

British prepare to fragment Colombia

by Gretchen Small

Colombia today provides a classic case of how London manufactures “failed states,” assaulting the institutions of a nation until they disintegrate, and then demanding that supranational institutions move in to pick up the pieces. Here can be seen how, exactly as Lyndon LaRouche warned over the spring of 1997, the British Empire is deployed to bring about the disintegration of the nations of Ibero-America, using the same methods and, often, even the same personnel, as are deployed to set up the genocide in the Great Lakes region of Africa.

London’s Colombian operation constitutes an immediate security threat to every nation in the Americas, including the United States. It was British support, directly, which allowed the cartel-run government of President Ernesto Samper Pizano to survive the sanctions placed upon it by the Clinton administration in 1996. Under Samper Pizano’s cartel reign, the narco-terrorist armies expanded the territory under their control to the point that Colombia faces disintegration.

Congressional elections are scheduled for March, and Presidential elections for May. The drug cartels own various candidates, including the current frontrunner, Samper Pizano’s former Interior Minister, Horacio Serpa. One leading contender for the Presidency, Gen. Harold Bedoya (ret.), however, is rallying Colombians for a fight to drive the drug cartels and their narco-terrorist armies from Colombia. Bedoya has repeatedly called for United States support, particularly for economic aid, so that Colombians can take on the cartels.

Should Colombian efforts to defend their nation fail to receive such aid, Britain’s projected disintegration of Colombia, under United Nations rule, will succeed, and entire chunks of the Andes/Amazon region of South America will fall to the marauding armies of the drug cartels.

The real drug lords speak

The key features of Britain’s “shatter Colombia” operation were laid out in an Oct. 15, 1997 debate in the House of Lords.

The debate was called by Viscount Waverley, one of the Lords most active in 1996 in blocking international action to save the lives of millions in Congo-Zaire. Waverley opened the debate with the following declaration of war: “My Lords, let there be no misunderstanding. The internal political and security situation in Colombia has the potential to escalate in

its enormity and tragic viciousness, placing it alongside the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians, Kashmir and Afghanistan.”

Multilateral intervention is required in the case of Colombia, he argued, because “the Colombian political system has lost the ability to resolve its internal difficulties by itself.” The purpose of said intervention? “To press for peace negotiation” with the very FARC and ELN terrorists, whom Waverley freely admitted protect the drug trade and threaten democratic institutions. The “single most important assistance” Britain can give Colombia, Waverley insisted, is to use its “influence over the United States and other consuming nations” to develop “a new attitude to the problem of drugs,” a formulation favored by drug legalization advocates.

Waverley, and the other five Lords and Ladies who followed him in the debate, including Foreign and Commonwealth Office Undersecretary Baroness Symons, all agreed on two points: 1) that Her Majesty’s government must continue to back the Samper government against “unjust” U.S. pressure on the narcotics front; and 2) that the Colombian military—not the drug cartels—is the real threat to “democracy.”

It is precisely the support given by Her Majesty’s government which has kept Samper’s regime alive, against U.S. pressure. Samper turned to Britain for increased aid, investment, trade, and, vital to them, diplomatic pressure against the United States, when President Clinton decertified Colombia in March 1996, as non-cooperative in the fight against drugs. One month later, then-Overseas Development Minister Lady Lynda Chalker declared Samper’s government “a spectacular success” in fighting drugs. Britain’s minions in the European Union, the Canadian government, and various non-governmental organizations (NGOs)—the Inter-American Dialogue, most prominently—set to work organizing a regional bloc within the Western Hemisphere, in opposition to U.S. efforts to toughen and coordinate actions against the dope trade.

Waverley played his own quiet role in ensuring that the United Kingdom remain a “close ally” of Colombia, deepening its economic, political, military, and intelligence cooperation with the Samper government. He likes to tout his “close association with Colombia,” and his personal visits to its oil regions and coca fields, to meet with “a wide range of local NGOs, community representatives, and elected officials,” reporting that he plans new visits, “to play our small part in trying to help the process” of a “peaceful solution.” (Waverley’s activity in the Western Hemisphere also includes a close interest in Belize, where his wife was British High Commissioner. Waverley seeks an expanded British military presence in that country.)

British financial interests, of course, did not fail to profit from this “deepening” of relations with the cartels’ government. Symons reported to the Lords in the October 1997 debate, that the U.K. is now the number-one foreign investor in

Colombia, an assertion so startling—the United States has long been, by far, the leading investor in Ibero-America—that the folks at Canning House, Britain’s leading business think-tank for Ibero-America, did not believe it possible, when first asked about it. After making inquiries, however, Canning House reported that, indeed, the British now claim the top position, citing British Petroleum’s investments in Colombian oil as what tipped the balance.

Murderers of Africa

In their debate, Waverley et al. wept crocodile tears for human rights in Colombia. Two of the most outspoken were Lord Colin Moynihan, an Undersecretary of Energy during Margaret Thatcher’s government who later served as privatization adviser to the Sánchez de Losada government in Bolivia, and Baron Nicolas Rea. The latter was identified by *EIR*, in its Aug. 29, 1997 issue, as the leading drug legalization advocate in the House of Lords.

Moynihan singled out General Bedoya by name as an obstacle to peace, and praised Samper for sacking him last July, because Bedoya “defiantly refused to capitulate to the guerrillas.” Moynihan specified that peace talks will require concessions such as “the Army’s withdrawal from certain areas” of the country.

For his part, Rea admitted that he has never visited Colom-

bia, but said he knew all about it, from reading Amnesty International’s reports. He denounced the war on drugs as a “smokescreen,” and urged the British government to “strongly encourage” the Colombian government to curb its military, and force through the elimination of military justice.

Who are these Lords to speak of “human rights”? They have the blood of half a million dead Africans on their hands today!

In November 1996, Baron Rea joined Viscount Waverley in a campaign to block any international mission to save the lives of 1 million Rwandan and Burundian refugees huddled without water and food in camps in eastern Zaire. Instead of aid, Rea demanded that the international community use the refugee crisis as the excuse to “re-examine the entire structure of the nations of the Great Lakes region” of Africa. That is: to carve up the nations of Zaire, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, and Tanzania. (See *EIR*’s June 1997 Special Report, *Never Again! London’s Genocide Against Africans.*)

No mission was carried out, and while the exact number casualties will never be known, a minimum of 500,000 people in those camps were killed in the months after Rea’s demand was issued, as the London-sponsored “guerrilla liberation army” of Laurent Désiré Kabila marched to power in Kinshasa. And who moved into Congo-Zaire, once Kabila was in power? The same British companies now moving in on Colombia.

Soros spreads ‘failed state’ lie

Other instruments of British policy are busy pumping out the lie that Colombia is “a failed state,” whose “crumbling” will require some form of UN intervention, to force upon it “peace” with the narco-terrorists.

Intelligent people will draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that this propaganda campaign was kicked off by an instrument of the world’s biggest promoter and financier of drug legalization, Britain’s favorite megaspeculator, George Soros.

On Aug. 17, 1997, the *Washington Post* ran an opinion column by Roger Weiner of the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. With the blazing headline, “Colombia Emerges as the Bosnia of South America,” the article proclaimed that Colombia “is tearing itself apart. It is fast becoming a Bosnia, or the closest thing to it in this hemisphere.”

If the Clinton administration does not want to be held responsible for this calamity, Weiner’s argument went, it must intervene in Colombia’s upcoming elections to ensure the defeat of General Bedoya, to thereby defeat any Colombian mobilization to stop the drug trade militarily. Hysterical that the Clinton administration might support such a Colombian effort, Weiner wrote that the alleged “spread of this ‘dirty war’—not the country’s drug cartels—is the greatest threat to Colombia, its neighbors, and the interests of the United States.”

By his job, it would indeed appear that Weiner does not

DO YOU KNOW

- that the American Revolution was fought ~~against~~ British “free trade” economics?
- that Washington and Franklin championed Big Government?
- that the Founding Fathers promoted partnership between private industry and central government?



Edited by Nancy Spannaus
and Christopher White

READ

The Political Economy of the American Revolution

edited by
Nancy Spannaus and
Christopher White

order from the publisher:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390
Washington, D.C.
20041-0390

or call

Ben Franklin
Booksellers

800-453-4108

\$15.00

plus \$4.00 shipping and handling

consider the drug cartels a threat. He is the coordinator for the Latin American and Caribbean Program at the Lawyers Committee, an influential NGO headquartered in New York City, closely involved in United Nations operations, and funded by George Soros, every which way: by his Open Society Institute, by executives of Soros Management Fund, and personally. Soros and his wife are listed among the largest financial sponsors of the Lawyers Committee.

In a conversation, Weiner explained that the key to his crowd's policy, is to use a "human rights" campaign to "limit options of the U.S. government, to either fight the drug war, or help the Colombian Army fight the insurgency."

By publishing in Washington's leading daily, Weiner put on the table what the British-loving crowd around the Inter-American Dialogue has promoted privately. The Dialogue's Viron Vaky is reported to be most vocal on the urgency of multilateral intervention in Colombia. Edgar Dosman, board member of the Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL), a Canadian government dependency busy organizing for hemispheric drug legalization (see *EIR*, Aug. 29, 1997, p. 40), puts out the line that it is the Clinton administration's refusal to consider drug legalization which has led to the imminent "fragmentation" of Colombia. Former U.S. Ambassador to Colombia Charles Gillespie, from Brent Scowcroft's Forum for International Policy, argues that while he prefers the Haiti analogy to that of a Bosnia, it must be assumed that Colombia faces "fragmentation, fracture." He, too, angrily rejects any proposal that the United States aid Colombia in defeating the cartels and their narco-terrorists, calling General Bedoya, "nuts."

Shell's 'Flight of the Buzzards'

In February, a new phase of the assault on Colombia is set to begin, this one run inside the country, and directed by the networks of Royal Dutch Shell, one of the British Crown's leading instruments of global economic and political power. Portraying itself as just "a neutral group" of Colombians, an outfit called Destino Colombia is preparing to launch a national debate on the future of Colombia, as a complement to Britain's desired "peace" negotiations with the narco-terrorists.

Destino Colombia was set up in 1996 by Inter-American Dialogue Co-Vice Chairman Juan Manuel Santos (now a Presidential candidate in Colombia), and a businessman from Cali, Colombia, Manuel José Carvajal. The man running the show, however, is Adam Kahane, a Canadian national who comes out of Royal Dutch Shell's Scenario Planning Department. Kahane currently runs "scenario projects" in Canada, Cyprus, Japan, and other countries, out of his Center for Generative Leadership, co-founded with Joseph Jaworski, a former Director of Scenarios at Royal Dutch Shell.

During 1991-93, while still working for Shell, Kahane and Clem Sunter, right-hand man to Harry Oppenheimer of Anglo American Corporation, ran a brainwashing project in

South Africa known as the "Mount Fleur scenarios." Mount Fleur's purpose was to shape the transition to a post-apartheid government in that country, in order to best protect the long-term interests of the British Empire and its corporate agencies, Anglo American and Royal Dutch Shell.

The "scenario process" concocted by Shell in the early 1970s—Shell maintains a kind of patent on these scenario workshops, its proponents claim—is designed to give participants "the ability to re-perceive reality," as the founder of Shell's scenarios, Peter Wack, asserts. (Wack is a New Age nut, burning incense and meditating on puja sticks in his office, speaking in riddles and parables, etc.) The "process" starts with small T-Group sessions, run by a team of Shell controllers. Out of these groups, two to four alternative scenarios for future developments are concocted, packaged as simple "stories."

In the case of South Africa, Kahane's team came up with four "stories," which were then debated across the country: the Ostrich, the Lame Duck, Icarus (this one warned South Africans that if their country attempted to take off with "noble origins and good intentions," but neglected to take into consideration "economic forces," it would crash!), and, the Shell/Anglo American preferred outcome, "the Flight of the Flamingos." In the last, any group which did not agree to fly on the flock's terms, was held responsible for bringing down the flock.

What makes Shell's scenarios different from others, members of the Shell network explain, is that Shell shapes the "stories" to achieve a preferred outcome, by concentrating on changing *how* people think.

Shell "facilitators" discuss the South African Mount Fleur project as a dramatic example of how, through the propagation of carefully designed "stories," whole populations can be induced to put aside considerations of morality or truth, and instead argue the merits of one "story" over another. One facilitator explains that once people accept the stories as real, and not just propaganda, then people can be induced to discuss proposed policies on the basis of whether they "*fit*" the accepted story or not, not whether "it's good or bad. . . . You don't have to argue it on moral grounds. . . . When we argue on moral grounds, we have to make someone wrong. And that's a losing proposition. If you argue on the grounds of *fit*, then you don't have to be wrong."

In Colombia, Phase I, the T-Group sessions, has been completed. Participants included businessmen, trade unionists, two retired military, NGO representatives, paramilitary leaders, and leaders of the narco-terrorist groups (the latter, connected by speaker phone from jail or clandestinity!). Destino Colombia, under Kahane's direction, is now preparing for Phase II: the release of their "stories" about Colombia's future, through a big media splash in February. Videos and pamphlets are being produced, as well. What is to be eradicated from Colombia, if these Nazis succeed, is "intolerance," particularly toward narco-terrorists.