

Colombia Strikes Back At Britain's Dope, Inc.

by Dennis and Gretchen Small

Oct. 3—If you want to win, you first have to be willing to fight. That is a lesson which most of the U.S. Congress evidently has yet to learn, as they scampered back to their districts without even mentioning Glass-Steagall in public, without a volley being fired.

Not so Colombia, whose government and Armed Forces bombed the military headquarters of the narco-terrorist FARC on Sept. 22, and then helicoptered troops in for a final assault. When the combat cleared, the FARC's satanic military commander, Jorge Briceño Suárez, alias "Mono Jojoy," had been killed; the jungle compound, concrete bunker and all, was destroyed; and 18 computers, 94 USB memory sticks, and 14 external hard drives of the FARC military command were in government hands.

This blow marks "the beginning of the end" of the FARC, Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos announced hopefully.

If followed up right, it could bring down a lot more than the FARC in Colombia. The FARC is the world's leading cocaine cartel, and a key British imperial asset. What a treasure trove of intelligence on its international connections must lie in those computers! It would not be at all surprising to find the names of top Inter-Alpha bankers—who, after all, are the principal controllers and beneficiaries of London's Dope, Inc. And, who knows, maybe even the private cell phone number of the Queen of England?

Five Minutes to Midnight

Equally important, is the blow that the Colombian action delivered to London's Big Lie that drug cartels are undefeatable.

Since the 1970s takeoff of the global drug trade, which followed the end of the Bretton Woods system, and the establishment of Lord Jacob Rothschild's Inter-Alpha Group, the City of London has defended its dope trade with a message delivered in blood, in country after country: You can't win, so don't fight. The crude strat-

egy is called "silver or lead": Get on the cartel payroll, or be shot. Or watch your parents, your children, your wife be shot.

The message delivered locally by cartel killers, is repeated *ad nauseam* by City of London mouthpieces such as *The Economist*, George Soros's legalization apparatus, et al. The dope trade is too big, too rich, too powerful, to be defeated. Legalize dope, make some money (we've bankrupted you already), and we'll ease up on the killing—maybe.

Just look at what has been done to Mexico: Not only has London's drug trade driven that nation into Hell, but the City of London's media outlets are urinating on it. The Autumn issue of London's *FT Wealth* magazine features as its cover story the obscene cemetery of the narco-lords that towers over Culiacán, the capital of the state of Sinaloa, where the drug trade has ruled for years. Gilded, turreted, two- and three-storied, marble- and Virgin statue-filled, air-conditioned mausoleums for cartel drug lords and killers are packed into Culiacán's Los Jardines del Humaya cemetery, as if they were the tombs of royalty. (*FT Wealth* is the quarterly magazine of London's *Financial Times*, offering exotic investment opportunities to the world's wealthiest 1%. Amongst whom is many a drug lord.)

London's key asset in its drug legalization drive is U.S. President Barack Obama. Obama has given 100% backing to Britain's Opium War in Afghanistan, over objections from some of his own national security advisors. And he set up Mexico for the kill, over the objections of U.S. anti-drug institutions, with his decision a year ago to stop using Federal law to prosecute marijuana trafficking in California carried out under the cover of "medicinal marijuana."

Now, endgame has arrived in California. On the ballot in that state on Nov. 2, without a peep of opposition from the White House, is Proposition 19, for the legalization of the cultivation, sale, and consumption of marijuana. The legalization lobby has already announced that, should Prop. 19 pass, the anti-drug fight in Mexico is over, and across-the-board legalization of drugs begins.

Two of the most outspoken drug pushers among Mexico's political elites, former Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda and intellectual and political advisor Héctor Aguilar Camín, both asses in Soros's legalization stable, laid out the sequence of events envisioned by London in in the *Washington Post* on Sept. 5.

“If California legalizes marijuana, will it be viable for our country to continue hunting down drug lords in Tijuana? will Wild-West shootouts to stop Mexican cannabis from crossing the border make any sense when, just over that border, the local 7-Eleven sells pot?” they wrote. The question instead would be, whether Mexico should “legalize all drugs, or just marijuana,” and should it do so unilaterally, or coordinate a joint surrender with the United States? Castañeda and Aguilar Camín explain that they want all drugs legalized, but “it strikes us as easier and wiser to proceed step by step toward broad legalization, starting with marijuana, moving onto heroin ... and dealing only later, when Washington and others are ready, with cocaine and synthetic drugs.”

Colombian President Santos had a different take on the California ballot initiative. In a *Time* magazine interview after the blow against the FARC, Santos said: “Can you imagine what I am going to say to peasants in Colombia who grow marijuana if the referendum in California is approved? Is there not a tremendous contradiction and paradox? This is a situation that we’re going to have to sit down and review with maturity. Because it’d be very difficult for you, the U.S., to continue saying that the war on drugs is marvelous ‘but for my richest state, it’s legal to produce and consume.’ If you can explain that to me, I will bow.”

The Alternative to Dope

Colombia’s timely blow on behalf of civilization intersects the fight inside the United States over whether to fight or not. Not everyone has acquiesced to Obama’s capitulation to Dope, Inc.

President Santos made the broader point in his *Time* interview. Asked if there were “lessons that can be learned from Colombia that can be applied to other countries like Mexico that are dealing with drug problems as well as long-running insurgencies,” Santos answered: “I don’t negotiate with terrorists. You must give a very clear signal. Free the kidnapped people and cease the recruitment of children and terrorist activities, and then we talk. If they don’t do that, we’re going to continue the pressure.” He argued that the government must then bring economic development to peasants who currently have no options other than growing coca for the cartels.

Santos, who was trained as an economist at the London School of Economics, left the matter there. The

Colombian people, however, remoralized by the hope of an end to the hideous war they have been suffering for decades, yearn for much more far-reaching goals, as is demonstrated by the explosive interest in Lyndon LaRouche’s concept of global cooperation on great infrastructure projects such as the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), and the related Bering Strait tunnel to link the Americas with Eurasia. Ten university campuses organized showings of LaRouche’s Sept. 24 webcast, so that hundreds of Colombian students would have an opportunity to see the future they can help build.

The prospect of peace in Colombia, in fact, is a necessity for completing the companion project of building a high-speed rail line through the Darien Gap, which spans the Colombia-Panama border, and would link South America into such a planetary renaissance.

That Colombia can now contemplate such development, stands as a dramatic testament to the potential for freeing Mexico from death as a dope plantation. As Santos’s remark indicates, the Colombia-Mexico parallel is already a hot one. Britain’s Obama already was forced to publicly counter his own Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, on the lessons of Colombia vis-à-vis the drug cartel threat to Mexico. In the Q&A after her address to the New York Council on Foreign Relations on Sept. 8, Clinton stated that the drug-trafficking threat in the Western Hemisphere “is, in some cases, morphing into, or making common cause with what we would consider an insurgency, in Mexico and Central America.”

Citing the appearance of carbombs in Mexico, she accurately noted that Mexico “is looking more and more like Colombia looked 20 years ago, where the narco-traffickers control certain parts of the country—not significant parts; in Colombia, it got to the point where ... more than a third of the country—nearly 40% of the country at one time or another—was controlled by the insurgents, by the FARC.”

The clear implication of Clinton’s remarks was that you have to fight to defeat the drug trade, not capitulate to it in the form of drug legalization.

But the very next day, in an exclusive interview with the Los Angeles daily *La Opinion*, Obama flatly contradicted Clinton, stating that “you cannot compare what is happening in Mexico with what happened in Colombia 20 years ago.”