

reporters are fired, since they had written articles hostile to Shining Path. Billboards in Lima are being postered with warnings that "all uniformed men will be annihilated. . . . All police stations and public dependencies will be burned down in the name of President Gonzalo," Guzmán's *nom de guerre*. Graffiti demanding "respect for President Gonzalo's life" is appearing everywhere.

Children, in particular, are being targeted. Anti-terrorist police commander Gen. Vidal Herrera, who has been credited with Guzmán's capture, has had to pull his son out of school following threats against the child. Numerous schools in Lima have received bomb threats, and rumors are flying that the children of military personnel, especially, are being targeted for kidnaping, to be held in exchange for Guzmán. The schools of Callao, where Guzmán's trial is occurring, were saturated with Shining Path leaflets threatening revenge Sept. 30, forcing many of them to shut down. Latest reports from Peruvian military intelligence are that 100 Shining Path commandos freshly trained in Libya are returning to Peru.

'Human rights' for terrorism

The Fujimori government, aware that the capture of Guzmán is but the beginning of an all-out offensive against the narco-terrorist Shining Path, is sticking to its guns in pursuing a serious war strategy. Decrees increasing the severity of sentences for "terrorist apologists" are being issued, the extradition of Shining Path's "ambassadors" in Europe and the United States is now being sought, and the judicial system is being revamped to meet the requirements of war.

Predictably, the international human rights lobby and their media outlets, terrified that Fujimori's successes might prove a model for other besieged Ibero-American nations, are raising a hue and cry over the "potential for human rights violations." Thus, the *New York Times* of Sept. 27 condemned the "faceless tyranny" of Peru's courts, which have used anonymity to protect Peruvian judges from terrorist intimidation and reprisal. Such tactics, the paper protested, "only incite the Shining Path to escalate violence" and "take Peru yet another step away from the democratic process." The *Wall Street Journal* has uttered similar garbage, clearly intended for external consumption only, since the Peruvian population couldn't be more jubilant over its government's aggressive stand against narco-terrorism.

Joining these terrorist apologists in the media are the U.S. and British governments, which in the name of protecting "freedom of expression" have refused to collaborate in the prosecution of Shining Path terrorists in their respective countries. An international "pluralist commission" of human rights activists, lawyers, and "intellectuals" is currently being put together by those terrorist "ambassadors" abroad, to go to Peru and demand "respect for Guzmán's rights." It remains to be seen whether the Human Rights Commission of the Organization of American States, which has made a campaign in recent years of defending the rights of imprisoned Shining Path terrorists, will get in on the act as well.

Medellín Cartel kills Escobar's judge

by Andrea Olivieri

Judge Myriam Rocío Vélez of Medellín, Colombia was gunned down by cocaine cartel assassins on Sept. 18, on the eve of her decision to convict fugitive Medellín Cartel chieftain Pablo Escobar of the 1986 murder of newspaper publisher Guillermo Cano. Judge Vélez was one of the so-called faceless, or anonymous, judges allegedly protected by the César Gaviria government. She is the fourth person related to this particular case to be murdered since the murder of Cano himself, and the third judicial official to be slain this year by presumed mafia hit men.

Judge Vélez's conviction of Escobar of the first serious crime with which he has been formally charged would have posed a major obstacle to President Gaviria's pursuit of a new non-aggression pact with the drug cartel. Thus, in one sense, her murder gives both Escobar and the Gaviria government more legal "breathing space" in conducting their negotiations. At the same time, her murder confirms what everyone in Colombia already knows: that Escobar has never ceased to wage a two-front war against the nation, of both selective terrorism and cooptation of the most corrupt elements of government, *starting with the presidency itself*.

Indeed, many suspicions are raised by the fact that government officials as high-level as Justice Minister Andrés González Díaz and Attorney General Carlos Gustavo Arrieta insist that no evidence exists to link Vélez's assassination with her imminent ruling on the Cano case! That the Gaviria government is desperate to renew its failed pact with Escobar and avoid an all-out war with the drug cartel was made explicit by Arrieta's public plea: "I pray that this event does not signify a return to periods of violence that have been superseded, and that this remains an isolated case."

Judge Vélez had only days earlier protested the government's failure to provide her with a bullet-proof vehicle. Medellín Police Commander Col. Daniel Alfonso Peralta told the press that those seeking an explanation for her lack of protection should inquire with the DAS, the Justice Ministry-linked political police. He further insisted that the intellectual author of Vélez's murder was "indisputably" Pablo Escobar.

Return of 'the Notables'

In the immediate aftermath of Vélez's murder, the forces favoring capitulation to the cartel have intensified their appeasement scenario. First, on Sept. 22, President Gaviria

was personally absolved by the second commission of the Chamber of Representatives of "all political and legal responsibility" for Escobar's July "escape" from prison, despite the fact that Gaviria himself had agreed to take political responsibility for that debacle.

Second, according to the Sept. 25 issue of the daily *El Tiempo*, Pereira Bishop Darío Castrillón Hoyos met with Escobar—at the request of various unnamed "Colombian personalities"—on the matter of "avoiding a new bloodbath" and forging a new surrender arrangement. Bishop Castrillón achieved notoriety back in the early 1980s as the "favorite priest" of convicted Medellín Cartel figure Carlos Lehder, and was later to admit having taken money from the cartel, "to give to the poor." Castrillón told the press that the narco-assassin insisted on his Catholic faith and even cried a little during their meeting. The bishop made no mention of the nearly \$4 million in reward money that he might "give to the poor," should he succeed in mediating a new Escobar surrender.

Bishop Castrillón's meeting with Escobar revives the infamous "Notables" arrangement of 1990, when several former Colombian Presidents headed by "godfather" Alfonso López Michelsen collaborated with Escobar's lawyers in helping to forge a deal with the government. They thereby succeeded in derailing President Virgilio Barco's military offensive against the traffickers then, and are now apparently determined to complete the cartel's takeover of the Colombian state.

Parejo's challenge

The opposition to this scenario took a courageous step forward, with the Sept. 20 announcement by former Justice Minister Enrique Parejo González of his bid for the presidency in the 1994 elections. Parejo, one of the few surviving heroes of Colombia's anti-drug wars of the 1980s, has become a pole of resistance to Gaviria's "narco-democracy" and, despite the permanent death sentence against him from Escobar's hit-squads, has offered his leadership to the country.

Parejo has not only challenged the Gaviria government's capitulation to the drug cartels, with the consequent emasculation of such institutions of government as the legislature and the judiciary, but has also begun to criticize the U.S.-sponsored free trade policy, known as "the opening," through which the drug trade has gained a stranglehold on the Colombian economy to the detriment of the nation's productive base: "The national government persists in defending and promoting an economic policy which is, from every standpoint, contrary to the national interest. . . . The government is playing all of the country's cards on the market, confident that it will act as the great regulator of all economic and social phenomena. . . . This is pure illusion. . . . Instead of opening ourselves to the outside, we should first open ourselves from within, simultaneously battling poverty."

East Europe smeared as anti-Semitic

by Our Special Correspondent

From Sept. 21-23, Berlin was the scene of an international conference entitled "Anti-Semitism in Europe." The purpose of this large gathering of academics, sociologists, and other "experts," was not really to discuss why elite Anglo-American circles have been fomenting a rash of anti-Semitic incidents in Europe at this time; rather, the goal was to exploit the threat of the rise of anti-Semitism as a weapon which can be thrown against those countries in eastern Europe and the Community of Independent States attempting to resist the policies of the free trade and shock therapy of the International Monetary Fund.

The conference was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Anti-Semitism at the Technical University in Berlin, along with the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Anti-Semitism in Jerusalem and the Institute for Jewish Affairs in London.

From the outset, the concern of the conference was not with the safety of the Jewish community in Europe as such. It was in fact pointed out that the community is extremely small. In Czechoslovakia it numbers no more than 3,000, while in Hungary, the second largest Jewish community in all of Europe numbers 80,000.

Yet the discussion went along the lines: "Can anti-Semitism exist without Jews?" or "Should we say that Poland is an anti-Semitic country?" or "Can we trust these east European politicians with fascist backgrounds, when they say they want to be friends with Israel?" and so forth. It thus sought to open a discussion of anti-Semitism at a time when the economic collapse in eastern Europe and the Community of Independent States is leading to profound political instability, and when in many cases authoritarian regimes can be expected to come to power, probably with the blessing of western creditors.

Thus an underlying theme of the conference was for a reassessment of eastern European countries not as victims of Nazi aggression and 40 years of communist repression, but as nations, which in their expression of nationalism are ostensibly developing dangerous anti-Semitic tendencies. Some of the speakers went so far as to say these countries should share responsibility along with Nazi Germany for the Holo-