

innocence was winding up. On June 11, Castro issued a brief public “appeal” to Gaviria’s kidnappers, “to make contact with the family in order to seek a humane and honorable solution.”

Then, just hours before the vote in the Congress occurred, late in the night on June 12, eight terrorists, the captive, Juan Carlos Gaviria, and National Police director General Rosso Serrano boarded a plane in Pereira, where Gaviria had been kept captive, and flew to Bogotá’s international airport, the terrorists’ guns trained on Gaviria throughout the flight. Once in Bogotá, the terrorists, still armed and their faces covered, accompanied by an official from the International Red Cross and a Cuban official, boarded a waiting plane, which was given immediate clearance to leave for Cuba, by air traffic controllers who had been ordered to stop all other flights, because this was “a national security flight.”

Exactly what happened, when, is not known, but that this was a deal negotiated between narcos, terrorists, Castro, and the Samper government, is unquestionable. It is also acknowledged by all that two Cuban government officials were the intermediaries for the operation, one of them being Cuba’s ambassador to Colombia. According to a June 18 report in the well-informed opposition daily *La Prensa*, Castro’s two personal emissaries were, in fact, the only ones to actually go to where the victim was being held, and to escort him to waiting authorities.

According to *La Prensa*, negotiations included the move of “Commander Bochica” from where he was being held, to the Modelo prison. There, he was placed in a cell adjoining that of a top Cali Cartel drug trafficker, Victor Patiño Fomeque. A meeting was then held at the Modelo prison, this report goes, between “Bochica,” the drug trafficker, the director of the jail, and, possibly, the National Police director himself, from which, it is said, the terrorist “Bochica” placed the call ordering Gaviria’s release.

After the exoneration of Samper, Inter-American Dialogue President Peter Hakim urged the Clinton administration not to impose strong sanctions against the Samper government, because, as he insisted to the *Washington Times* of June 14, the Samper regime “is not a terrorist state. This is a country with which we have strong relations.”

Samper’s forces, however, brazenly declare otherwise. In his final speech during the Congressional debate over Samper on June 12, Dignity for Colombia’s congressman, Lucio, outlined a program for how to continue in power, indefinitely. Accepting drug money for political campaigns is no crime, he raved; there is hysteria against the drug trade, because this is how poor people can become rich, and that should be a cause for joy. “We” must prepare ourselves, so that in the next elections, two years from now, “we” continue in power, and so, drugs must be legalized, the “faceless judges” program stopped, and all contracts for opposition media which is “servile” to the anti-regime “conspiracy” orchestrated by the United States, cut, he concluded.

Lee Kuan Yew declares himself a British agent

by Michael O. Billington

On June 5, the *Singapore Straits Times* reported that Singapore Senior Minister Lee Kuan Yew has confirmed publicly, and embraced, what *EIR* has repeatedly stated, that Lee Kuan Yew is the principal spokesman for British financial and political interests in Asia, especially in regard to British plans for the dismemberment of China. At a meeting of the Business Council in Williamsburg, Virginia, and subsequently, in an interview with NBC-TV’s Tom Brokaw, Lee proudly described himself as a “product of the British Empire,” who sees the world “through British eyes,” and who “has the habit of reading British weeklies such as the *Economist*, the *Sunday Times*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, and listening to the [British Broadcasting Corp. as] the best sources of information.”

This admission has a striking resemblance to the famous declaration of Henry Kissinger, before the leaders of British intelligence gathered at Chatham House in London on May 10, 1982, that throughout his years of service in the U.S. government, he considered the British Foreign Office to be his primary center of loyalty. Indeed, Kissinger and Lee Kuan Yew are close associates, and allies in imposing British geopolitical policies in Asia. For example, Lee Kuan Yew, in his presentation before the Business Council, berated Taiwan’s President Lee Teng-hui for his Japanese training and education, pronouncing:

“Unfortunately, the Japanese worldview does not accord high regard for China” (unlike the British—“no dogs or Chinamen allowed”). This effort to pit Japan against China is precisely the method used by Kissinger to explain his feigned support for China, a familiar British geopolitical “balance-of-power” strategy aimed at maintaining British control over both.

The British anti-development strategy

As *EIR* has documented over the past months, the British have launched a public campaign to reassert the power of the Empire, building upon the structure of that Empire as it exists today in the British Commonwealth. Asia is central to the new Empire, with Singapore and Australia the two primary centers for control. On March 1-2, a conference of Asian and European nations was held in Bangkok, Thailand, organized on the initiative of Lee Kuan Yew’s Singapore and the leaders of

the new Entente Cordiale, France's President Jacques Chirac and England's Prime Minister John Major, whose purpose was to advance the new British imperial agenda (see *EIR*, March 22, "Britain's New Empire Strategy Invades Asia").

Their purpose was to pull the rest of the Southeast Asian nations, as well as China, South Korea, and Japan, into agreement that dirigist economic policies should be eliminated, in favor of deregulation, privatization, and similar "free trade" shibboleths, to govern the economic process in Asia. National sovereignty should be sacrificed to the enforcement power of international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

EIR warned that such policies were intended to *prevent* the development of Eurasia, turning all of Asia into an extension of the British Hongkong model of hot money, cheap labor, and speculation.

That warning was confirmed by one of the foremost spokesmen for the new British Empire, Sir Leon Brittan, currently functioning as the vice president of the European Commission. Brittan spoke at a conference in Beijing on May 7-9, entitled the International Symposium on Economic Development of the Regions along the New Euro-Asia Continental Bridge. As the title implies, the Chinese government called the conference for the purpose of advancing the revival of the "silk routes," not only as connections between Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, but as "development corridors," to bring about the urbanization and industrial development of the great Eurasian landmass. This concept was first proposed by *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., and the Beijing conference featured as speakers his wife, Helga Zepp LaRouche, and his associates, Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum and Mary Burdman, who discussed the necessity of this great project in the face of the unfolding global financial crisis (see *EIR*, June 14).

Brittan, however, in an insulting display of imperial pique, threatened the Chinese that any effort to develop Eurasia using government-directed methods of credit or public sector ownership would meet with sabotage by the British-controlled financial markets. In particular, Brittan pointed to the agenda of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) in Bangkok, as providing the necessary model for the Chinese to follow. Throughout his speech, he treated the land-bridge not as a "development corridor," but merely as a connection between the end points of Europe and Asia. Sir Leon pontificated:

"What is the relevance of the Bangkok platform to the objectives of this conference? . . . It is clearly important to ensure that infrastructure planning is soundly market-based. . . ; the critical mass of funding cannot be based on government contributions. . . . To put it bluntly, demand to use a land-bridge between Europe and Asia will only be high if certain political conditions are met. . . . Only if these conditions are met will foreseeable demand for use of a bridge grow to a level where the necessary capital can be attracted. On this score, the picture so far is mixed." He insisted that China must

"make a common front against protectionist pressures," by joining the WTO, which would require China to "accept the rules of the WTO—all the rules. . . . For a land-bridge to work, the rules must be in place before the prospectus is issued."

Sir Leon's insistence, that governments must play no major role in such great projects, betrays the British intention, that great projects never come to fruition. Throughout history, the industrial transformation of national economies has only succeeded through centralized government direction and investment in the necessary large infrastructural projects. This is true for the United States, Germany, and Japan, as it was for the little tigers of South Korea and Taiwan.

Meet Lee Kuan Yew

Lee Kuan Yew is a classic case of what LaRouche has called the British "dumb cow" principle, whereby colonies were controlled by killing off any rambunctious elements of the "herd," then placing in power one of the remaining pliant subjects, after careful grooming in London. "Harry" Lee, as he was known in those days, attended the foremost colonial preparatory school in Singapore, Raffles College, before being trained for the bar at Cambridge after World War II. Upon his return, his case officer was MI-6 operative Alex Josey, an expert in psychological warfare. Sir Henry Gurney, the British High Commissioner in Malaya (1948-51), had been Josey's commanding officer in the Middle East, and called Josey to Malaya during the "Emergency," the term Britain used for the Malay fight for independence. The British used Malaya as a testing ground, under the personal direction of Brig. Gen. Frank Kitson, for "gang-countergang" methods of counterinsurgency, designed at the Tavistock Institute center for psychological warfare in London. Josey was brought in as chief editor for Radio Malaya, adopting a leftist coloration, and befriending Lee Kuan Yew. He was to remain Lee's close companion and adviser for the next 15 years.

In 1957, Lee's primary factional opponents for power were arrested, and Lee, with direct help from British Special Services agent Richard Corridon, took power over the colonial government. Josey wrote in his biography of Lee: "It was a matter of bitter regret to Lee that he could only assume leadership again after the British, through an acquiescent Chief Minister, had jailed the culprits."

Independence was granted to Malaya (but not Singapore) in 1957. The British, however, were anxious that their banking apparatus in Singapore, a principal center for laundering the spoils of the Empire—especially that of the enormous Southeast Asian drug trade—would retain control over the Malayan economy. Lee Kuan Yew, the trusted comprador protecting this British banking establishment, was sponsored to bring about a merger with Malaya, which occurred in 1963 (together with Sarawak and North Borneo), thus creating Malaysia. Lee made his intentions clear:

"A peaceful, happy, prosperous Malaysia is only possible if we keep Singapore the center of Malaysia." The merger

was abandoned after two years, however, when Malaysian nationalists reacted against the ethnic Chinese dominance of the economy. (Singapore is mostly Chinese, while Malaysia is majority Malay, with a large Chinese minority.) Ironically, on June 7, Lee floated the possibility of a new merger of the city-state and Malaysia, on Singapore's terms, of course, which idea has been received with laudable, guarded skepticism in Kuala Lumpur.

It must be noted that Lee Kuan Yew, true to his British training, is a racist. He argues that races from tropical climates (such as the Malay) are genetically inferior to those from the temperate zones (such as the Chinese), adding: "To gloss over these kinds of issues because it is politically incorrect to study them, then you have laid a land mine for yourself. This is what leads to the disappointments with social policies, embarked upon in America with great enthusiasm and expectations, but which yield such meager results." One can see why Lee is so highly regarded by the spokesmen of the Nazi-like policies of the Gingrich "Contract with America" crowd in the United States.

Singapore's hot money

Since the 1984 agreement to return Hongkong to Chinese sovereignty in 1997, Singapore has become the preferred location for relocating British corporate and financial operations. In addition to its continuing role as one of the world's largest derivatives traders (despite the Barings' disaster), Singapore is also the second largest repository of the massive "offshore trusts," the hiding places for drug and hot money. Singapore holds \$390 billion in such trusts, second only to the infamous British dirty money haven in the Cayman Islands.

As Singapore was assuming this new importance, Lee Kuan Yew also took a leading role in efforts to bring the reform process in China into line with British free trade demands. Lee's right-hand man, Goh Keng Swee, who proudly points to Venice as the model for Singapore, moved to Beijing in the 1980s, where he helped introduce Chinese reformers to the Hongkong and Singapore models, in the form of Special Economic Zones. Lee himself spearheaded a plan for a "Greater China," to bring the mainland and Taiwan under the guidance of the Hongkong-Singapore financial nexus, in conjunction with leading Southeast Asian overseas Chinese tycoons.

Lee has also made considerable headway in a cultural warfare campaign against the mainland. The success of the new British Empire free trade policies in Asia depends upon the creation of an apparent "Asian" cover for the British model. Lee, who never studied the Chinese classics, suddenly, in the 1980s, pronounced his support for a "New Confucianism." Lee's so-called Confucianism is actually a mish-mash of Legalist and Taoist ideological constructs, pasted together as "Asian thought," while, in fact, rejecting the most fundamental ideas of Confucius, Mencius, and Chu Hsi, the great minds of the Confucian tradition.

Lee's "New Confucianism" became the basis for an "Asian way," which supposedly explains the economic explosion in Asia over the past years. It also serves to justify the continuance of authoritarian political regimes, while implementing deregulation, privatization, and free trade measures on the economy, providing international speculators with the freedom to loot. Although China has carefully restricted this "shock therapy" approach to its economy, with an eye to the disaster in Russia, nonetheless, Lee Kuan Yew has successfully inserted himself into the cultural debate. He was chosen as the honorary chairman of the newly constituted International Confucian Society, giving the keynote speech at the founding conference on Oct. 3-5, 1994, in Beijing.

'This is not Confucianism'

Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui, although, he, too, has been used by the British and the "Conservative Revolution" fanatics in the United States, in an effort to provoke civil war in China, made a very astute appraisal of Lee Kuan Yew's "New Confucianism" in a May interview with *Newsweek*. Asked about Lee Kuan Yew's attacks on Western values, Lee Teng-hui responded:

"He doesn't know classical Chinese thinking; 2,500 years ago, during the Warring States period, Chinese people were very humanistic. . . . Chinese thinking is very humanistic, not just feudalistic, as it was in the imperial era. . . . I don't think there are distinctly Asian values. There are human values."

On the issue of "authoritarianism," Lee Teng-hui said: "Paternalism is very powerful [in China]; you must listen to your father, to the emperor. This is the biggest problem in China. This is not Confucianism. Confucianism has been distorted by politicians. Now Singapore has adopted this distortion."

Lee Kuan Yew responded with the attack on Lee Teng-hui at the Business Council meeting, quoted at the beginning of this article, while proudly declaring his British pedigree. Introduced by Business Council moderator John Bryan as "the father of modern Asia," Lee Kuan Yew displayed his servile allegiance to the British Crown by explicating his view of the "Asian way." Although he berated the United States for attacking China over issues of democracy and human rights, and paid lip service to the unity of China, he quite openly called for the United States to use all necessary means to force the Chinese to accept free trade dogma: "The unity of China must not be attacked; no question that Taiwan is a part of one China, no question about Tibet. Once these are settled and put aside, you can argue, bang the table, slosh them, and they will have to give way to trade, bilateral agreements, IPR [international property rights] investments, WTO conditions. . . . You'll have the whole of Asia on your side if you press them hard on IPR or any of the trade infringements."

Lee Kuan Yew has once again upheld his reputation, given him by the 1960s British foreign secretary, as "the best bloody Englishman east of the Suez."