

---

## Interview: Dennis Small and José Carlos Méndez

---

# Defenders of the drug trade 'want to wipe us off the map'

*The following are excerpts of an October 1991 interview conducted by Washington, D.C. journalist Carlos Wesley with Dennis Small, EIR's editor for Ibero-America and co-author of the bestseller *Dope, Inc.*, and with José Carlos Méndez, associate director of EIR's Spanish-language publication, *Resumen Ejecutivo*. Méndez, along with three other EIR journalists, was arrested and expelled from Venezuela in February 1985, when the police raided the Caracas offices of the EIR and the Venezuelan Labor Party and confiscated copies of the book *Narcotráfico, SA* (the Spanish-language edition of *Dope, Inc.*), prior to its unconstitutional banning by court order.*

*A full videotape of the interviews was presented at an Oct. 17 press conference in Caracas, Venezuela by Alejandro Peña Esclusa, secretary general of the Venezuelan Labor Party (PLV), and was later broadcast in Venezuela on RCTV television.*

**Q:** Mr. Méndez, what were the circumstances of your departure from Venezuela in February of 1985?

**Méndez:** Well, they were rather unexpected circumstances in that agents identifying themselves as DISIP [Dirección de los Servicios de Inteligencia y Previsión] came to my house, where I lived with my wife, in the early morning hours of Feb. 4.

**Q:** Venezuela's judicial police?

**Méndez:** No. A kind of political police. And they brought us both, together with Lorenzo Carrasco, another *EIR* correspondent who was visiting the country, to the DISIP offices, and there they immediately interrogated us about the existence of copies of *Narcotráfico, SA*. Evidently they searched the house and carried off copies that we had there.

**Q:** Then, you were attacked by the Venezuelan authorities?

**Méndez:** Well, I wouldn't say I was attacked. I don't consider it an aggression. I think that with the banning of *Narcotráfico, SA*, and the confiscation of its copies, the first party attacked is the Venezuelan Constitution, the Venezuelan in-

stitutions, and in general, the Venezuelan people, because they were denied information that I believe would have contributed a lot to preventing the growth of the drug trade, the consumption of drugs, and the laundering of drug money that we have had in Venezuela in the past five years.

**Q:** Your departure then was due to the book *Narcotráfico, SA*?

**Méndez:** Well, yes. At least some agents mentioned extra-officially, let us say, that our book had bothered some prominent Venezuelans, without giving further explanation. Later, it was published several times in various newspapers that Mr. Gustavo Cisneros had sponsored the action against the book. More specifically, as I learned later from the Venezuelan press, it appears that on Feb. 15 [1985], the Fourth Civil Court was the one that ordered the ban on the book at the behest of Mr. Gustavo Cisneros and Mr. José Rafael Revenega, who works with them. . . .

**Q:** Mr. Small, you are one of the co-authors of *Narcotráfico, SA*. Tell us, what can this book contain that would provoke such an aggressive reaction?

**Small:** I have asked myself the same question for the last six years. Frankly, it is a little surprising, because this book was distributed, edited, and published in many Latin American countries, not only in Venezuela, and in every country it freely circulates.

Were it slanderous to certain Venezuelan individuals or institutions, as some say, the correct way to proceed . . . is with a slander trial, and not with an injunction to prohibit the circulation of the book.

Thus, as a journalist, one is necessarily obliged to conclude that the intention here was to halt the circulation of the book, because it addresses the question of the international drug trade as a vast multinational business which, at the time, produced \$300-400 billion a year. From the time of the book banning, in 1985, through today, the drug trade has grown at a rate of 25% a year.

What the book explains is how and why this is occurring;

who is behind this; what are the international financial interests that launder the drug money. Because in the final analysis, the great beneficiaries of the drug trade are really neither the consumers nor the producers, but rather the financial and banking interests that launder the dirty money. Today, we are talking about \$558 billion a year! Thus, there is a great deal of interest.

**Q:** Can you elaborate a little more on this matter of the banks?

**Small:** Essentially, we are talking about more than \$500 billion a year in profit from the drug trade. That money has to be laundered somehow, to make it legal. This annual income of more than \$500 billion has been one of two fundamental supports for the international financial system during the decade of the '80s. To put it another way, without the money from the drug trade, the great banks of Wall Street, the City of London, and the other financial centers would not have been able to survive. They need drug money; they are the ones who benefit from that money and they are the ones who are behind the international drug trade. The book *Narcotráfico, SA* mentions the names of the banks and talks about them: Chemical Bank, Chase Manhattan Bank, Bank of America, and other banks, including the famous BCCI—something we had already said six years ago.

**Q:** Apart from being editor for Ibero-America of *Executive Intelligence Review*, you are associated with Lyndon LaRouche, U.S. politician and economist, whose name also appears in the book *Narcotráfico, SA* as the inspiration behind it. In fact, Mr. Small, you have just left jail. You were tried and jailed together with Mr. LaRouche, who is accused by some of being an expert in disinformation. The United States government says that Mr. LaRouche is in jail for tax fraud. You say that he is in jail, and was sent to jail for political reasons. What can you tell us about this, and what did LaRouche have to do with the publication of *Narcotráfico, SA*?

**Small:** In a certain sense, I have had the honor of a being a political prisoner in the United States. People think that there are no political prisoners in the United States. They're wrong: There are political prisoners. Mr. LaRouche remains in jail. I just left jail a few months ago. I was a prisoner for two years. We were accused of many things; the charges were absolutely political.

The main reason that LaRouche and I were put in jail was political. Since 1982, we have had evidence that the defenders of the international banks, that the defenders of the international drug trade, have had their eye on us, to wipe us off the map.

Concretely, I would like Venezuelan television viewers to know of a letter from Dr. Henry Kissinger himself, written in August 1982 and sent to William Webster, who was the director of the FBI at the time.

**Q:** The same Kissinger who today works as an adviser to the Venezuelan government?

**Small:** That's right. The same.

**Q:** On the foreign debt?

**Small:** That's right, and he collects a salary for the expert advice he offers in this regard.

**Q:** If I understand you correctly, Mr. Small, you are saying that Mr. LaRouche was silenced because he opposed the drug trade and opposed the new order of the bankers, of international banking. Is that true?

**Small:** Essentially, yes. LaRouche has been the leading opponent inside the United States to Bush's policies, which are keeping the international banks going at all cost, violating the sovereignty of any nation that gets in their way, be it Panama or Iraq, and now we have a great danger of an intervention that would violate the sovereignty of Haiti. And what is behind Bush's new order and the banks is the urgent necessity of guaranteeing their own financial situation, as we said earlier.

To accomplish this, two things are required. First, enormously increasing the drug trade. This is unfortunately what we see happening today in Latin America. And, secondly, increasing the rate of looting through payment of the foreign debt. To achieve this, innumerable new mechanisms have been invented.

One of the mechanisms popular today on Wall Street is the *privatization* of state companies. The idea of paying the foreign debt of a country with its national patrimony. In Mexico's case, for example, selling off airlines, Mexican banks, steel plants and perhaps also, as the banks are proposing, the de-nationalization of *Petróleos Mexicanos* (Pemex).

In the case of Venezuela also. And in the case of Argentina, Brazil, and so forth, there has been a lot of talk about privatization, which is nothing but the surrender of one's national patrimony to creditors through payment of the foreign debt.

If that isn't sufficient, what comes next—in our evaluation—is paying the foreign debt with national territory. And lo and behold, we now hear talk of swapping debt for nature. In that case, Mexico could pay its debt by handing over, perhaps, Baja California. And Brazil the Amazon, as is already under discussion. Perhaps they would want Venezuela to pay its foreign debt by handing over Lake Maracaibo.

**Q:** Isn't it a fact that even before *Narcotráfico, SA* was published, the movement associated with LaRouche had been involved in fighting drugs? You put out a publication known as *Guerra a las Drogas* (*War on Drugs*)?

**Small:** Yes, that is right.

**Q:** Some have said that this is a waste of time, that the war on drugs doesn't work, that it leads to violence, that it costs

too much, that the way to resolve the problem is by legalizing drugs, carrying out a dialogue with the drug trade, as is happening in Colombia, and that this will at least bring peace and resolve the problem of the violence linked to drugs. What do you think of this?

**Méndez:** Well, the proof that this will not lead to peace is what is happening today.

But I would like to approach this question from a different angle: All the arguments that the war on drugs cannot be won always leave out the key point of that war, as Mr. LaRouche declared several years ago—the question of money laundering. As long as this question is not addressed and the banks not prevented from laundering the money, the war is going to be lost. That is the central issue. And that, as Mr. Small explained, is the objective of the drug trade: the profits that remain in the banks. . . .

**Small:** I would like to add something. The matter of the laundering is fundamental.

Today, they are proposing in several Latin American countries the idea of a banking reform, of a tax reform whose purpose is to truly facilitate the laundering of drug money through the national financial systems of Latin America. Mexico is in the process of doing this; in Argentina, something similar is occurring. They are trying to free up the stock exchanges of several countries a little bit. They are talking about the same thing in Venezuela. And one must be very careful with this, because it can truly threaten institutions, since with this kind of opening up of the national banks to the international financial institutions, what will enter more than anything else is drug money.

Regarding legalization, well, one can always avoid crime by declaring the criminal act legal. In the case of the drug trade, something like that may be done.

No. We think it is better, no, necessary, to fight. If this means that sometimes one must spend a few years in jail, that's life. But one cannot surrender to the drug trade with pragmatic arguments. One cannot accept the destruction of one's nation.

I, as a citizen of the United States, have seen what has happened to American youth as the result of drugs. This is something intolerable, unacceptable for anyone who believes that the human being should be a creative person capable of contributing to the development of society. Man has been made in the image and likeness of God. We cannot tolerate in any sense—moral, economic, or political—the legalization of the drug trade, because this is a violation in the most fundamental sense of God's law, of the concept of man made in the image and likeness of God.

That is why we think that the humble contributions we have made through the knowledge we have of the international drug trade, are of some importance for the patriots of every country, and what we would like to see is Venezuela playing this kind of aggressive role in the international fight against drugs.

## The ADL: a profile of the dope lobby

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), which parades itself as a U.S.-based Jewish civil rights group "combating anti-Semitism," is in reality a sophisticated public relations arm of the international dope cartel. From its founding over 70 years ago to the present day, the ADL has been owned and operated by a collection of Jewish-surnamed gangsters and corrupted intelligence operatives linked to the late national crime syndicate boss Meyer Lansky, the CIA, Israel's Mossad, and to the same British banks that sponsored the international opium trade of the nineteenth century.

- Throughout most of the 1960s, the ADL's national chairman was Hollywood producer Dory Schary, a lifetime friend and protégé of Abner "Longy" Zwillman, the underworld boss of Newark, New Jersey from the time of Prohibition when he was part of the infamous bootlegging Reinfeld syndicate. Zwillman was one of Meyer Lansky's closest associates, as was Cleveland syndicate head Morris Dalitz. In 1985, the ADL proudly presented Dalitz with its annual Torch of Liberty award for his generous financial support.

- Another big ADL financial backer is Lebanese-born banker Edmond Safra. In 1989 alone, Safra donated \$1 million to the ADL. Yet, on Jan. 3, 1989, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) officials in Berne, Switzerland identified Safra and his New York Republic National Bank as a major element in the "Lebanese-Bulgarian connection" which floods Europe with heroin and hashish. Dope proceeds from the Middle East trade were traced by the DEA to a numbered account at Republic National Bank registered in the name Shakarchi Trading Company, a Swiss firm owned by long-time business associates of Safra. Simultaneously, other DEA agents working on "Operation Polar Cap" traced millions of dollars in Medellín Cartel cocaine profits to the same bank account.

- Another ADL national chairman during the 1980s was New York City attorney Kenneth Bialkin. In January 1980, a federal jury in the Southern District of New York found Bialkin and his law firm, Willkie Farr and Gallagher, guilty of having masterminded the theft of over \$260 million from Investors Overseas Service (IOS), an international mutual fund that was also used by the Lansky syndicate and the Israeli Mossad as a money-laundering service. Willkie Farr was ordered to pay \$35 million to victims of the IOS theft.

Bialkin's client in the IOS ripoff was Robert Vesco, who is a fugitive from a string of federal narcotics indictments in