

movement based on proper religious grounds, and is a very, very important movement, it could help in such a dialogue. Although you are not clergy, I said it at your Berlin conference; what interested me in your movement, was I noticed that it stems from the noblest of Christian ideas and this is very close to me as a Muslim, it's as simple as that. You see, what is very important, is that we should not open our discussions and debates by referring to labels, we should begin by the content. What are you delivering? You are delivering a plan or a product, and when I see that product, without a label, and see that it is very close to what I deliver, I get through the barriers of brainwashing and preconceived ideas about others. "Muslims, oh I don't want to have anything to do with Muslims," or "Oh, this LaRouche, I don't want to hear anything about him." If you bring out the content first without the identification label, you get through to the general public, which includes a lot of so-called intellectuals, for only true intellectuals who are real truth seekers (with their small number) don't allow labels to stop them from exploring with their own intellect and their own brain what the other side has, and take what is good and leave what doesn't fit. This is an exchange of culture, that's how knowledge in the world advances.

Strangely enough, in our modern universities, it is always taught that in the Middle Ages, the Church was persecuting knowledge and science, which may be true, but what is also true is that the new priesthood in the "democracy" of today is doing exactly the same thing now. I do not see the existence of a democracy in the West, as is being claimed. Democracy is when everyone can explore and express his own ideas without being subjected to violence, violent attack by others. I know that you cannot go to some universities and talk because some extreme leftists or extreme rightists might attack you. Take this scientific breakthrough in cold fusion, for example, how it is being attacked by the establishment. So, whoever is established, unfortunately, attacks the new development.

So whatever we criticize in the Middle Ages, although we look very advanced, we have the same fault, by not allowing any breakthrough, by running witchhunts against ideas that are not established. So how can you claim that we are liberated, now that it's the age of democracy, etc., different from the Middle Ages? The only difference is, there is a lot more reading material, but it is not affecting the attitude of people, there is no respect for people, for their ideas. We all have a right to talk, and a right to be heard. You feel, I am sure, targeted, in this "open" society; you see how your leader is put behind bars in the most atrocious manner, in a "legal" manner and how the brainwashing machine is controlling the ideas of people about this great thinker and true lover of humanity. . . . How does this differ from the attitude toward Galileo? Democratic instruments (a corrupt judiciary) were used to impose such authoritarian fascist decisions. . . . This is the culmination of injustice.

## News of Russian SDI offer hits S. America

by Cynthia R. Rush

In the early 1980s, American statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the intellectual author of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) proposal subsequently announced by President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1983, elaborated how Ibero-American countries, especially those with more advanced scientific infrastructure such as Brazil and Argentina, could benefit from collaboration with the United States on SDI and related technological and scientific projects. These projects, LaRouche emphasized, could act as a "science driver" for an economic and technological renaissance in these countries.

The Russian leadership did not accept Reagan's offer of joint development of the SDI; in fact, Russian President Mikhail Gorbachov demanded that LaRouche be imprisoned, while all of Ibero-America suffered a decade of economic devastation as a result of its submission to the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) austerity dictates.

But now, ten years later, political, military, and scientific circles across Ibero-America are again showing keen interest in the implications of joint U.S.-Russian development of the SDI, following news that Russian President Boris Yeltsin had made such an offer during his April 3-4 summit with President Bill Clinton in Vancouver.

Most international media have deliberately blacked out all coverage of Yeltsin's offer for joint development of anti-ballistic "plasma weapons," first reported in the Russian newspaper *Izvestia* on April 2. If accepted, the offer represents an opportunity to completely alter the world's strategic geometry, which has produced genocide in former Yugoslavia, as well as worldwide economic devastation and growing violence and regional warfare. Most important, the offer can lay the basis for real economic and scientific development, with crucial implications for the Third World.

### Anglo-Americans worry about LaRouche

This realization, and LaRouche's role in promoting such development, has unnerved some among the Anglo-American policymaking elite. On April 18, a slanderous article under the byline of Marcelo Helfgot appeared in the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín*, hysterically charging that LaRouche, together with jailed Argentine Army nationalist Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín and Venezuelan Col. Hugo Chávez, were planning to hold a May meeting in Buenos Aires of *carapintadas*

or "painted faces," a term which refers specifically to Argentina's nationalist military, and more broadly to anti-IMF military forces on the continent. A "*carapintada* international" is about to be formed, Helfgot shrieked, "financed by LaRouche."

But Helfgot's real concern is revealed in his assertion that regional intelligence services think that the alleged *carapintada* international "is a threat to the stability of democratic governments."

Apart from Helfgot's lying fabrications, the truth is that the Anglo-American establishment is very worried about the emergence of anti-IMF civilian-military forces in several Ibero-American countries and the potential they represent for overturning the international banking community's policy of "democracy" based on usury. One day after Helfgot's article appeared in *Clarín*, excerpts were published in newspapers in Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela.

LaRouche and *EIR* have repeatedly exposed the fact that the Anglo-American establishment is committed to the destruction of Ibero-America's armed forces, in its drive to eliminate national sovereignty. Thus Helfgot's compulsion to identify *EIR*'s Buenos Aires correspondent Gerardo Terán as the "link between LaRouche and Seineldín," and lie that *EIR* is the means by which LaRouche is organizing the alleged *carapintada* international. He worriedly reported that *EIR* was planning an April 22 seminar entitled "The Russian Crisis, LaRouche, and the Strategic Defense Initiative: How to Save the World from World War III."

Helfgot's publicity helped ensure a very successful seminar in Buenos Aires, attended by 80 people. Similar seminars were held the same day in Lima and Rio de Janeiro, all attended by foreign diplomats, military officers, scientists, political and labor leaders, students, journalists, and even intelligence "spooks."

Aside from presenting details on the implications of the Yeltsin proposal, speakers at these events emphasized the urgency of freeing LaRouche from federal prison in the United States, to make possible his crucial input into defusing the present dangerous strategic crisis.

On the same day as *EIR*'s seminar in Rio de Janeiro, the daily *Jornal do Commercio* published an article by Lorenzo Carrasco, *EIR*'s correspondent in Brazil, commenting on the Russian offer. The proposal, Carrasco emphasized, "has the obvious backing of the powerful Russian military-industrial complex, which means that it is serious and transcends any eventual governmental changes which might derive from Moscow's volatile internal political situation."

The Russian proposal, he explained, nullifies the insane doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction which dominated the Cold War era, and makes obsolete the strategic nuclear weapons on which the doctrine is based. "What then is the argument for continuing to impose a 'technological apartheid' on the developing nations, if the excuse of proliferation no longer exists?"

## State Dept. grooms S. American leftists to be Presidents

by Peter Rush

Five high-level officials of the U.S. State Department and National Security Council, along with a World Bank vice president and others, met on April 22 with three leftist contenders for the presidencies of Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela, respectively: Luiz Inacio "Lula" da Silva, head of Brazil's Workers Party (PT); Antonio Navarro Wolff of Colombia's M-19 Democratic Alliance; and Pablo Medina of Venezuela's Causa-R party.

Making the meeting more remarkable was the fact that Navarro Wolff is a "former" narco-terrorist involved in the cold-blooded murder of 12 Colombian Supreme Court justices in November 1985, among many other atrocities committed by his guerrilla group, the M-19. "Lula" da Silva is an ignorant but dangerous demagogue trained in the school of "Liberation Theology" based on preaching Marxist "class struggle." Together with Medina, all three are leading members of the São Paulo Forum, an organization founded in 1990 under the auspices of Fidel Castro's Cuba to try to "regroup" the communist and radical parties of Ibero-America under Cuban leadership, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

### On parade at Princeton

Just six days earlier, on April 16-17, the same three, joined by Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas of Mexico's Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD), Rubén Zamora of El Salvador's Farabundo Martí Liberation Front (FMLN), and Luis Maira, secretary general of Chile's Socialist Party, took part in a public relations show held at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, a training ground for State Department officials. The affair, designed to boost the credibility of all six candidates, both back in their own countries and in policymaking circles in the United States, was entitled "Alternatives in Latin America: A Panel of 1993-1994 Latin American Presidential Candidates."

Cheered by a partisan audience of leftist students and professors and fed pabulum questions by a panel of academics and journalists, the six used the occasion to assert their strong support for ill-defined concepts of "social justice," "democracy," and "helping the poor," while saying absolutely nothing about how to reverse the deepening poverty and economic crisis afflicting every country. Although they rant-