

Colombian Voters Throw Over Narco-Capitulators

by Valerie Rush

Colombians gave an unmistakable “thumbs down” to the Andrés Pastrana government’s four-year policy of appeasement of the narco-terrorist cocaine cartel known as the FARC, when they went to the polls on March 10 and voted en masse against the “establishment” congressional candidates from the ruling Conservative and “opposition” Liberal parties. In fact, the Conservative Party was hit so badly that its chairman resigned in shame, its Presidential candidate threw in the towel, and a much-reduced bloc of Conservative congressmen gave their support to the front-running Presidential contender, dissident “hard-liner” Alvaro Uribe Vélez.

From now until the Presidential election in May, the issue on the table will not be whether to move against the narco-terrorists. That question was already decided on March 10. Rather, the campaign must now center around how to defend and rebuild the war-ravaged nation of Colombia, in the midst of an international financial crash brought on by the same global financier interests in Wall Street and the City of London who promoted the narco-terrorist FARC in the first place.

The Choices Facing Colombians

In the period leading up to the election, a dramatic escalation of FARC terrorism across the country had forced Pastrana to abandon his cherished illusion of clinching a negotiated “peace pact” with the FARC before leaving office. Instead, he ordered the military to retake the “DMZ,” 42,000 square kilometers of sovereign territory he had surrendered to the FARC cartel upon assuming the Presidency in 1998. The population celebrated this long-overdue decision to unshackle the Armed Forces, but gave no credit to Pastrana or to the political elites who have backed his lunatic policy for years.

The FARC’s reaction has been to up the ante. In the days immediately after the “DMZ” and its 100,000 captive inhabitants were liberated, FARC terrorists seized fringe Presidential candidate Ingrid Betancourt, and are holding her and at least five kidnapped congressmen, in hopes of exchanging them for imprisoned FARC leaders. FARC attacks on the nation’s critical energy, telecommunications, water, and transport infrastructure have escalated, as well. On March 16, Archbishop Isaiás Duarte Cancino from the city of Cali—an outspoken critic of both the FARC/ELN narco-terrorists and the drug traffickers infiltrating government—was gunned down leaving church. Terrorist attacks on Colombia’s urban centers and

more targeted kidnappings and assassinations are expected.

Uribe Vélez has promised, if elected, to use the resources of the State to fight back, with everything from armed militias even to foreign troops. But, by also embracing the very neo-liberal economic policies that have driven the Colombian economy into free-fall, he has been unable to present the nation with a plan for winning the peace, while winning the war.

The only candidate who has done that is retired Army general and former Armed Forces Commander Harold Bedoya Pizarro, who has not only pinpointed the Wall Street-FARC alliance that Colombia is up against, but has elaborated an economic reactivation program for the country, within the context of an international reorganization of the global monetary and financial system. Unlike Uribe Vélez, Bedoya also insists that Colombia’s Armed Forces can win the war against narco-terrorism without resort to UN “blue helmets” or foreign troop interventions—as long as they are given the financial, logistical and, most importantly, political backing they require.

How Will U.S. Policy Change?

Without a radical change in U.S. policy, however, it will be extremely difficult for Colombia, at this point of advanced disintegration, to seize the opportunity provided by the decisive electoral defeat delivered to the capitulationists on March 10. For more than two decades, despite occasional opposition here and there by saner American policymakers, U.S. policy towards Colombia has been dictated by Wall Street financiers who not only want to continue enjoying the proceeds of the drug-trade, but seek to legalize the business outright. Thus, despite the policy twists and turns since the drug trade established its beachhead in Colombia in the late 1970s, U.S. policy has been primarily aimed at taking down the national economy, State, and military of Colombia, while insisting the government negotiate “peace” with narcoterrorists.

Thus, the lie that the FARC are idealistic “rebels” and not narco-terrorists, was promulgated by the likes of New York Stock Exchange chief Richard Grasso, America On-Line founder Jim Kimsey, et.al. Also critical to blocking proper U.S. military assistance to Colombia, has been the continuous slanders against Colombia’s Armed Forces propagated by the United Nations and its gaggle of European and American “human rights” NGOs—most financed by George Soros’s drug-legalization operation.

In March, the Bush Administration began shifting policy towards Colombia, on a critical front. Against a backdrop of

***To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com***

public statements and testimony to Congress on the “symbiotic relationship” between terrorism and the drug trade, administration officials announced it would ask Congress to eliminate the restriction which currently prohibits U.S. security aid to Colombia from being used in anything but counter-narcotics operations. Under the current law, for example, the U.S. cannot legally provide Colombian authorities with satellite and other intelligence on FARC, ELN or other terrorist activities, unless it could be proven directly related to drugs.

Then, Attorney General John Ashcroft and Drug Enforcement Administration chief Asa Hutchinson announced on March 18 that three FARC leaders, including the head of the its 16th Front, Tomás Molina Caracas (alias “El Negro Acacio”), had been indicted for drug- and weapons-trafficking. Hutchinson specified that the 1st, 7th, 10th, 39th, and 44th Fronts, “among others” are identified as supplying cocaine to Acacio’s operation. Ashcroft said the entire FARC was being indicted: “Today’s indictment charges leaders of the FARC not as revolutionaries or freedom fighters, but as drug traffickers.”

That established, on March 21, the administration included a change in restrictions on aid to Colombia, in its supplemental request to Congress for \$27.1 billion in new security aid. The bill would permit Colombia to use U.S. aid to counter the “threat posed by groups that use narcotics trafficking to fund their terrorist and other activities.” No change was proposed, however, to the drug legalizers’ favorite law, known as the Leahy amendment, which, in the bogus name of protecting human rights, allows George Soros’ stable of “human rights” activists to knock out any Colombian military officer who fights to win, in any battle with the narcoterrorists.

Should Congress approve the change, stepped-up U.S. military aid should start going through. However, given the Bush administration’s adoption of the utopians’ imperial military posture globally, the question of what *kind* of aid goes to Colombia, and what, if any, broader policy package accompanies it, looms as a big question.

Thus far, officials, from President Bush on down, insist they have no intention of sending U.S. ground troops into Colombia, but rather, as Secretary of State Colin Powell said in a March 20 interview with the Colombian daily *El Tiempo*, “It’s a matter of trying to support the government of Colombia while it defends itself from terrorists and the drug trade.”

Repeated reports, however, insist that plans for increased aid to Colombia come attached to the sending of a new contingent of U.S. Special Forces trainers, modeled on the current deployment of “trainers” and “advisors” to the Philippines—who *are* deployed in combat, despite the official lies to the contrary. In any case, Colombia has not been losing this war because of a lack of Special Forces training, but rather because of the foreign-imposed refusal to mobilize all the State’s resources—military, economic and civilian—to defeat Wall Street’s Dope, Inc.