

Terror attack fails to silence Zapatista foes

by Carlos Wesley

A terrorist assault in Paris on June 20, staged by French supporters of the Mexican Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN), failed in its aim of preventing two Mexican congressmen, Walter León Montoya and Alí Cancino Herrera, from completing a tour of Europe and publicizing the ugly truth about the EZLN. The two legislators, who represent the beleaguered state of Chiapas in the Congress of Mexico, visited France, Germany, Italy, and the Vatican. They were accompanied by Marivilia Carrasco, leader of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) in Mexico.

The visit, organized with the help of the respective Schiller Institutes of the host countries, gave Europeans the true picture about the ongoing uprising launched on Jan. 1, 1994 by the EZLN: This is not an indigenous "Mayan Indian" rebellion, as is generally portrayed by the media, but rather a grab by the *international* oligarchy for resource-rich Chiapas, said the congressmen.

Apparently fearing that the tour would destroy the tissue of lies they have spread internationally around Chiapas, thus threatening the political and financial support that important layers of European society provide to the EZLN, controllers of the EZLN ordered the June 20 terrorist assault. As the lawmakers were about to give a talk in Paris, about 20 individuals, some of them hooded with ski masks in the style of the EZLN, entered the hall, blocked the doors, and attacked the Mexican parliamentarians and the audience with chemical irritants, stink-bombs, and firecrackers. A number of conference participants were injured, including a representative of the Mexican embassy and two journalists. The majority of the attackers were French skinheads, who absconded with the list of participants. Before leaving, they spray-painted on the wall, "Land and Liberty: EZLN," "EZLN," and "Viva EZLN."

The attackers' actions spoke more loudly than words could have done. They proved conclusively that the Zapatistas are not fighting for Chiapas's "poor and downtrodden," but are part of an international terrorist operation, whose

aim is Mexico's institutional and territorial disintegration. Details of the attack, and of the congressmen's message, were reported prominently by the Mexican and the international media, including Reuter and Univisión.

The attack had the effect of exposing the British sponsors behind the EZLN. Parts of an interview given to a Chiapas radio station by Hugo López Ochoa, spokesman for the MSIA, were picked up and rebroadcast throughout all of Mexico by Notisistema Mexicano. López Ochoa said that the Schiller Institute had protested to the French government for the negligence of the French police, which failed to provide protection for the congressmen. He also gave a detailed report on how the international oligarchy that is grouped around the British monarchy, has deployed and run the EZLN and its international support apparatus, acting through such individuals and institutions as Prince Phillip's World Wide Fund for Nature, the elite Club of the Isles, the Hollinger Corp. media empire, columnist Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, and the multi-millionaires Jimmy and Teddy Goldsmith.

Ruiz, the first-class terrorist

The congressional tour occurred in parallel to an organizing drive in Europe by Samuel Ruiz, bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas in Chiapas. Ruiz, who is known to be the top commander of the EZLN's armed insurgency, was in Europe "not only to lobby for the Nobel [Peace] Prize, which would be fatal for Mexico," said López Ochoa, but to get financing for the uprising the EZLN is planning for July-August, "when the most painful part of the International Monetary Fund's economic package will be implemented."

The MSIA spokesman said that "Samuel Ruiz may have lost his Nobel because of this attack. Now Europe knows that the EZLN is not only a Mexican problem, but a European one as well." On June 22, the Chiapas daily *Es* gave front-page, banner headline coverage to the charges levelled by the MSIA spokesman.



Marivilia Carrasco of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement stands before graffiti sprayed by French pro-Zapatista skinheads during the June 20 attack, during which a number of people were injured.

Bishop Ruiz, who subscribes to the existentialist Theology of Liberation, happened by chance to be flying to France on the same airplane as the congressmen—"but with the important difference that while Bishop Ruiz was flying in first class, we were flying in second class," quipped Congressman León Montoya in a phone interview with a Mexico radio station from Bonn, Germany on June 23.

Just as was the case with the Nobel Peace Prize that was bestowed upon Guatemalan terrorist Rigoberta Menchú in 1992, a Nobel for Ruiz would be a political warhead aimed at Mexico and all of Central America—and ultimately at the United States itself, since the effect would be a dramatic expansion of the insurgency that is feeding separatist tendencies inside Mexico, and a furthering of the Ruiz-led schism within the Roman Catholic Church.

What Indians?

At a press conference in Bonn on June 21, the two lawmakers explained that the EZLN's agenda of violence is linked to the strategic importance of Chiapas for the development of Mexico. "Chiapas has more than 15% of the potential oil reserves of the world, 10% of the uranium, and more than one-third of Mexico's strategic raw materials and resources," said Congressman Cancino Herrera (see *Documentation*). He added that Chiapas "provides 70% of the electricity to Mexico City, and supplies electrical power to 22 other states. About 80% of the country's hydro-power resources are concentrated in Chiapas."

The insurgents, conspicuously led by non-Indians, are not out to defend the legitimate social and political needs of Chiapas's indigenous population; instead, they want to drive Mexico into a fratricidal war, splintering the nation and leav-

ing it vulnerable to the international financial forces which are out to seize its vast natural resources, the Mexican lawmakers said.

The delegation met with European parliamentarians, diplomats, military and government officials, churchmen, and media representatives. They also met with "the very prestigious" Lyndon LaRouche, as he was described by León Montoya. At those meetings, Cancino Herrera dispelled the four most common myths about the Chiapas uprising:

Myth 1: The EZLN defends the Indians. Truth: Most of the truly indigenous population fled the EZLN.

Myth 2: The Chiapas cattlemen are racist oligarchs. Truth: Most are poor, and many are Indians.

Myth 3: The Roman Catholic Church supports the rebels. Truth: Of the three Catholic dioceses in Chiapas, two are against the armed movement. Only in Ruiz's diocese are priests actively engaged with the EZLN.

Myth 4: The Indians are the "good guys," the others are bad. Truth: There are good and bad Indians, just as there are good and bad Mestizos and whites.

In his June 23 interview from Bonn with Radio Red of Chiapas, León Montoya said that in Germany they had met with officials of Misereor and Adveniat, two charities linked to the Roman Catholic Church that have provided funds to Bishop Ruiz and his terrorist projects. León Montoya said that they informed officials of both organizations that the money they perhaps thought was going to help the impoverished Indians of Chiapas, was instead being used to finance violence. He said that officials of the charities took that information "very seriously."

Documentation

Excerpts from the speech which Mexican Congressman Ali Cancino Herrera delivered during his European tour.

More than two-thirds of the truly indigenous population fled from their supposed armed representatives during the 1994 uprising. . . .

The real leaders of the EZLN are not exactly Indians. The best-known of them, so-called Subcommander Marcos, is a Creole, who hails from the border with the United States. The chief of the guerrillas who took the town of Las Margaritas in January 1994, was a nun named Jeannine, of French origin and Canadian nationality. . . .

Regarding the cattlemen in Chiapas, it is evident that there is much generalizing going on. Agriculture in southern Mexico has been in crisis for years, and a good portion of the population is dedicated to raising cattle. In such circumstances, the term "cattlemen" is very misleading, because many indigenous people, even some who were with the uprising, have been cattlemen. . . .

In Chiapas, there are approximately 500 large-scale cattlemen, those who have between 100 and 1,000 head of cattle; approximately 20 have more than 2,000 head of cattle, and a few have more than 5,000 head. The major proportion of the cattlemen, more than 6,000, have 5-25 head of cattle. The last grouping has an annual income of between \$300 and \$2,500. But according to the propaganda, this sector is an "oligarchy."

Another definite factor in Chiapas is its religious composition. In real terms, the majority of the indigenous people are evangelicals who have stopped believing in the bishop of San Cristóbal. In the case of the Tzotzils, this is significant, because the great majority belong to the Orthodox Church. The bishop and his priests have no access to most indigenous communities.

The Catholic Church has three dioceses in Chiapas; two are against the armed movement, and only in San Cristóbal has the participation of priests in clearly organizing the conflict been noted.

Without a doubt, Bishop [Samuel] Ruiz is one of the direct or indirect instigators of the war. On several occasions, nuns have been caught transporting arms. The bishop himself chastises the guerrilla sympathizers for their passivity.

In the [peace] talks of San Andrés Larrainzar, Bishop Ruiz has been the voice of intransigence. . . .

The social demands of the EZLN are legitimate. . . . What no one agrees with, save a few special interests, is with the war, which will set back any solution to the problems for half a century. . . .

Now, the demands for a solution to the problems faced by the indigenous people, were changed for a political party, the PRD. The EZLN threatened to wage war if the PRD candidates—Amado Avendano and Irma Serrano—didn't win. The latter, as she admits in her book *A Calzón Amarrado*, made her fortune in illicit activities, including drug trafficking.

There is a myth that needs to be eliminated: that of the indigenous cultures. It is said that in Chiapas, the Indians are the "good guys," and the others are the bad ones. That's a way of manipulating the truth. As anywhere else in the world, there are some very good Indians, and good Mestizos also. There are Indians who are delinquents, just as there are whites and other racial groupings. . . .

What concerns us is that Chiapas has more than 15% of the potential oil reserves of the world, 10% of the uranium, and more than one-third of Mexico's strategic raw materials and resources. . . .

The guerrillas in Chiapas have no followers. Clearly, they do have some supporters among the old Stalinist left in the country. Communism . . . is waging one of its last battles in Chiapas. What is the worst, is that the militants from the former Mexican Communist Party stay in the comfort and security of their homes, away from the battle and without running any risk.

British intelligence footprints on Mubarak assassination attempt

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

As soon as the news broke on June 26 that Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak had narrowly escaped an assassination attempt in Addis Abeba, Ethiopia, Lyndon LaRouche raised the question, whether the attack had been the work of an intelligence agency, intent not on killing the Egyptian President, but on throwing a monkey wrench into a series of political processes in the region, and further targeting the nation of Sudan. Followup investigations in the United States and Europe provided ample information to back up LaRouche's thesis and implicate British intelligence involvement in the affair. There are three levels on which the events should be analyzed. First, the ground level *modus operandi* of the assailants; secondly, the immediate context within which it occurred; and thirdly, the broader political-strategic context, viewed from a historical perspective.

On the ground level, several disturbing aspects of the operation raise serious questions. Given that Mubarak was traveling in a heavily armored car, why did the estimated 7-9 assailants think they could achieve their aim with Kalashnikov automatic weapons? If, as press accounts reported, the assailants had heavy weaponry, including grenade launchers and explosives, in the villa where they were housed as well as in one of the two vehicles they used in the attack, why did they not use them?

Why did Mubarak, speaking to the press in Cairo on his emergency return, give such an odd account of his security situation? Mubarak was quoted in a June 26 bulletin of the Egyptian embassy, saying the circumstances were not usual on the ride from the airport into Addis Abeba. All his "personal security officers," he said, "were put in one car, which was rather suspicious." Mubarak continued, "In a blink of an eye, they got out of the car and started firing back at the attackers, gunning down three while the rest of the attackers fled." He added the curious comment, "Naturally, the attackers never expected to be fired at from our cars, perhaps they thought they were on a picnic."

According to press accounts, the gunmen opened fire after stopping the three-car motorcade with a jeep. Men who had been inside the jeep, and others placed on rooftops, fired automatic weapons at the armored car. Two Ethiopian policemen and two assailants were killed, whereas the other seven or eight succeeded in escaping. Mubarak's car immedi-