

Clinton pulls Samper's visa for abetting drug trade

by Robyn Quijano

When U.S. President William Clinton stripped Colombian President Ernesto Samper Pizano of his U.S. entrance visa on July 11, under a provision in the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Act which "provides for visa ineligibility when there is reason to believe that the individual has knowingly assisted or abetted illegal narcotics trafficking," the British plot to use Samper in their drive for international drug legalization took a hit. Cries that the move would cause a nationalist backlash against the United States have been muted by the evidence that it has given Colombian patriots the maneuvering room to take their nation back from rule by Dope, Inc. The British, and the entire British-run apparatus within the United States, from Henry Kissinger to the Inter-American Dialogue, had worked overtime to stop any escalation of Clinton's battle with Samper's narco-dictatorship.

Samper responded to the cancellation of his visa by reiterating his long-standing refusal to resign, declaring it now a "a question of principles," which would mean surrendering Colombia's "dignity" and "sovereignty." But *El Tiempo*, a Liberal Party daily that has previously backed Samper, called for his resignation, and business leaders and other opponents, who have demanded that Samper step down since the beginning of this year, renewed calls for his resignation.

Demands for Samper to get out

The day after the visa was rescinded, the editorial of *La Prensa* declared: "The truth is that Ernesto Samper has turned Colombia into a narco-democracy and an earthly paradise for organized crime. . . . Today Ernesto Samper, thanks to his brotherhood with the Cali Cartel, is a universal citizen of infamy and secretary general of narcotics trafficking."

The conservative daily *El Nuevo Siglo*, in its main editorial the same day, warned, "Surely he will ask us all to wrap

ourselves in the national flag so Samper and his friends can maintain power." The editors reiterated their long-standing call for Samper's resignation.

Rumors that the United States is preparing to indict Samper are circulating in Colombia and throughout the region. A high-level law enforcement official told *EIR* on July 17 that an indictment is possible.

According to widely read *El Tiempo* columnist Enrique Santos Calderón, Samper may end up indicted by a U.S. court: "The withdrawal of the visa did not merely refer to Samper's witting acceptance of narco-money for his campaign, but [to the fact that] in exchange for that financing, he encouraged policies designed to protect and encourage the interests of the drug cartels."

In what looks like the first major defection from Samper's camp by a national board member of his own ruling Liberal Party, Ines Gómez de Vargas told the press, "Intolerance and violence are growing daily because sometimes one feels that one is not living in a democratic country, but that a dictatorship is being established here. . . . The possibility of dissent doesn't exist, and those who dare to think differently are struck down."

The day after the corrupt Colombian Congress absolved Samper of criminal charges that he knew about drug cartel contributions to his 1994 election campaign, because of "lack of evidence," Samper's lawyer announced that anyone who repeated the charges would be sued. But opponents and former allies have suffered more than legal harassment.

In an interview with *El Tiempo*, former Samper campaign treasurer Santiago Medina revealed that just before his arrest, an assassin was sent by the Samper crowd to shut him up, but that he was tipped off in time. He had been given some damaging evidence against Samper and company by one-time

Samper financier (and the wife of a cartel boss), Elizabeth Montoya, to prove that she had the goods to bury Samper. Before she could testify before the Prosecutor's office, she was killed, with 19 bullets to the face. Hours before her gruesome murder, Samper's aide-de-camp Col. Germán Osorio had made an appointment to meet her. He was ushered out of the country to a diplomatic post in Italy, where he had been hiding until mid-July, when the Prosecutor's office forced him to return to Colombia and testify. Medina predicts that, like Montoya, Osorio will be killed.

Narco-sovereignty?

Samper's interior minister, Horacio Serpa Uribe (known in Colombia as an agent for the Cuba-linked narco-terrorist ELN guerrillas), has charged the United States with wielding a "big stick" in the worst imperialist tradition. Similarly, the Cuban government called the U.S. action "arrogant and unjustified," and claimed it represented "imperial thinking."

Many of Ibero-America's worst enemies have, like Castro's Cuba, proclaimed themselves advocates of "national sovereignty" to defend Samper's narco-dictatorship. Impeached Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez, just convicted of fraud and embezzlement in his own country, has furiously denounced Clinton's anti-Samper move as "flagrant intervention" into Colombian internal affairs, and as a violation of national sovereignty. He has called on the rest of the continent to rally to Samper's defense.

Ironically, it was Pérez who, as Venezuelan President, took the lead in imposing the doctrine of "limited sovereignty" in the region, and who was praised in 1992 by Kissingerian State Department adviser Luigi Einaudi for promoting collective intervention "in defense of democracy"—or was that narco-democracy?

Also coming to Samper's defense is Inter-American Dialogue President Peter Hakim, who told the July 12 *Washington Post* that the U.S. action will be seen by Colombians as "an insult to their country's sovereignty"—echoing Samper's own argument. It should surprise no one that, like Pérez, this would-be guardian of Colombian sovereignty is an ardent defender of the concept of "limited sovereignty." Hakim has even committed the pro-drug-legalization Dialogue to a so-called "Sovereignty Project," to rewrite the very concept of national sovereignty.

Desperate to shore up his Presidency, Samper has called on Colombia's 10,000-man irregular army of narco-terrorists to join him in an anti-U.S. "patriotic front." In mid-July, two of the country's most powerful labor unions, heavily infiltrated by the narco-guerrillas, carried out a day-long strike to protest Samper's privatization plans. But the rallies were turned into anti-U.S. protests, including the burning of U.S. flags.

Samper's policy of appeasement toward the FARC-ELN terrorists was slammed by Colombia's top military leaders, who denounced the guerrillas as part of the drug cartels, and

warned against using the crisis in U.S.-Colombian relations to "give the advantage to the enemies of peace." Bogotá Mayor Antanas Mockus warned that "we could soon end up with our own Fidel Castro."

Samper's narco-terrorist "popular base" has given him the power to resist demands for his resignation for over a year. Crucial to his success has been the destruction of the military's ability to fight the drug lords and the narco-guerrillas. Witch-hunts against the military for alleged human rights violations in their war against subversion, which is sponsored by British-run non-governmental organizations such as Amnesty International, combined with budget cuts, have sharply curtailed the military's ability to fight the war (see *Documentation*). And the 1991 Constitution that was bought and paid for by the drug cartels, forbids extradition and other measures that would allow a successful war on drugs.

On July 15, director of the U.S. Office of National Drug Control Policy Gen. Barry McCaffrey identified narco-terrorism as one of the greatest difficulties facing Colombia. Asked at a White House briefing whether he thought the administration's decision to revoke President Samper's visa would adversely affect U.S.-Colombian cooperation on drug interdiction, McCaffrey said, "The Armed Forces, the police, the prosecutors, the judges are still confronting an internal enemy that's just incredible—10,000 narco-guerrillas . . . assassination attempts. So, we will continue to cooperate in the counter-drug arena. That is unaffected by de-certification. We're all extremely sad about the complicity . . . of senior members of that government with drug cartels. And that's why the President took the action he did."

Inside Colombia, President Clinton's squeeze on Samper has given room to those who want to take the nation back from the drug cartels to act. On July 9, Colombia's chief prosecutor Alfonso Valdivieso, who has collaborated with the Clinton administration, seized over \$1 billion in assets of the Rodríguez Orejuela brothers, and other top Cali Cartel bosses. The funds from the seizures are to go into the war on drugs, thus strengthening Valdivieso, one of Samper's most important opponents.

Documentation

On July 5, the Conservative Party-linked Center for Colombian Studies sponsored a seminar in Bogotá which featured Armed Forces Commander Adm. Holden Delgado and Army Commander Gen. Harold Bedoya. The two distinguished military leaders used the opportunity to blast the Samper government's financial and political attacks on the military.

The main speaker at the conference, Admiral Delgado, presented a detailed analysis of the budget cuts that have the Armed Forces on the verge of paralysis. He observed that the

original military budget proposed by the Armed Forces was approximately \$2 billion. The budget passed by the Congress was \$1.5 billion. The first budget "adjustment," owing to an agreement between the Samper government and the Central Bank, reduced the military budget to \$1.3 billion. A recent decision by the National Planning Department cut the military budget another \$500 million, with plans to make yet a further \$300 million cut. This leaves the budget of the Armed Forces, at war with a 10,000-strong narco-terrorist army, at \$500 million!

In contrast, Admiral Delgado pointed out, the narco-terrorists have not suffered from the Planning Ministry's axe. In fact, the financing of the FARC, ELN, and EPL narco-guerrillas has grown considerably in recent years, reaching the incredible annual figure of \$1.6 billion—\$700 million from drug trafficking, \$480 million from extortion and robbery, \$330 million from kidnapping, \$12 million from investment profits, \$71 million diverted from municipal and provincial treasuries through blackmail, and \$22 million from other sources.

Delgado pointed out that President Samper's strategy is to "defeat subversion by forcing it to negotiate." He said the principal difficulties of this strategy are: 1) that 40% of military troops are guarding oil installations; 2) the campaign that has been launched against obligatory military service, which would do away with the Armed Forces altogether; 3) that "the soldiers most distinguished in battle against narco-subversion are accused of crimes they have not committed. At this moment, there are 700 cases before the Prosecutor General's office and 300 before the Attorney General's office"; and 4) the low budget and lack of personnel and equipment.

Bedoya: The 1991 Constitution tied our hands

"The worst enemies of the Armed Forces," said General Bedoya, "are not declared enemies. 'Tirofijo' [head of the FARC narco-guerrillas] is not our worst enemy, because we already know he is an enemy. . . . More dangerous are the undeclared enemies, the ones with white collars and top hats, who are like the termites that one cannot see but which gnaw away at your house until it crumbles. One finds these treacherous enemies in the Attorney General's office, in the Prosecutor General's office, in the People's Defender's office. . . ."

"The main problem is that we lack the legal tools for defeating narco-subversion. We have spoken with the Peruvian military, with [Armed Forces Commander] General Hermoza for example, and presented them with our situation. They told us: 'Change the legal framework or you can do nothing.' That is the problem of the 1991 Constitution. That Constitution tied our hands. . . . In Colombia there is no wartime legislation because the Constitution prohibits it. The commander has no authority. The evidence we present is not considered evidence. We have no ability to do intelligence. The 1991 Constitution has taken all of that from us."

TransAfrica's Payne fields anti-Sudan bill

by Linda de Hoyos

The TransAfrica Institute, the Anti-Defamation League, and Baroness Caroline Cox's Christian Solidarity International (CSI) are now operating as co-conspirators for the purpose of forcing President Clinton to ram international sanctions against Sudan through the United Nations Security Council.

The barrage in this British-orchestrated assault on Sudan is a bill introduced on July 9 into the U. S. House of Representatives by Rep. Donald Payne (D-N.J.), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and a member of the House Africa Subcommittee. The bill puts into legislative form the precise strategy of Baroness Cox, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords and chairman of CSI.

The British 'slavery' campaign

Taking a page from a Britain's long history of waving the charge of "slavery" as a weapon for its own geopolitical ends, Cox's CSI is the source of hoked-up allegations that the Sudanese government is deliberately conducting slavery in Sudan. The CSI's literature explains that the slavery charge is to be used as "motivation" for the United States to force through the UN Security Council an international trade embargo and economic and military sanctions against Sudan.

Representative Payne has taken the bait. It is unlikely that concern for Africans is his motivation, however. In 1980, the National Democratic Policy Committee, founded by Lyndon LaRouche, was waging a campaign against the International Monetary Fund's murder of African countries, and calling up African-American leaders to stand up for a U.S. policy of economic development for Africa. Hulan Jack, a leader of the NDPC and the first African-American to be elected to high office in New York City, approached Payne at the 1980 Democratic Convention, to seek his support—to which Payne replied: "Why should I give a sh—t about Africa?"

This attitude may be the reason Payne is on the executive board of Randall Robinson's TransAfrica Institute. Another sponsor of the bill, Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), also has close associations with TransAfrica's Robinson, as Robinson's wife worked in Dellums's office. As *EIR* has documented in detail, TransAfrica is a funded outlet of the Ford