moscow, at the millennial celebrations of the Christianization of Russia, almost immediately after Lambeth's conclusion.

The most frequently heard analysis passing around Britain, is that the stress caused by the pressure led Bennett to commit suicide.

The *Daily Express* Dec. 9 comments that Bennett feared that the church was "gunning for him" over his damning attack on Runcie.

'Incredible infighting'

Particularly violent pressure on Bennett had been coming from the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Hapgood, who is widely rumored to be positioning himself as the next Archbishop of Canterbury, should Runcie resign, and who had bitterly denounced the *Crockford's* preface as "scurrilous, sour, and vindictive." Hapgood is a strong advocate of liberal policies on homosexuality and AIDS. A trained biologist, he is a medical-theological adviser to the World Council of Churches' AIDS task-force, a group formed specifically as a response to the LaRouche-backed California voter referendum, Proposition 64, of 1986. He is a factional ally of Runcie's, but even more to the liberal-left and more ideologically committed to liberal views than Runcie is.

Bennett was a traditionalist in church and political affairs, and ally of the powerful number two man of the church, Bishop of London Dr. Graham Leonard, Runcie's chief opponent on such issues as ordination of women. According to the Dec. 9 *Today*, Bennett's main aim in writing the *Crockford's* preface, was to "unify a powerful alliance of Tory politicians, including Mrs. Thatcher, and leading churchmen, to block [Runcie's] natural successor, the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Hapgood."

One London observer, himself a member of the Church of Scotland, commented to *EIR*: "The pressure on Bennett was very, very great. There is an incredible amount of polit-

ical infighting in the Church of England. The factionalization, politicking, and conspiracies are growing and growing, all in response to the liberalization of the church under Runcie. It's become a hotbed of Roman-type politics."

This observer said that the atmosphere of intrigue and conspiracy was exacerbated by "the large problem of homosexuality among clerics. This has caused tremendous upheavals. The recent Synod debate on homosexuality was one of the most shocking debates I could ever remember. It has shaken the very heart of the Anglican faith."

Friends of Bennett are, according to British press accounts, "mystified" by his death, especially as he had appeared perfectly normal and happy in the past days. Dr. John Cowan, dean of New College, Oxford, said: "I have known him for nearly 30 years and I just cannot explain it. It's totally out of character that he could do such a thing." The Rev. Archie Miles, vicar near Bennett's Oxford home, said he did not believe Bennett was the author of the *Crockford's* attack, nor that he was capable of suicide. Fellow high churchman Roy Porter said, "I'm appalled at the very great pressure he was put under." Conservative Church of England theologian Dr. William Oddie said that Bennett had had "some powerful enemies."

The *Times of London* editorialized Dec. 9 that Bennett's death "may bring much bigger troubles to the Church of England."

Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of
Executive
Intelligence
Review

Order from:
**Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.**
27 South King St.
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$4.95 plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available.

