

Right-Left Synarchists Plan 100 Years' War in Ibero-America

by Valerie Rush

The psychologically unbalanced President Hugo Chávez of Venezuela devoted his regular Sunday television broadcast on March 7, to a five-hour rant against what he claimed was the Bush Administration's role in trying to overthrow his government. Referring to U.S. involvement in removing Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide from that country's Presidency, Chávez warned, "Venezuela is not Haiti, and I am not Aristide," and threatened that, should Washington attempt such an intervention in his country, "the Bolivarian revolution has enough allies on this continent to launch a Hundred Years' War, and not just on Venezuelan territory."

His threat is not an idle one. According to representatives of Haiti Progress and the Haiti Support Network who met with the deposed Aristide just after his fall from power on Feb. 29, the Bush Administration made the decision to remove Aristide from Haiti upon learning that "Venezuela was in discussion about sending troops to support Aristide."

Declaring Aristide the "legitimate elected President of Haiti," Chávez has already announced that his government will not recognize the new Haitian government, and that "the doors of Venezuela are open" to Aristide. Since Chávez came to power in 2000, Venezuela's doors have also been open to many unsavory elements on the continent, including the FARC and ELN narco-terrorists in neighboring Colombia, the coca-grower insurgents of Bolivia and Peru, and other armed Jacobin movements across Ibero-America.

Venezuela is at the epicenter of a continent-wide drive by the fascist Synarchist international to use "poor" versus "rich," "north" versus "south," and "left" versus "right" to engulf Ibero-America in a series of conflagrations that will trigger supranational military occupation and re-colonization. Haiti was but a trial run. Under the unstable tyranny of Chávez's so-called Bolivarian Revolution, Venezuela has been plunged into unending chaos, with no resolution in sight. The latest phase of the crisis came with a ruling by the Chávez-dominated National Electoral Council to invalidate more than one-third of the 3.4 million signatures on the opposition's recall petition against Chávez, bringing the approved number below the threshold of a constitutionally enforceable referendum. With an enraged opposition marching in the street, and splitting over peaceful or violent responses to the ruling, the

Supreme Court then issued its own finding, re-validating the signatures. More chaos and confusion.

Synarchist forces are doing their best to stir the pot. On the "left" are Chávez's Jacobin troops, the so-called "Bolivarian circles," which are rapidly taking shape as a fanatic paramilitary strike force. And on the extreme "right," backed by Vice President Dick Cheney's "chicken-hawks," are characters like Alejandro Peña Esclusa, a known collaborator of Spanish Falangist Blas Piñar and a public advocate of a military coup as the solution for Venezuela. Peña has hooked up with radical-right elements in Haiti, Venezuela, Peru, El Salvador, and within the Cuban-American community in Miami, to fight what he presents as a China- and Cuba-backed continental "communist threat."

Peña visited El Salvador in late January to exploit tensions in the period leading up to the March 21 Presidential election there. He addressed 300 people at an anti-Castro "Liberal Foundation" forum on the need to move quickly to prevent another victory by the Castro-linked São Paulo Forum, represented in El Salvador by former FMLN guerrilla leader and Presidential candidate Shafik Handal. Peña warned that failing that, "El Salvador could suffer a new civil war in the short term." His warnings were echoed by Salvadoran President Francisco Flores, who told the *Miami Herald* on March 11 that China was giving financial aid to Handal, that weapons were pouring into the FMLN's hands from unnamed leftist organizations in Latin America, and that a Handal electoral victory would turn El Salvador into another Cuba. In short, "a new civil war."

Cuban-American "chicken-hawk" Otto Reich, George Bush's special advisor on Latin America and infamous from the days of Iran-Contra, issued his own public threat in mid-March, that an FMLN victory on March 21 would bode ill for the small Central American country. The United States "would have to re-evaluate our relations" with El Salvador, Reich insisted, given that we don't share the "same values" with the FMLN that we do with the Flores government. He predicted that Handal would turn into another Chávez, and hinted darkly, "The choice [of a President] is sovereign, but the [U.S.] response will also be sovereign."

Despite Aristide's departure from Haiti and the arrival of U.S. Marines and other nations' troops, the threat of interne-

cine war has not abated, and it is clear that there will be no change in the U.S. policy of genocide against Haiti under Bush. In fact, no one but U.S. Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche (see box) is talking about the urgent need to resolve the desperate economic situation in the country, considered one of the four or five poorest in the world, as the most direct means of resolving Haiti's political crisis.

Haiti is a country in which 90% of the population is illiterate; the majority have no electricity or potable water, and a vast number are infected with AIDS. And while the United Nations called for establishing an emergency fund of \$35 million, to provide food and other necessities for six months, it turns out that this amount, divided among Haiti's 8 million, amounts to a ludicrous \$4.37 per Haitian, or less than 73¢ a month per person! Haitians are being told that they cannot escape the concentration camp into which their country has been turned by centuries of isolation and an unending series

of brutal dictatorships imposed or supported by the United States, including the infamous "Papa Doc" Duvalier and Aristide himself. On Feb. 25, President Bush reiterated that the United States would repatriate any Haitian who attempted to seek refuge on U.S. shores.

In fact, U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld gave the show away just days earlier, when he declared at a March 1 Defense Department briefing that Haiti "demonstrates the need for greater international capacity to conduct global peace operations." This is precisely the argument he used in November 2002 at the Defense Ministerial of the Americas, where he said that since terrorists and drug runners were threatening to take over "unoccupied areas of countries" such as Colombia, Haiti, and Brazil, it was necessary to deploy multilateral military forces to "re-establish sovereignty." The question is, *whose* sovereignty does Rumsfeld seek to re-establish on the Ibero-American continent?

LaRouche on Haiti

Excerpts from an interview with U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, by WRPI radio in Troy, New York on March 10, 2004.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, what's your take on the situation in Haiti? The recent coup d'état and President Aristide?

LaRouche: . . . The United States has a relationship with Haiti, going back to our struggle for independence. Haiti has been essentially destroyed many times over. I mean, the country is destroyed, even compared to the adjoining region of the island. We have done the worst with that area: It's not a problem with Aristide, or this guy, or that guy. The problem is, the United States has never accepted, in recent times, its moral responsibility to help the Haitians put their country back together again. That is our responsibility. We keep blaming them.

The way we treat the Haitians who are fleeing from that territory into Florida—it's horrible! It's wrong! We have to take a positive moral attitude on this thing, and we have to work with the nations of the region, to say—and tell the Haitians—"We are determined that you should have your independence, and you shall have development, and you shall have medical care, and the ability to live." That's our job.

We do it not only for the Haitians, we do it for ourselves. We do it, because we want to be the kind of country that does that kind of thing: Where a great injustice exists, we are the kind of country that will offer to help.

Q: Do you believe that, as President Aristide claims, the United States, directly or indirectly, assisted in kidnapping him from Haiti?

LaRouche: Well, I think that, certainly, U.S. policy created a situation in which that happened. As to what actual agencies were involved, I don't know. But, I am certain, from reading and following these events, that the United States is the principal perpetrator of the most recent mess! It started, probably, under the Clinton Administration, the mishandling of this Haitian problem under Clinton, and it's being mishandled in a much more extreme and worse way, under George Bush. . . .

Remember, Haiti established itself as a Republic, which at one point was modeling itself on the idea of the United States. So, this got it special hatred. . . . Of course, the problems that are occurring in other parts of the Caribbean are not much better; but they're not quite as bad, either. And the Haitian thing, is the thing that really sticks in my craw: This is the *worst* example of a *rotten policy* from the United States. There are other policies that are bad, but this is the absolute worst.

In my view, you always go to the worst case, to set a policy. In your own country, you look at the poorest layer of our population, and say, "Will this policy work for their children and grandchildren?" And if it works for the poorest ones, justly, then it'll probably work for everyone—as Franklin Roosevelt defined that: Always go to the "forgotten man." Take the person who's the greatest victim, of injustice or neglect, and start there; and prove that you are really for the general welfare of people, by showing that you're willing to face that problem. Look it in the eye, and talk about curing it.