

InSight

by Nora Hamerman

A voice of sanity

On Feb. 27, terrorists stormed the Dominican Embassy in Bogota, Colombia, while a large part of the diplomatic community was there. They seized 60 hostages, including the ambassadors of Brazil, Mexico and the United States. Across the street from the embassy, at a major university, students rioted after the taking of the embassy.

On Feb. 28, Lyndon LaRouche issued a strategic document warning that the Bogota incident has set into motion a scenario for nuclear confrontation with Moscow over the Caribbean—to be triggered by the sort of U.S. military action against Cuba that Brzezinski and Kissinger circles' leaks to the press in recent days have focused on.

LaRouche warned that “of a nation which continues to tolerate Kissinger and Carter’s lunatic adventures in bluffing, one must repeat the old adage, ‘Whom the gods would destroy, they first drive mad.’” The Democratic presidential candidate, targeted during the recent New Hampshire primary for an unprecedented slander and dirty tricks campaign by the New York Council on Foreign Relations, while his 20 percent of supporters in that election were brazenly disenfranchised by the same forces, has again raised the voice of sanity in American foreign policy.

We warned last week in this space that the “Iran model” of taking hostages would be repeated globally, spreading first to Latin America, unless the American population moved to put the responsible individuals in the Carter administration on trial for treason. Days after that column was penned, the Bogota incident erupted.

Let us speak plainly. There is a close analogy between Bogota and Teheran. The Bogota attack was widely advertised in advance. Warnings that the Colombia government was on alert for a terrorist attack on foreign embassies appeared Feb. 16 in the Mexico City daily *El Dia*, and Feb. 22 in the

London intelligence sheet, *Latin America*.

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance knew of the danger in advance, just as he cooperated with Henry Kissinger in bringing the exiled Shah of Iran into the United States—after Vance himself had authored a memorandum warning that the Shah’s entry would probably cause the taking of U.S. citizens hostage by the Iranian dictatorship of Khomeini.

Mr. Vance’s CFR friends, the people who connive with terrorists, are the same people who hate Lyndon LaRouche. Their specific hatred is directed against national sovereignty. They are “One Worldists.”

The “leftist” Prof. Richard Falk of Princeton, and the “right-wing” Mr. Kissinger agree on this. Kissinger is the author of the “limited sovereignty” doctrine, which he was only too glad to reiterate a few days back in Mexico City, offering U.S. military intervention there in case of terrorism.

Richard Falk, in the “human rights” volume he contributed to the Council on Foreign Relations *1980s Project*, asserts that human rights will only be achieved when sovereignty is destroyed. And Mr. Falk, as we have proven in some depth in this review, is one of the gurus of the Iranian “anti-imperialists,” as well as the U.S. antinuclear movement, the American Indian Movement, and assorted Central American “revolutionaries.”

Carter’s capitulation to the demands for a United Nations commission to try the United States for “crimes” against Iran, has given terrorists all over the world a legal precedent to carry on the assault.

LaRouche began to educate the American population on the real issues of foreign policy in two late-January national television addresses. He will be on CBS television March 15. A voice of sanity will be heard. Now, it must be heeded.