

accurately call it their victory.

Will the Real Christians Stand Up?

On July 1 Bauer made his first trip to Israel, where he delivered a letter to Sharon. Speaking in the name of “Christians” like Dr. James Dobson, Chuck Colson and Rev. Jerry Falwell, this letter pledges total support for the fascist policies of the current Israeli government.

In reality, as *EIR* has documented, the so-called Christian evangelicals do not speak for Christians in the United States. The major Christian denominations—Catholic, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist—have all gone on record attacking the recent outrageous Israeli assaults on the Palestinians, and on the Church of the Nativity. The National Council of Churches has also raised its voice, as have the Christian Churches in the Occupied Territories.

Yet, the national news media of the United States have been dominated by the Christian Zionists, who, in their alliance with Israel’s right-wing Likud party, promote a violently pro-Israel line. The roots of this alliance go back to 1977, when Likud’s Menachem Begin took power, and powerful financiers, who promote both the Likud and the U.S. evangelicals, decided to foster it. A study was produced by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1978, called “American Fundamentalism and Israel,” which obviously served as a guidebook to deepening the ties between the two.

Likud’s parody of Biblical themes—claiming that God gave the land occupied by the Palestinians exclusively to the Jews, and that the Jews have a divine right to settle anywhere in Eretz Israel—was opportunistically applauded by the Christian Zionists of various “dispensationalist” and “millennialist” strains, as consistent with their own distorted theology and Biblical interpretation. That reading is that the re-establishment of Biblical Israel is a fulfillment of prophecy, portending the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

When Likud came to power again in 1996 with Benjamin Netanyahu’s victory, Netanyahu moved quickly to mobilize the American Christian Right, including bringing evangelical and fundamentalist leaders to Israel for a tour and conference at which they pledged their support for the Likud agenda.

As of today, that agenda has been exposed for all with the will to see, as a program copied directly from the Nazis—of Warsaw Ghettos, mass expulsion, and destruction of a people. The next step would be the detonation of a wider war in the Middle East, which would expand into a worldwide religious war of unimaginable horror. Those who support that agenda, are no more “Christian” than Adolf Hitler.

For further reading:

- Scott Thompson and Michael Minnicino, “British Israelites and Empire,” *EIR*, Nov. 1, 1997.
- Anton Chaitkin and Nancy Spannaus, “Pat Robertson: End-Times Cultist, British Agent,” *EIR*, Nov. 21, 1997.

Case Studies

When ‘War on Terror’ Supports Terrorism

While the Bush Administration has pronounced the “war on terrorism” to be the number-one issue since Sept. 11, on the agenda of all the world leaders, a careful review of how it has pursued that war reveals some dramatic cases of double-speak and hypocrisy, and, in Ibero-America, an outright capitulation to the very narco-terrorist forces that comprise the leading component of the irregular warfare apparatus stalking the planet today. Here are the cases where that hypocrisy presents the greatest danger.

- In the case of Saudi Arabia, the “moles” inside the Bush Administration, in league with several prominent Washington think-tanks and tax-exempt foundations, is promoting the very overthrow of the House of Saud that has been the stated goal of al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. Thus, the neo-conservatives, Christian Zionists, and Jabotinskyite agents in the administration and Washington think-tanks—led by the Hudson Institute—are working in league with the very “new international terrorist apparatus” that they pretend to be combatting.

- In Colombia and Peru, the Bush Administration has, so far, failed to reverse the disastrous policies of former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and her allies on the Wall Street, who, during the Clinton Administration, abetted the narco-destabilizations of both Colombia and Peru. Albright boldly declared that there could be no effective war on narco-terrorism in Colombia, and she, therefore, embraced the idea of granting the narco-terrorist FARC a demilitarized zone, from which they waged a terror war against the Colombian people, and ran the biggest cocaine and heroin cartel in the hemisphere. Wall Street’s official endorsement of that policy came in the form of the infamous “investment embrace” between the chairman of the New York Stock Exchange and the financial leader of the FARC, which took place in the DMZ jungles in 1999.

Albright is an avowed proponent of George Soros’ Well-sian “Open Society.” In the case of Peru, Albright joined with Soros in promoting the overthrow of President Alberto Fujimori, installing Alejandro Toledo, a World Bank bureaucrat, as the President.

The brief case studies that follow are intended to supplement the profile of the Malthusian, Jabotinskyite, and Christian Zionist “mole hill” inside the Bush Administration, which must be purged, if there is to be any sanity reintroduced into American foreign and national security policy during the next three years.

In addition to targetting the Persian Gulf and Ibero-America, some of the same moles are promoting a shift in U.S. policy on the Korean Peninsula and in the Indian Subcontinent. As the result of their efforts, both regions are also on the verge of war and chaos.

- The drive to destabilize the Indian Subcontinent began at the end of 1998, and came in direct response to the official visit to New Delhi, by then-Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov. During that visit, Primakov gave his personal endorsement to the proposal, long associated with Lyndon LaRouche, for a strategic triangle of scientific and technological cooperation among Russia, China, and India. The LaRouche “strategic triangle” idea was a cornerstone of his Eurasian Land-Bridge proposal for bringing peace, stability and prosperity to the entire Eurasian land-mass, through the buildup of development corridors, with high-speed rail and other transportation links, massive construction of energy and other vital infrastructure, and the establishment of agro-industrial centers.

Initially, the Rand Corp. and the Cato Institute, two leading Washington Beltway think-tanks, launched vicious attacks against the Primakov proposal, falsely describing it as an attempt to build an anti-American alliance in Asia. India was seen as the weak link of the triangle, given the long history of British colonial manipulation, and the legacy of that manipulation in the always simmering conflict between India and Pakistan, over the disputed territory of Kashmir. Since October 2001, the U.S. war in Afghanistan has served to trigger rapidly worsening India-Pakistan tensions.

The presence of nuclear weapons on both sides of the India-Pakistan conflict has posed a particularly grave danger that any military brush-fire conflict between the two nations could rapidly degenerate into the first use of nuclear weapons since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This crisis could erupt at any moment, and there are utopian war-planners in Washington who would delight in provoking such a nuclear exchange, as a means of destroying any prospects for erecting LaRouche’s Eurasian Land-Bridge.

- The Korean Peninsula has been targetted for identical reasons by the same utopian madmen. Like the Indian Subcontinent, the Korean Peninsula is a crucial area for the Eurasian Land-Bridge. In his recent travels to Seoul, Russian President Vladimir Putin had supported the completion of the South-North Korea rail line, which would link up to the Trans-Siberian Railroad, and provide a completed transportation corridor, running from the Pacific Far East all the way to the Western European port of Rotterdam.

Key to the Land-Bridge advancement has been the “Sunshine Policy” of South Korea’s President Kim Dae-jung, who will leave office late this year. As already detailed in this report, several of the most prominent moles in the Bush national security apparatus—including John Bolton and J.D. Crouch—are on record as favoring a hard military confrontation with North Korea.

Appendix A

Narco-Terrorism Spreads War in South America

Colombia today is under siege by the world’s largest and wealthiest drug cartel, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The FARC deploys its assassins and explosives experts into Colombia’s cities, its chemists to cocaine and heroin labs around the country, its billions into the world’s stock and other financial markets, and its “ambassadors” into the global terrorist underground. It uses its army of 20,000—made up largely of kidnapped children, impoverished and desperate peasants, and lumpenized cast-offs from the Medellín and Cali drug cartels of the 1980s—as a battering ram against the nation’s political, economic, and military institutions, while destroying energy and communications towers, pipelines, aqueducts, and bridges, to isolate and balkanize the nation, the better to dominate it.

During the long years in which the FARC has been building an army intended to rival the Colombian Armed Forces, official Washington has prattled endlessly about “human rights,” “civil conflict,” and “negotiating the peace,” while furiously denying the mountains of hard evidence documenting that narco-terrorism does indeed exist. In fact, the FARC could have been stopped in its tracks years ago, by a firm agreement between Bogotá and Washington to shut down its drug-money pipeline and arrest and extradite its leaders as drug traffickers. Instead, the narco-terrorists were protected and encouraged by “utopian” elements within the State Department and Wall Street and London financial circles. They saw the FARC not only as a crucial source of drug money to reinflate their sagging monetary system, but also as a useful weapon for dismantling Ibero-America’s nation-states, and capturing its vast natural wealth—precisely the agenda set forward in Henry Kissinger’s 1974 NSSM-200.

Who are these new imperialists in Washington?

- Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs **Peter Romero** served during the Clinton years as the point-man for the State Department’s Ibero-America policy under **Madeleine Albright**. As Secretary of State, Albright’s role was to enforce the utopian agenda inside the Clinton Administration, in continuation of her father’s close friendship and collaboration with leading utopian figure Zbigniew Brzezinski. Romero did Albright’s footwork in Ibero-America.

In 1998, Romero hosted a “peace seminar” in Cartagena, Colombia, whose goal was to pressure the country—and especially its military—into negotiating a power-sharing ar-