

of economic and social developments, people have organized intimate relationships and made choices that define their relationships and made choices that define their views of themselves and their places in society, in reliance on the availability of abortion.”

Hence, terminating 1.6 million lives yearly for birth control, convenience, economic relief, job advancement, or gender selection, is such a fundamental part of our culture, according to the Supreme Court, that it cannot be reversed. The majority writes that to overturn a “watershed” opinion “under fire” without a most compelling reason would subvert the court’s legitimacy. And, given the abortion controversy, we cannot do so without “some special reason over and above the belief that a prior case was wrongly decided.”

Even so, the abortion industry is up in arms over the ruling because the Supreme Court says the 1973 *Roe* ruling never gave women an “unqualified constitutional right to abortion.” The opinion says court decisions since *Roe* have expanded a woman’s abortion rights to the detriment of substantial state interests in protecting the woman’s health and “the life of the fetus that may become a child.” *Roe* “gives” a woman the right to terminate a pregnancy before viability, the point at which there is the possibility of maintaining life outside the womb. The majority found that independent existence of the second life “can in reason and all fairness be the object of state protection that now overrides the rights of the woman.”

While *Roe*’s trimester framework forbids any state regulation aimed at protecting potential life before viability, this court maintains that a state’s profound interests in protecting potential life exist throughout pregnancy. The court abandoned *Roe*’s trimester framework (it “undervalues” state interests) and *Roe*’s “strict scrutiny” standard, which bans all abortion restrictions but those narrowly tailored to “the most compelling” state interest. The court’s new standard allows state regulations meant to further states’ interests of potential life, as long as the regulations do not impose an “undue burden” or a substantial obstacle for women “seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus.” Using the “undue burden” test, the majority upheld all but the spousal notification provision of Pennsylvania’s law.

The majority writes, “Some of us find abortion offensive to our most basic principles of morality, but that cannot control our decision. Our obligation is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate our own moral code.” And, later, “An entire generation has come of age free to assume *Roe*’s concept of liberty.”

Perhaps what is most malevolent about this “concept of liberty,” is that not only has it spawned a “reliance,” as the majority puts it, on killing some 1.6 million people every year as a resolution to problems, but it also fosters the same “trashing” mentality to those other “problems” around us: the one in five children who are malnourished, homeless men and women, the abandoned elderly.

Court’s okay to kidnap may explode debt bomb

The Ibero-American Solidarity Movement issued a statement on June 30 denouncing the Rehnquist Supreme Court’s ratification of the Thornburgh Doctrine, under which the United States claims the right to go into any sovereign nation, take foreign citizens hostage, and bring them back for trial. The statement demands that the nations of Ibero-America respond to this outrage with their most effective weapon, a debt moratorium, and a halt to all negotiations on the North American Free Trade Treaty.

The Ibero-American Solidarity Movement was founded May 17-22 in Mexico by forces from most of the leading nations in Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking America, allied to the ideas of the U.S. political prisoner and presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. It describes itself as a continent-wide movement for national sovereignty and solidarity, as that concept is defined by St. Paul’s Epistles to the Corinthians, which inspired the evangelization of the Americas 500 years ago.

We here publish excerpts of the statement, “A Call from the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement: End the Subservience to the U.S.! A Debt Moratorium and the Suspension of NAFTA Are the Only Worthy and Effective Responses to the Alvarez Machain Case.”

The sanctioning by the U.S. Supreme Court of the kidnaping of Dr. Humberto Alvarez Machain is not an isolated case, but further proof that the United States has become a renegade nation under international law and is committed to violating all international treaties, to becoming a planetary policeman, and to dragging the world down to judicial barbarism.

This criminal international policy of the government of the United States is only the external manifestation of the sick situation that now prevails inside the country, expressed in the growing judicial racism, in “Confederate justice,” as evidenced by the recent summary executions of condemned prisoners, most of whom are blacks and Hispanics. Many of these could have proven their innocence. One of the most recent cases was that of Roger Coleman, executed by the state of Virginia despite significant proof of his possible innocence.

It goes beyond racism; there is a trend toward totalitarianism that is threatening to become hegemonic. The most important precedent was the jailing of Lyndon LaRouche and six of his collaborators on Jan. 27, 1989. At the time he

became a political prisoner of the tyrant George Bush, LaRouche, who was sentenced to 15 years, warned: "I will fight this sentence to the utmost, because if I cannot obtain justice, nobody can get justice, and this system of lawlessness will turn against all those who did not come to my defense."

The most recent instances of tyrannical persecution against the LaRouche movement were the incarceration of his collaborator Rochelle Ascher, sentenced to 10 years, and the denial by the Virginia Supreme Court of the appeal presented by Michael Billington, sentenced to 77 years.

LaRouche is running his campaign for the U.S. presidency from his jail cell. The whole world knows that he is innocent and that the persecution against him and the political movement he leads was orchestrated by Henry Kissinger, not only because the LaRouche forces are the most powerful opposition forces within the U.S., but also because of the tremendous impact in Ibero-America of the proposal made by LaRouche to use the "debt bomb" to impose a new, just international economic order.

Less than a year after he jailed LaRouche, Bush ordered the invasion of Panama. And just as Bush today hypocritically claims that the Alvarez Machain case will not set a precedent for a wave of kidnappings, in December 1989 he claimed that the invasion was not against the Panamanian people. However, the Marines killed an estimated 6,000 unarmed Panamanian civilians! That was the first time that then-Attorney General Richard Thornburgh's doctrine was used to kidnap a foreign citizen, Gen. Manuel Noriega, who had organized two continental meetings of patriots in favor of the integration of Ibero-America.

Natural law vs. the law of the jungle

The cynical view expounded by the Rehnquist Supreme Court, that "kidnaping is not forbidden by the extradition treaty" between the United States and Mexico—that is to say, that everything that is not explicitly barred by law is permissible—shows that the U.S. has descended to the extreme of radically divorcing the law from all consideration of truth and falsehood, of good and evil, of innocence and guilt. It is a barbarous rejection of the Christian concept of natural law which conceives of man as *imago viva Dei*.

Only if one understands that man is the living image of God can one establish a legitimate corpus of individual rights or universal human rights, a principle that is, in turn, the basis for defining the concept of sovereignty and relations among nations. It is therefore the principle that defines all the world's constitutions. By rejecting the rule of natural law in both domestic relations and international affairs, the United States rejects the founding principles of western civilization, and if the world does not respond to that, we shall all revert to the most perverse and degenerate abuse of the law, to the law of the jungle, to might makes right.

It is no coincidence that Chief Justice William Rehnquist

is a fanatical defender of Thomas Hobbes, the father of modern totalitarianism and of the separation between morality and law. For the past 25 years Rehnquist has been promoting the transformation of the United States into a totalitarian nation.

The debt bomb is the only option

Fortunately, perhaps providentially, Ibero-America has in its hands the most powerful weapon to deactivate this Frankenstein: the debt bomb, just as Lyndon LaRouche proposed in 1982.

Perhaps because he believes we are cowards and have lost our national honor, David Rockefeller recently bragged that what is keeping the banks afloat is Ibero-America's punctual payment of the debt. Perhaps because they believe that we will bend over to the point of ignominy, they have now decided to do *de facto* what they could not do *de jure* in San Antonio: to establish a multinational army under U.S. control to occupy all of Ibero-America, on the pretext of the war against drugs.

Let's look at it from the other side: If Ibero-America collectively decides to stop paying its foreign debt, the creditor banks will finally go to hell. This is no longer just a weapon against the creditors. As indicated by the collapse of the stock markets, it is *our only defense*, to isolate our economies from the vortex of the worldwide depression. It is urgent that exchange controls be reestablished, that our currencies be unlinked from the U.S. dollar and tied to a market basket defined by our capacity for self-sufficiency within an Ibero-American Common Market. That is what LaRouche proposed in 1982. He called it "the debt bomb," and it was the only effective weapon that Argentina could have used during the War of the Malvinas.

What better way of celebrating the quincentenary of the arrival of Christianity in the Americas? What better way for the South to recover its place in history, which has been destroyed by the liberal masonic revolutions led by the Anglo-Americans?

The difference between the situation today and the 1982 debt crisis, is that the deployment of the debt bomb will not only garner the support of the people of Ibero-America, but also that of the United States, of Europe and even of Russia! That is shown by the tremendous support the people of Venezuela gave to the anti-IMF revolution led by Lt. Col. Hugo Chávez Frías last Feb. 4. That is shown by the recent vote by the Danish people against the IMF-type program known as "Europe 92." That is shown by the growing demonstrations of discontent in Russia against the free market policies of Boris Yeltsin.

He who violates natural law sows the seeds of his own destruction. The governments of Ibero-America that continue to get on their knees before the U.S. Frankenstein will be swept away by the coming revolution against neo-liberalism. That is their Manifest Destiny.