

Anti-drug strategy must target bankers behind legalization drive

by Michele Steinberg

In a letter dated Nov. 12, African-American U.S. Rep. Maxine Waters (D-Calif.) confronted Attorney General Janet Reno, demanding an answer to a simple question: Will the bankers responsible for laundering massive amounts of drug money in the case of Mexican political figure Raúl Salinas, brother of the former President of Mexico, and friend of former President George H.W. Bush, be indicted?

Following the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee hearings into money laundering on Nov. 9-10, Waters wrote: "I am today, demanding a response from you about the so-called investigation of Citibank/Citicorp and their alleged money laundering. . . . It is clear that Raúl Salinas, who is now legendary for his criminal activities, deposited not legally earned money, but drug money into Citibank/Citicorp's private banking system."

Waters is one of the highest-ranking U.S. officials ever to demand that *bankers*, the "money-changers" of the international drug trade, be charged with crimes.

The issue raised by Waters was at the heart of debate at the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Leadership Conference, hosted by the head of the White House Office on National Drug Control Policy, Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.), in Washington, D.C. on Nov. 3-4. That conference brought together, for the first time, the heads of the national anti-drug commissions for 34 nations in the Western Hemisphere.

The same issue is at the heart of the battle for Colombia, where New York Stock Exchange president Richard Grasso visited the jungle headquarters of the Colombian narco-terrorists, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), in June. He delivered Wall Street's implicit "stamp of approval" to the narco-terrorist group, which has murdered thousands of elected officials and Colombian citizens, as well as a handful of kidnapped Americans, and supplies the cocaine and heroin which floods the United States.

However, if Waters, or any other official of the U.S. Congress, means business, they will have to go a step further—to conduct a full Congressional inquest into Grasso's visit to Colombia. Anti-drug forces in Congress should also rally behind General McCaffrey's request to get \$1.5-2 billion in anti-drug funding to Colombia—immediately. At present, due to combined sabotage by GOP right-wing "balanced budget" fanatics, and the State Department's Madeleine Albright, funding has been cut from fiscal year 2000 appropriations.

Naming the names

Maximiliano Londoño, president of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) of Colombia, and a collaborator of U.S. Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, issued a statement on Nov. 6 which should act as the basis for the needed collaboration among the 34 nations, and for the needed follow-up hearings in the U.S. Congress. In his statement, entitled "No to Wall Street and the FARC," Londoño said:

"What in the world was New York Stock Exchange president Richard Grasso doing on June 25 of this year, meeting with 'Raúl Reyes,' the financial chief of Colombia's narco-terrorist FARC Cartel, in the very 'demilitarized zone' in Colombia where all the coca crops, laboratories, and illegal airstrips are located for the production and processing of cocaine?"

"Everyone assumes that the chief of Wall Street went to offer international backing to the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)—Who knows why? But couldn't it perhaps have been the reverse—namely, that the Third Cartel of Colombia is helping to financially rescue its Wall Street bosses and controllers. . . .

"The truth is, . . . LaRouche has warned, the international financial and monetary system is a huge speculative bubble on the verge of bursting. . . . In the course of trying to keep the current international financial system alive . . . Wall Street and its senior partners in London do not hesitate to use any kind of 'bonanza' or liquidity that might serve to bolster this sinking system a bit longer. . . .

"This is the main reason Richard Grasso came to Colombia, to consolidate an alliance with the FARC narco-terrorists, with the transparent backing of the U.S. State Department. . . . [This is] what is behind the fact that for the first time ever, Colombia's National Statistics Department (DANE) will officially include as part of its GNP calculations, the production of illicit crops, on the explicit orders from the IMF [International Monetary Fund], the World Bank, and United Nations."

Londoño, who has led the fight against legalizing dope in Colombia since he founded a leading anti-drug organization there in 1980, also exposes a key Grasso ally, "megaspesulator and drug legalization promoter George Soros, [who] has deployed his employee, Ethan Nadelmann of the Lindesmith Center, and Coletta Youngers of the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), to carry out yet another round of

lobbying in favor of legalization.” Indeed, Soros’s penetration operations are so high level into the U.S. and Ibero-American governments, that the “WOLA letter” was allowed to be included in official handouts at the hemispheric conference in the name of “democracy”! As one Bolivian official who did not wish to be identified said, “Soros has a \$550 million mining investment” in his country. How could he be officially denounced?

The inclusion of the WOLA letter was the work of the Organization of American States permanent bureaucracy and the State Department, which co-hosted the conference. Such tragic compromises are the only reason that the drug lobby has continued to make any gains whatsoever.

In fact, the effective collaboration between Londoño and patriots such as former Colombian Armed Forces Com-

mander Gen. Harold Bedoya (ret.), is a nightmare for Soros and his top gun Nadelmann, who deploy hundreds of millions of dollars a year for a well-greased drug legalization “propaganda machine” that is now operating in about 18 countries in North and South America, the Caribbean, Europe, and Australia. For years, the drug lobby has tried, and failed, to legalize the dope economy in Colombia.

Drug enforcement works

Despite Soros’s slick propaganda that the “drug war has been a failure,” country-by-country case studies show that drug enforcement *works*. At the hemispheric drug conference, a fact sheet on U.S.-Bolivia anti-drug operations prepared by McCaffrey’s office showed a dramatic reduction in coca leaf production. In 1995, Bolivia was the world’s second-largest

The international drug lobby’s targets

Nineteen ninety-nine was a critical year, as defined by the international drug lobby. The drug-legalization forces of billionaire speculator George Soros, an avowed enemy of nation-states in the Third World, have attempted to consolidate a victory in Colombia, where the narco-terrorist guerrilla group, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), gained control of about 40% of the territory of the country in a “cease-fire agreement” that is pushed by U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and President Andrés Pastrana of Colombia.

But the legalizers have at most achieved a temporary stalemate. Because of the counterattack by patriotic political and military leaders, it has again been shown that drugs can be eradicated, and that “surrender” to legalized drugs is folly.

On the “social policy” side, however, the rhetoric of the big lie—that drugs are “here to stay”—has gained allies. The drug lobby’s new propaganda is “harm reduction,” i.e., once people are brainwashed into thinking that drugs are here to stay, the dope lobby proposes laws to isolate the *diseases and damage* from drug use. For example, “clean needle exchange” or “heroin injection parlors,” the dope lobby suggests, will minimize the danger of hepatitis, or HIV and AIDS transmission.

The “harm reduction” argument is nothing but carefully crafted psychological warfare that takes hold in an atmosphere of cultural pessimism. Among frustrated law enforcement and military personnel, the argument is made that fighting drugs is like “banging your head against the wall.” Among political leaders in Hispanic and African-

American communities, the dope lobby plays on the unfortunate truth that addicts and low-level drug sellers get long jail terms, but bankers and brokers who launder money are never prosecuted.

The reality is that law enforcement efforts *succeed* where a mobilization by citizens carries the political battle. The best ally is the truth, along with a good intelligence picture of where the drug lobby is operating. While the drug lobby is well-financed and highly organized, with daily Internet news bulletins and fax operations to newspapers throughout the world, in reality, their numbers are few, and their support is limited.

The following is a sampling of recent initiatives by the tightly knit web of organizations financed by the Drug Policy Foundation and Lindesmith Center, which shows that the dope lobby is escalating its efforts:

U.S. Congress: June 1999—Legislation was introduced to legalize “medical marijuana” under Federal law. It has met serious opposition.

New Mexico: October 1999—Gov. Gary Johnson advocates drug legalization at a Washington, D.C. conference. Despite heavy support from the dope lobby, Johnson has been unable to legalize drugs in his state.

Maine: November 1999—A referendum to approve the “medical use of marijuana” passed by 61% to 39%.

Australia: November 1999—The Greater Danendong Council, a suburb of Melbourne, proposed “legalized drug” safe areas and heroin injection parlors, especially in areas with large Vietnamese immigrant populations. The move has been blocked by other elected bodies.

Spain: November 1999—Heroin injection parlors are officially opened in Madrid under government protection.

Argentina: November 1999—A federal judge associated with the newly elected ruling Alianza coalition proposed a drug legalization model based on Denmark’s “legal drug zone,” Cristiania, a counterculture ghetto.

coca leaf producer, with 48,600 hectares of coca planted. After years of gradual reduction, in 1998-99, there was a precipitous drop, down to 24,800 hectares — nearly half of the coca production was eliminated. Even more important, 1999 saw a sharp reversal of new land put into coca production: More than 12,000 hectares of coca was eradicated, and only 800 hectares of new plantings was added. This represents a drop in cocaine production potential during 1995-99, from 240 metric tons to 90 metric tons.

However, the key to the Bolivia coca problem, as *EIR* has documented, was something not officially discussed at the international conference: The rise of the coca trade in Bolivia was never an underground phenomenon, but a *deliberate* move by the financier oligarchy, whose tool, Harvard's Dr. Jeffrey Sachs, served as an economic adviser to the Bolivia government's privatization board in the late 1980s. Only when Bolivia got rid of Sachs, was it possible to decrease drug production. But now, Sachs is operating in Colombia, which has become the world's leading coca grower and cocaine producer. (Wherever Sachs goes, there has been a destruction of the physical economy in favor of dope and the black market. In Russia, Sachs administered "shock therapy," which resulted in setting up the mechanisms for the theft and looting of about \$100 billion by IMF and free market "reformers.")

Legalizers on a rampage

The Soros networks are on an unprecedented campaign to force through whatever facet of legalization they can muster under the rubric of "harm reduction" (see box). They are using falsified figures, and covering up clear advances in the anti-drug war, such as the coca eradication success in Bolivia, and similar success in Peru. The legalizers, who depend on their disinformation and a "clueless" electorate, are celebrating the gains of 1999, including the Nov. 2 vote that legalized the "medical use" of marijuana in Maine.

The clearinghouse for *all* legalization operations worldwide is the Drug Policy Foundation (www.dpf.org), which receives about \$5 million a year from Soros. The DPF and the Lindesmith Center, which operates out of Soros's Open Society Institute buildings in New York, provide funding to "harm reduction" (i.e., pro-legalization) groups, including in Central and Eastern Europe.

The DPF also announced that it is now providing "fiscal and political support" to the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws and other groups to establish the Medical Marijuana Network, "MMN," for a big push for ballot initiatives in 2000.

Nadelmann explains it like this: "Drop the 'zero tolerance' [i.e., that drug addiction should not be accepted and tolerated in a republic] . . . and the illusory goal of a drug-free society. Accept that drug use is here to stay, and that we *have no choice* but to learn to live with drugs so they cause the least possible harm and the greatest possible benefits."

McCaffrey has "zero tolerance" for this sophistry. On

Nov. 5, in answer to questions about the legalization drive in America, McCaffrey said, "This isn't going to happen. This doesn't make sense. This would be a violation of the human rights of the individual. . . . I would prefer to leave these decisions in the hands of the National Institutes of Health . . . and the physicians. I don't believe it is a wise exercise of democracy to vote on medicines, or to vote on air traffic control procedures," or in other cases where the "majority opinion" might endanger the lives of 270 million people.

Nat'l Missile Defense: a Lott of rotten pork

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Sometime before he leaves office in January 2001, President Bill Clinton will decide whether the United States shall proceed with the construction of a National Ballistic Missile Defense system; and, according to several well-placed sources in the defense establishment, the specific proposal being shoved down the President's throat has more pork in it than a "good ol' boys" Southern pig roast.

The deadline was imposed on the President in February, when the Senate, by an almost straight party-line vote, passed the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (S. 257), a foolish piece of agitational propaganda that stated, "It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as it is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense [NMD] system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate)." The bill mandated that President Clinton make a decision on deployment before his term expires.

Shortly after the bill was passed, Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, the author of President Ronald Reagan's March 23, 1983 Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), penned a devastating exposé of the folly of the so-called NMD bill ("The New ABM Flap," *EIR*, Feb. 26, 1999), equating the proposed deployment of outmoded "kinetic kill vehicles" with the earlier anti-SDI efforts of the late Gen. Danny Graham's High Frontier organization, the Heritage Foundation, and other "strategically challenged" right-wing think-tanks.

LaRouche emphasized, "The issue of SDI as I proposed this in 1979 and 1982, and as President Reagan offered this to Moscow in March 1983, is still high on the agenda of nations today, but the circumstances are different. What remains the same, then and now, is that we must never permit any weapons-system to become so much a power over mankind's fate, that such weapons might doom us. . . . We must never permit the world, ever again, to be locked into a state