1 The History of the Anti-Military Project

The time has come for Ibero-American patriots, civilian and military, to report for battle. Now must they defend the sovereign right of their nations to maintain national Armed Forces, if they wish to still have a country to defend in the very near future.

Too many have failed to acknowledge the existence of the "New World Order" project to eliminate the institution of the Armed Forces in Ibero-America. Too many argue that all that is under discussion is that the military should be "restructured," like every other institution of the state, because of an economic crisis for which it is claimed there is no remedy. But far more than this is actually at issue.

The project to dismantle the Armed Forces is a matter of importance not only for the military. At stake in this battle is nothing less than the continued existence of the nation-state itself. If this vile plot is not stopped, the disintegration of the economy and national institutions that it will unleash will bring genocide of unimaginable proportions. Entire nations will disappear.

Therefore, it is imperative that civilians also join this battle. In June 1991, *EIR*'s Spanish-language magazine, *Resumen Ejecutivo de EIR* published a special issue, entitled "Bush's 'New Order': Eliminate the national sovereignty and Armed Forces of Ibero-America," which detailed the anti-military project. There we warned that the policy of destroying the Armed Forces "is not only directed against the institutions

of the military, but also against the Catholic Church, the trade unions, national industry and any institutionalized force which could offer resistance to the final objectives of George Bush's New World Order: colonial subjugation, looting of natural resources and genocide against the supposedly excessive population of the South."

Six months later, in January 1992, *Resumen Ejecutivo* again took up cudgels against the project, this time in a special supplement centered on the call to arms by Argentine Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín and his fellow officers against the New World Order. "The decisive battle before the continent is *not* that of 'democracy' versus 'dictatorship.' Rather, the continent must choose between genocide and development. . . . The very existence of the nation-state itself is now called into question," the supplement warned.

Resistance against the project has begun in every country in the region. Now, however, the time has come to move beyond national resistance, to forge a unified continental offensive determined to no longer resist, but to defeat the enemy and his plans. It is to aid in the elaboration of a strategy for *victory* that *EIR* now publishes this book.

The enemy has made its plans clear. "A world army is down the road," Paul Volcker, North American chairman of the Trilateral Commission, announced happily on March 29, 1993, following the annual meeting of that top Anglo-American policy planning body. The Commission spent much of its meeting discussing how to crush resistance to the creation of a permanent United Nations army: Volcker personally announced he is working on securing financing for the world army project.

Volcker epitomizes the bankers who designed the anti-military project. As U.S. Federal Reserve chairman, in 1979 Volcker deliberately initiated what he himself termed "the controlled disintegration" of the world economy by jacking up U.S. interest rates to unprecedented levels. Where the policy is heading was enunciated most starkly in 1990 by the chairman of Citibank, John Reed. Reed told Brazil's *Veja* magazine that "countries have disappeared from the face of the Earth. Peru and Bolivia will disappear." The bankers have declared global

war against every principle of western Christian civilization upon which world order has been based for the past 500 years.

The underlying premises upon which the anti-military project is based are three:

1. International Monetary Fund (IMF) rule over the world economy remains sacrosanct. In other words, usury and its constant companion, malthusianism, must govern all economic activity.

2. Sovereignty is passé, an outdated concept replaced by the "globalism" of the so-called post-modern era. This is not some minor shift of emphasis in world affairs, but a commitment to *eliminate the nation-state itself as the form in which human social life is organized.*

3. Communism is dead, leaving the Anglo-American combination—British brains deploying U.S muscle—as the sole superpower worldwide. All nations are expected to adapt to a world run by one superpower, and therefore, the argument goes, they no longer need a national military. The plan for Ibero-America in this schema is that it be absorbed, de facto, into the United States: its economy, its government, its culture, and its military.

Each of these premises is demonstrably false, but each has been driven into public acceptance by constant repetition in the mass media and elsewhere. Cowardice and a failure of nerve have also allowed the project to advance as far as it has, although the rationalizations for inaction have varied. Some have spent their time reassuring themselves that "demilitarization" would only happen to the other fellow; their country and military were too strong to be touched. Others blustered that they would tolerate "part" of the policy, because then they could negotiate a better deal under the New World Order for their country than their neighbors could. These were often the same people who sneered at Colonel Seineldín for leading an open fight against the New World Order, arguing that the Argentine colonel had "failed" because he got a life prison sentence, while they remain "free" on the outside, in a better negotiating position.

One military officer who made that mistake was El Salvador's Gen. René Emilio Ponce. General Ponce led the accep-

tance of the United Nations peace accord within the Salvadoran military, arguing, concession by concession, that in this way the military would not permit its own destruction. Today, not only is the Salvadoran military being dismantled wholesale and handed over to the communists, but Ponce himself has been labeled a murderer by the lying U.N. "Truth Commission," and has been ordered purged in disgrace.

Would-be reformers should consider carefully the frank admonition of Trilateral Commission ideologue Samuel Huntington to "democratizers" worldwide: "Promptly purge or retire all potentially disloyal officers, including both leading supporters of the authoritarian regime *and* military reformers who may have helped you to bring about the democratic regime. The latter are more likely to lose their taste for democracy than their taste for intervening in politics," Huntington wrote in his 1991 manual on *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century.*

It is the military institution as a whole that is the target, and therefore all military officers, whether they choose to fight, be "neutral," or even join the enemy side, are targeted for destruction.

The campaign against the military in El Salvador is just the beginning of a campaign for *international tribunals* to try Ibero-American military officers for the "crime" of defending their nations. The international propaganda demanding anti-military trials has already begun, based on the Big Lie that the Armed Forces of Ibero-America have committed crimes equal to or worse than those committed by the Nazis in World World II, or the Serbs in the former Yugoslavia today.

A worldwide campaign to get international courts to annul the national amnesties already granted in various Ibero-American countries to military personnel who participated in the anti-subversive campaigns of the seventies and eighties has already begun. New trials are being brought against these officers, this time in international courts such as the Inter-American Court in Costa Rica and the courts of other nations, including those of the United States.

This new offensive aims not only at bringing military officers to trial, but also *to make them targets for assassination*

by narco-terrorist groups. The pro-terrorist lobby, operating under cover of defending human rights, has already begun to publish, in Peru and Colombia, hitlists of military and police officers accused of "violating human rights."

So there is nowhere left to hide. The enemy is blowing up the foxholes. The time has come to fight.

To defeat an enemy, it is necessary to understand what the enemy's goal is, what strategies he is employing, and most important, his most vulnerable flanks. It is also necessary to have most clear what it is that one is fighting for, because only on those grounds can the whole population be mobilized in the defense of the nation.

A crucial part of this book, therefore, is the chapter on "How to Survive Without the IMF." For far too long, nationalist military officers have left the economic development of their nations in the hands of the very bankers and technocrats who are committed to destroying their nations. As American statesman Lyndon LaRouche emphasized in a 1993 interview with *Resumen Ejecutivo,*[1] the gains won against the communists on the battlefield can only be temporary, unless the military ensures that adequate measures are adopted to resolve the real problems of national life. And that requires an end to the looting by the IMF.

"It is almost impossible to fight guerrillas and submit to the IMF at the same time," LaRouche emphasized in this interview. "If you are carrying out an IMF program against your own population, which is what it is, or similar policies, and you are trying to fight guerrillas, you are facing a losing battle. Because the IMF is recruiting the guerrillas while the United States State Department will come in and threaten to cut you off from what little aid you're getting, if you kill any more of these guerrillas—and the Masons are accusing *you* of being human rights violators.

"So a firm, determined policy, but a policy which is based on *affirming* the welfare of your people, is the way to fight; and if you do not do that, you may lose."

---

1. Interview with Lyndon LaRouche in *Resumen Ejecutivo,* Vol. X, No. 7, May 1, 1993.

The looting and destruction of Ibero-America is neither a natural phenomenon nor a punishment of its peoples ordained by God, but the result of usury imposed by transnational financial powers whose evil policies have also destroyed the very northern nations in whose name they claim to act. If it musters its moral resources and political will, Ibero-America can bring the Anglo-American enemy to its knees.

1982: The Project Is Founded

The demilitarization project against Ibero-America became formally established as United States policy out of the great crisis in hemispheric relations of 1982-1983. Political and economic institutions in the Americas were hit by two successive shock waves in 1982: the Malvinas War of April-June 1982, and, three months later, the explosion of the Ibero-American debt crisis with the September declaration of a debt moratorium by Mexican President José López Portillo. Although few understood it at the time, the two events were closely related.

The first shock blew apart the military arrangements upon which Ibero-American defense strategies had been based for decades. The impact of the U.S. decision to back Great Britain in its war against Argentina extended beyond the unjustness of its rejection of the clear historical merits of the Argentine claim to the Malvinas Islands, illegally occupied by British forces in 1833. By providing Great Britain, an extracontinental power, with intelligence and military supplies for its war upon Argentina, the United States violated its solemn treaty obligations with Argentina under the Inter-American Reciprocal Treaty (TIAR).

The betrayal sent a message for every country signatory to the treaty. As State Department policy-planner Luigi Einaudi so bluntly stated in a 1991 address to a Woodrow Wilson Center forum, it was at the battle in "the Falklands/Malvinas Islands," as he called them, "when the great mythological alliance of the United States with the rest of the Hemisphere proved to be precisely that, mythological."

The abrupt burial of TIAR by the United States equally abruptly placed on the agenda of every country in the Ameri-

cas the question of what system of alliances, based on what hypotheses of national defense, should replace it. The Anglo-American powers had their answer ready, using the crisis to organize for the establishment of outright supranational rule under the doctrine of alleged "collective democratic security." For patriots in Ibero-America, however, the Malvinas War and the crisis which followed it offered a different lesson, awakening again the historical dream of a strong, independent, and integrated Ibero-America.

The Underlying Economic Issues

There was only one U.S. leader, economist and statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., who organized within the United States and abroad on behalf of the Argentine cause, and against the U.S. decision to ally with its own historic enemy, Great Britain, in the Malvinas War. In words that today appear prophetic, LaRouche warned that this war was not simply a conflict over the islands, but was provoked by Anglo-American financial interests, grown increasingly desperate over the looming bankruptcy of the world financial system. In the deteriorating international debt crisis, these interests, LaRouche charged, sought to establish a precedent for NATO out-of-area deployments against developing-sector nations. What the Anglo-American powers seek to defeat, in addition to the Argentine nation, LaRouche emphasized, is the principle of national sovereignty itself.

LaRouche, pointing to the underlying unity of the military and the economic crises, recommended that Ibero-American nations aim their fire at the most vulnerable flank of the would-be colonial powers: the financial system. At a press conference following his meeting with Mexican President José López Portillo at the presidential palace in May 1982, LaRouche called upon Ibero-America to unite, and drop "the debt bomb" as the only means to defeat the Anglo-American enemy, both in the ongoing war in the South Atlantic, and in the coming debt crisis.

Three months later, in August, LaRouche outlined a combined economic and political strategy whereby Ibero-America

could reassert strict adherence to the principle of sovereignty and the right to development in the Western Hemisphere, and simultaneously force the industrial powers to the negotiating table for long-overdue reform of the bankrupt, Anglo-American-dominated, international financial system. *Operation Juárez,* as LaRouche's strategy was titled, proposed that Ibero-America declare a joint debt moratorium and form an independent Ibero-American Common Market. The Common Market would allow the region to both defend itself in the short term against reprisals, and maximize long-term development. With proper investment of its rich resources, Ibero-America could become an economic superpower, LaRouche argued.

The proposal contained the possibility of changing the entire world strategic geometry. If an independent power bloc formed in the Americas, the entire "New Yalta" to which the Anglo-American interests were committed could be overturned.

The Inter-American Dialogue Is Born

The Anglo-Americans were not about to let that happen without a fight. With political and institutional networks thrown into disarray by the combined Malvinas War and debt crisis, Anglo-American interests moved quickly to rebuild channels to ensure the continuation of their dominance over policy in the region. Thus was born the Inter-American Dialogue.

In June, July, and August of 1982, three seminars on the subject of the implications of the Malvinas War for inter-American relations were hastily organized at the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, a U.S. government-run and financed think-tank.[2] Director of

2. The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was founded by the U.S. Congress in 1968 to serve as a government-sponsored private research and policy center. Its governing board is made up of eight government officials, including the Secretary of State, and another 11 members appointed by the government. The latter include such top representatives of the Anglo-American financial elite as Citibank President John Reed, the honorary president of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith Max Kampelman, and

the Center's Latin American Program that year was Abraham Lowenthal; Program Associate was Louis Goodman, who four years later would head up the infamous 'Bush Manual' project against the Ibero-American military (see Chapter 2).

At the first seminar, Heraldo Muñoz, then a professor at the University of Chile, argued that if there had been a democratic government in power in Argentina, the attempt to recover Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands would never have occurred. Muñoz, today Chile's ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS) and a favorite on the Inter-American Dialogue circuit, is one of the leading operatives in the limited sovereignty project. In the second seminar, former U.S. State Department official Viron Vaky, and Nicolás Ardito Barletta of Panama, then-vice president of the World Bank, argued that the crisis offered an opportunity to create a stronger hemispheric system of government. In the third, former U.S. Ambassador William Luers suggested that greater communication between the U.S. and Ibero-America was needed.

Out of those seminars came the Inter-American Dialogue. Between October 1982 and March 1983, the Woodrow Wilson Center sponsored a series of meetings of the Dialogue, in which 48 Ibero-American and U.S. members discussed the agenda required for the continent, each ostensibly only as a "private" individual. U.S. government support for the endeavor ex-

---

Dwayne O. Andreas, president of grain cartel giant Archer Daniels Midland.

In 1977, the Center established a separate Latin American Program, financed by the U.S. government and the Ford, Mellon, and Rockefeller Foundations, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the World Bank, major U.S.-based multinational corporations, and a group of "far-sighted Venezuelan leaders from that country's private sector." Since then, the center has brought up dozens of Ibero-American policymakers and academics to work jointly with their U.S. counterparts on projects of interest to the U.S. government. At the end of 1991, for example, the Center set up a special three-year project to study Venezuelan affairs, jointly sponsored with the Venezuelan government's Fundación de Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho. The Center's 1990 project advocating indigenous ethnic conflict in Ibero-America is reported in Chapter 4 of this book.

tended beyond the sponsoring role of the Woodrow Wilson Center: Attending the founding meeting on Oct. 15, 1982 were Secretary of State George Shultz and Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Thomas Enders. Shultz promised participants he would keep abreast of the Dialogue's efforts.

Founding the Dialogue were the cream of the U.S. liberal establishment. Members of the Trilateral Commission dominated the group, with David Rockefeller, Robert McNamara, Cyrus Vance, and Elliot Richardson serving as members. The banks were represented by Donald Platten, chairman of Chemical Bank, as well as Chase Manhattan's chairman, David Rockefeller. Later, top executives from Marine Midland, First Boston International, Bank of America, Morgan Guaranty, and others would also join.

World Bank Vice President Nicolás Ardito Barletta, architect of Panama's off-shore banking center, joined the Dialogue at its founding, as did Rodrigo Botero, the former Colombian finance minister who had established the so-called "sinister window" at Colombia's central bank, which allowed drug money to be deposited, no questions asked. Argentina's Oscar Camilión (today defense minister in the Carlos Menem government) and Brazil's Fernando Henrique Cardoso (finance minister in Itamar Franco's government) were another two founding members who continue with the Dialogue today.

Spokesmen for Liberation Theology joined the bankers and Trilateralists from the outset, represented by Father Xabier Gorostiaga, a Panamanian Jesuit who worked for the Sandinista government, and the president of the University of Notre Dame (and Chase Manhattan Bank board member) Father Theodore Hesburgh.

The Woodrow Wilson Center's Lowenthal was named executive director of the Dialogue, a post he held for the next ten years (he is still an IAD member); serving as consultant was Richard Feinberg, the U.S. academic who returned to serve as Dialogue president from 1992 until he was named Latin American adviser at the National Security Council by President Clinton in 1993.

From the outset, the Dialogue proposed that supranational structures be created to monitor military activities in the Hemisphere. In its first report, titled *The Americas at a Crossroads* (*Las Américas en la encrucijada*), the IAD proposed that the Organization of American States (OAS) be given oversight over national military activities, and that human rights be accepted as a cover for OAS intervention. Presaging what has now become a major campaign of the United Nations, the Dialogue asserted that "carefully considered multilateral action to protect fundamental human rights is not intervention but an international obligation."

The Dialogue's policy package for the Hemisphere was premised on the negotiation of a new Yalta-style division of the world into superpower spheres of influence, under which the Soviet Union was to have a legitimate say in Western Hemisphere affairs. "The basic principle of the U.S.-Soviet understandings on Cuba [of 1962, 1970, and 1979] could be extended to Central America and the rest of the Caribbean.... For over 20 years, these accords have contributed to protecting major political and security interests of both the United States and the Soviet Union," the IAD wrote. Such deals were to decide the fate of Central America: *Crossroads* called for U.S.-Soviet and U.S.-Cuban dialogue to be matched by dialogue between the governments of El Salvador, Nicaragua and Guatemala and "the respective opposition movements in those countries," to "find a way for settling the conflicts on a basis that recognizes the vital interests of each party."[3]

3. Today it is fashionable to repeat Washington's litany that, because communism collapsed worldwide along with the Berlin Wall in November 1989, the communists of yesterday must now be handed leading positions in the governments of Ibero-America. What a fraud! Here, as we see, the Inter-American Dialogue demanded the same thing since its founding in 1982—long before the communists were driven out of power throughout the former Soviet bloc. *The communist-New Age project did not collapse in Ibero-America after 1989—because the State Department and the Anglo-American powers have saved it.* Look who the Inter-American Dialogue chose to shepherd around Washington, D.C. in the first months of the Clinton administration: the Pol Pot of Haiti, "Father" Jean-Baptiste Aristide, and

Project Democracy

The policies advocated by the Inter-American Dialogue on a regional level flowed out of the "global agenda" which the Anglo-American establishment had successfully imposed as U.S. government policy. The policy package went under the name "Project Democracy," officially announced as U.S. policy by President Ronald Reagan in a speech delivered, appropriately enough, to the British Parliament on June 8, 1982. This was no partisan policy, however. The idea had been cooked up in the 1970s by the same group which founded the Inter-American Dialogue, David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission. One of the intellectual authors of the Project, in fact, was the same Harvard thug, Samuel Huntington, who in 1991 published a "how-to" manual for the demilitarization of all developing nations (see Chapter 4).

The thesis behind Project Democracy had been outlined in the final report issued in 1975 by the Trilateral Commission's "Task Force on the Governability of Democracies." Huntington was one of the three co-authors. The world was entering a period of economic crisis and scarce resources which would lead to worldwide political instability, the study argued. Therefore a new definition of democracy, and new institutions to enforce it, are required to ensure that political control is maintained through the coming turmoil. One Trilateral ideologue bluntly suggested the new definition be called what it was: "fascism with a democratic face."

That was the task given Project Democracy in 1982: to set up transnational networks which, operating in the name of "democracy," could police the new order envisioned by the Anglo-Americans. There was a secret side to the operation, the covert drugs-for-arms operations run through the National Security Council exposed in the infamous Iran-Contra scandal of Oliver North fame.

There was also a public side, run through the National

---

the presidential candidates of the São Paulo Forum, the continental group of leftist parties founded and led by the Cuban Communist Party in 1990.

Endowment for Democracy (NED), a strange entity created in 1983 by the U.S. Congress as a "democracy quango," the latter term standing for "quasi-autonomous non-governmental organization." The term "quasi" was very generous indeed, as the job of the NED was to centralize U.S. *government* deployment of the so-called "NGOs." The proposal presented to Congress calling for its creation stated that the NED was to function as "a comprehensive structure for a non-governmental effort through which the resources of America's pluralistic constituencies . . . could be mobilized effectively."

Where does the money which the NED deploys to the NGOs come from? The U.S. government.

Operating through four branches (business, trade union, and Republican and Democratic Party International Institutes), the NED set out, in the name of "strengthening the institutions of democracy," to fund political parties, trade unions, "civic" programs, newspapers, university programs, etc. in foreign countries. The one proviso, of course, was that recipients agreed to play ball with the Project's form of "democracy." That means, first and foremost, acceptance of International Monetary Fund dictates and the ideological and political tenets of the "emerging global order": an end to sovereignty, and promotion of malthusianism, "human rights" (for terrorists and ethnic separatists), fanatical environmentalism, etc. Those who refused to play ball were labeled "authoritarians."

If there were any doubts whose interests the NED represented—and they were definitely not what any U.S. patriot could call *national* interests of the United States—the appointment of the self-proclaimed British agent, Henry Kissinger, to the Board of Directors soon after its founding removed them. In the middle of the Malvinas War, on May 10, 1982, the hated former Secretary of State, by then a leading figure in the Trilateral Commission, delivered a major speech to London's Chatham House in which he bragged that he had sided with the British Crown in every postwar policy dispute with Washington. When I served as Nixon's National Security Adviser, he added, "I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department."

Kissinger used that speech to float a proposal to Moscow on behalf of his Anglo-American owners for a revived New Yalta accord, or strategic condominium, through which the great powers could maintain their rule. He proposed that the United States adopt a "balance of power" strategy globally, lessening the direct leadership it had exercised since World War II. That is, everywhere but in the Western Hemisphere, where Kissinger proposed the U.S. concentrate its power.

Target Ibero-America

The primary focus of Project Democracy's activities in its first years was thus Ibero-America, where a revived spirit of nationalism and talk of a debt moratorium after 1982 worried the bankers greatly. In 1985, the NED's Annual Report noted that "the bulk of our support has gone to grantees in Latin America."

The influence of Project Democracy in the area, however, goes far beyond financing. Project Democracy shaped the entirety of Reagan administration policy toward Ibero-America. The outlines of that policy were spelled out in the final report issued in January 1984 by the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. On the board of the Commission (better known as the Kissinger Commission because Kissinger headed the panel), were various board members of the NED, including Kissinger himself, AFL-CIO trade union chief Lane Kirkland, and Carl Gershman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL).

The central theme of the final report was that hemispheric relations will be subordinated to the New Yalta crowd's escalating "East-West crisis" in Central America, and to the economic interests led by the Rockefeller group. Any nation, or political group, standing in the way of that plan, would be targeted as an obstacle to "democracy."

Obstacles emphatically included the region's military. According to the Kissinger Commission report, "The diversion of funds from the economic, social, medical, and educational development of the region into military containment would exacerbate poverty and encourage internal instability in each

of the countries. . . . The creation of garrison states would almost certainly *perpetuate the armies of the region as permanent political elites.*" (Emphasis added.)

That the Kissinger/Project Democracy crowd considered the military a greater threat than the communists then advancing in the region, was displayed clearly in the handling of the Sandinista threat in Nicaragua. The Kissinger/Project Democracy crew adamantly rejected any proposal that the U.S. aid the economic and military development of Nicaragua's neighbors, even as the military strength of the Soviet-allied Sandinista regime grew. They preferred instead to build up the so-called Contras, an irregular force of Nicaraguan mercenaries, run by the U.S. and financed through the same narcotics trade which fed the Sandinistas and their allies in the region.

For the Kissingerians, the communists in Central America served as one more point of negotiation with the Soviet Union. Unlike the communists, however, national militaries could not be trusted to sit by and watch while their country's fate was negotiated away for a New Yalta condominium.

Thus, even at the height of the anti-communist rhetoric over Nicaragua and El Salvador, U.S. officials were emphatic that there were to be strict limits on any aid to the national Armed Forces in Central America. When questioned about strategies to counter the buildup of pro-Soviet forces in Central America in February 1986, then-Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Elliott Abrams, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "I would commend again to your attention the Kissinger Commission. . . . What is it that we would do? Would we double the size of the military and double our military aid to say, Honduras and El Salvador? What is the impact on democracy in those countries, of building and building, and building the military machines?"

'The Cross and the Sword'

The commitment to dismantle the institution of the national military in Ibero-America stems from a longer-term project, however. That is the project of British Empire interests to

bring Spain and her ex-colonies under total Anglo-American rule. With few exceptions, that strategic objective has dominated United States policy toward Ibero-America since the turn of the century, when Anglo-American empire interests seized firm control over U.S. institutions in the government of that evil Mason and admirer of the Confederate cause in the U.S. Civil War, Teddy Roosevelt.

Project Democracy's effort to impose a "pluralist democracy" in Ibero-America is simply a retooling of that centuries-old project which created the "Black Legend," the British-spread lie that Spanish culture is by definition autocratic and dictatorial because of the dominance of the Catholic Church and the military. The hatred expressed by the new "democrats" for the Catholic Church and the national military flows out of this project; for Ibero-America to be finally conquered, these two institutions which form the backbone of the nation-state in the region must first be broken.

This commitment has been openly stated in official U.S. documents. In March 1987, for example, the State Department published Special Report #158, entitled *Democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean: The Promise and the Challenge.* This document complains that "the pervasiveness of hierarchical structures with deep historic and cultural roots has created ingrained authoritarian habits" in Ibero-America, which must be "overcome." The report specifies that this requires forcing "religious and military institutions—'the cross and the sword' of the Spanish conquest and key pillars of traditional order ever since" to yield to "new values [and] organizational diversity."

"Institutional development" requires "religious diversity," SR #158 states bluntly, praising "the spread of Protestantism" and Theology of Liberation ("positions open to change and independent of secular authorities," in State Department language) for assuring such "religious diversity." In the name of "Protestantism," the U.S. government has fostered the spread of the worst fundamentalist cults, such as the perverse Jimmy Swaggart, Luis Palau, and the Unification Church ("Moonies").

In Project Democracy's concern for "religious" matters

can be recognized the continuation of a policy outlined by Nelson Rockefeller in 1969, after his much-publicized "fact-finding tour" of Ibero-America. As Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger noted in his November 1985 speech on the "Responsibility of the Church in the Future of the World Economy," the effort to eradicate the influence of the Catholic Church in Ibero-America is a project which extends back to the reign of Teddy Roosevelt. Take note, said Ratzinger, of "the well-known words of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912: 'I believe that the assimilation of the Latin American countries by the United States will be long and difficult, so long as these countries remain Catholic." Rockefeller, speaking in Rome in 1969, recommended that Catholics in the region be replaced by "other Christians."

As for 'the sword,' Special Report #158 repeats the arguments of the Kissinger Commission that the military must be kept small and contained, despite "the terrorism, drug-trafficking or guerrilla warfare" which they acknowledge threatens the region.

The premises of the "Black Legend"—including the assertion that bestial, human-sacrificing pre-Christian cultures are "more democratic" than the Christian civilization which now dominates—permeate the entirety of U.S. policy, military and otherwise, toward Ibero-America. If you wonder why the United States would hand over power to the Farabundo Martí Liberation Front (FMLN) in El Salvador today in the name of "peace" and "democracy," consider the views put forward by Gen. John Galvin in August 1987 when he was still commander of the U.S. Southern Command, on what he believed were the issues being fought out in the war in El Salvador. Asked why he thought there was no strong basis for democracy—the kind sought by the U.S., that is—in El Salvador, Gen. Galvin answered:

> The root causes go back 400 years. First of all there was never any franchise for the indigenous people in Central America and indeed in most of Latin America. . . . The so-called revolutions of Latin America were the revolutions of the Spanish elite to free themselves from Spain, in

> order that they could do whatever they wanted to do in running the governments. . . . The revolution, in effect, never came. The gnawing background that is there is the elitism. Really, I believe there is a great deal to what the historians say about the old civilizations, such as the Toltecs, the Aztecs, the Incas. They were more collective civilizations. True, the priests were an elite. But, there was greater involvement of the masses at that time. The Spanish Conquistador outlook is still reflected in the elitism that you see in many of these countries. There was not the same desire to bring the country itself ahead. There was more of a "what's in it for me" attitude in a lot of these people. I realize that's a strong accusation, but it is one that I think is supported by history.

He continued:

> Now, in addition to that, you had governmental infrastructures which were extremely weak. . . . So a combination of lack of franchise for indigenous peoples and extremely weak infrastructures gave a comparatively greater strength to the Church and the military and those allied with the administrations, one after the other, in those countries. These conditions did not provide a kind of strong foundation for democracy. These weaknesses remain in the background. Now, it is the move of the disenfranchised people and the reaction to that by the elites that has a lot to do with the problems in Central America.[4]

This provides the answer to that question which perplexes Salvadoran military officers still incredulous that the U.S. has betrayed their country to those whom they believed were an enemy to U.S. interests, the FMLN. The underlying objectives of U.S. involvement in the Salvadoran war are thus demonstrated to have been from the outset to restructure Salvadoran

---

4. From *El Salvador at War. An Oral History,* by Max G. Manwaring and Court Prisk, 1988, National Defense University Press.

society along lines similar to those sought by the FMLN: to break down the "elitism" of Spanish culture through the promotion of a more "collectivist civilization" rooted in the pre-Columbian cultures, by reducing the role of the Church and the military in national life.[5,6]

1986: The Project Takes Off

In 1986, the anti-military campaign of Project Democracy escalated sharply. Three special operations directed toward the takedown of the military in Ibero-America were set into motion.

In April 1986, the Inter-American Dialogue issued a new

---

5. Once the Soviet question was removed from the picture, from the standpoint of Project Democracy, *the United States no longer had a fundamental conflict with the FMLN's goals.* The FMLN leadership understood this, as FMLN commander Joaquín Villalobos demonstrated in his 1989 appeal for U.S.-FMLN cooperation published in the spring 1989 edition of *Foreign Policy* magazine. Villalobos argued the U.S. should support the FMLN's "democratic revolution," even though the FMLN is admittedly Marxist-Leninist, because the FMLN seeks to further the ongoing "cultural fusion" between Ibero-America and the United States—the most degenerate side of U.S. culture, it should be noted.

"It is a mistake to assume that political actions of 'communists' are automatically untrustworthy," or that we communists wish to create "a shift in a country's cultural values," Villalobos wrote. Why? Because the "young men and women now in the revolutionary movement have grown up under the influence of rock music, Hollywood, salsa music, Mexican romanticism, and Christianity," he answered. "The process of cultural fusion between Latin America and the United States is part of universal culture. Such influences cannot and should not be subjected to ideological restrictions. Such dogmatism would not represent the true sentiment of our people."

6. The notorious activist role played by part of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in El Salvador on behalf of the FMLN, does not contradict the statement that the twin objectives of Project Democracy are to eliminate the Church and the military; it rather demonstrates how dangerously far the project has advanced in Central America, where the Theology of Liberation—"positions open to change and independent of secular authorities"— has gained dominance in the local hierarchy of several countries. Witness the recent promotion of the Mayan religion by the Church in Guatemala.

report, outlining the three primary issues with which they sought to dominate the agenda in the Hemisphere. The first reiterated what it demanded in its first report: that the Soviet Union's right to have a say in Western Hemisphere affairs be formalized in negotiations over the fate of Central America. Two other issues were now added: 1) that narcotics be legalized; and 2) that a "democratic network" be established with sufficient power to oppose "the communists and the military," whom the authors treat equally as enemies.

To obtain the last objective, the Inter-American Dialogue declared that military participation in "civilian" affairs must be immediately reduced. The Dialogue created a special task force dedicated to formulating the institutional mechanisms required to reshape civil-military relations in Ibero-America, and mandated that it coordinate its work with the Project Democracy's NED and the U.S. State Department.

War against the Panamanian Defense Forces was also launched in 1986. The campaign had little to do with the ostensible target, Defense Forces commander Gen. Manuel Noriega. Rather, Panama was singled out as the first place to establish the precedent that the military could be dispensed with altogether, because it was judged to be an easy target. The Defense Forces were small and still in the process of being restructured into a military out of the limited police functions previously permitted the National Guard. The country's economy was based on the U.S. dollar and dominated by the U.S.-run "off-shore" banking center, while the U.S. militarily occupied the center of the country, and based some 10,000 of its troops there.

In June and July 1986 *EIR* published in Spanish and English a White Paper on the Panama crisis, entitled "Who's Out to Destabilize Panama and Why," which warned that "the principle of the sovereignty of nation-states is the fundamental issue at stake in the Panama crisis," and that the United States' "Get Noriega" operation was aimed ultimately at turning Panama into another Puerto Rico-style colony. *EIR* documented that the Panamanian opposition deployed by Project Democracy was "neither 'honest' nor democratic, but rather front men working for the drug mafia: drug money-launderers, law-

yers for the cocaine and marijuana traffickers, terrorists and gun-runners," and that drug-trafficking and money-laundering through Panama was run by the very U.S. interests targetting General Noriega.

By and large, *EIR*'s warning was ignored in Ibero-America. With the notable exception of Argentine Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín, then serving as Argentine military attaché in Panama, Ibero-American military officers treated the anti-Noriega campaign as a special case, of little relevance to their or their country's future. Many even opportunistically joined the anti-Panama campaign.

The enemy miscalculated: Panamanians resisted the onslaught for more than three years, and were defeated—at least for the moment—only by the brutal U.S. invasion in December 1989. The Panamanian resistance slowed down the pace of implementation for the anti-military project continentally. Had Ibero-America risen to defend Panama at any point along the way, the project could have been defeated long ago.

The third operation set in motion at the end of 1986 was the project which produced the infamous "Bush Manual" against the military, published in 1990 under the title, *The Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America.* The State Department set up a network of U.S. and Ibero-American academics to serve as an ongoing task force to coordinate ideological work and organize for the overall anti-military project. The task force, named "Civil-Military Relations and the Challenge of Democracy," is based out of American University in Washington, D.C. and the PEITHO Institute in Montevideo, Uruguay. Because the State Department had no authority to train foreign military officers directly, the operation was farmed out to the academics, but it was from the beginning, as it continues to be today, a U.S. government operation in both financing and overall direction. Placed in charge from the U.S. government side was the State Department's top expert on the Ibero-American military, Luigi Einaudi (see Chapter 2).

The project quickly became the center of the anti-military effort. In May 1988, some 50 military officers of the rank of colonel or above attended a conference on "civic-military rela-

tions" organized in Washington, D.C. by this project. The organizers boasted that "until now, this was the largest privately sponsored meeting of high-ranking Latin American military officers held in the United States."

Three people coordinate the project. One is the same Louis Goodman, now dean of the School of International Service at American University,[7] who helped Abraham Lowenthal organize the Inter-American Dialogue back in 1982. The other person from the U.S., Johanna Mendelson, teaches under Goodman at the School of International Service, and serves as an honors fellow in the Executive Office of Immigration Review at the U.S. Department of Justice.

The third coordinator of the project is the Uruguayan Juan Rial. He and his wife, Carina Perelli, another participant in the project, run the PEITHO "Society of Political Analysis" which serves as the Ibero-American base for this State Department group. Rial and Perelli are familiar faces in Washington. In 1992, the Woodrow Wilson Center gave both three-month scholarships to continue their research on the Ibero-American military from Washington, D.C.

The Philosophical Basis of the Anti-Military Project

The project was premised from the outset on the anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish tenets of the Black Legend. Underlying that,

---

7. American University, and particularly the School for International Service which Goodman heads, functions as a key training center for students preparing for careers in U.S. foreign service, intelligence agencies, Congress and Army, or becoming technocrats in key globalist organizations (World Bank, International Monetary Fund, NGOs, etc.). Its curriculum is dominated by New Age themes. Goodman's school offers courses on such themes as "Beyond Sovereignty," "Human Rights," "International Organization," etc. The leading drug-legalization organization in the U.S., the Drug Policy Foundation (DPF), is based out of the University. The president of the DPF, American University Professor Arnold Trebach, heads an Institute on Drugs, Crime and Justice at the University which offers courses *advocating* narcotics use as well as the benefits of drug legal-

however, is one of the most degenerate philosophical outlooks yet concocted by the human mind: the so-called *post-modernism* and *deconstructionism* propagated by the Communist International's (Comintern) Frankfurt School and a network of perverse French existentialist-communist professors.

The Rial and Perelli duo most directly express the deconstructionist outlook which drives the project as a whole. Both assert in their writings, for example, that the military must redefine its mission to fit the "post-modern culture" which now dominates world affairs. A "post-modern" society is one characterized by chaos, where it becomes difficult "to integrate" competing heterogeneous interests, and which in turn creates "difficulties in perceiving what concept of social order is possible for this new society," as Rial specified in a 1990 essay on "The Armed Forces of South America and the Challenge of Democracy in the 1990s."

The supposed universal chaos upon which deconstructionists found their theories is a chaos they seek to impose upon the world. In the United States, where deconstructionism now dominates most universities, the deconstructionists' "political correctness" movement, for example, has set out to destroy the concept upon which the U.S. Declaration of Independence is based: that "all men are created equal." This movement insists that no human being has the right to a universal identity, but rather to an existence strictly determined by his or her race, sex, socioeconomic class, particular preference of sexual perversion, etc.

Where this worldview leads is seen most starkly in the ethnic genocide being perpetrated by the Serbian nazi-communists in the former Yugoslavia. As *EIR* has documented, *the leaders of the Serbian military forces are psychiatrists and sociologists who are followers of deconstructionism.*[8]

Two specific theoreticians of this deconstructionist evil

---

ization. The University became the center of major scandal in 1990, when the president of the University resigned, admitting to police that he had engaged in acts of sexual perversion.

8. See *Executive Intelligence Review*, Vol. 2, No. 17, Feb. 12, 1993.

who are cited by Rial in his work on the military provide deeper insight into why this crew is so committed to destroying the institution of the military.

The 1992 Spanish edition of the Bush Manual includes a new chapter which reviews the various schools of analysis applied by the sociologists studying the military. Rial's approach most closely follows what is identified there as the "psycho-social/organizational paradigm" for the military, a school of analysis which the Bush Manual reports is based upon the work of one of the main forces which created deconstructionism, the Institute for Social Research (ISR), better known as the Frankfurt School.

The ISR, based originally at the University of Frankfurt in Germany, was founded in 1922 by a group of sociologists and intellectuals associated with the Comintern. The School's most influential leader was Comintern agent Georg Lukacs, a Hungarian aristocrat who had served as one of the Commissars of Culture in the Hungarian Soviet in Budapest in 1919. As he had written during World War I, Lukacs' lifelong goal was to find an effective answer to the question, "Who will save us from western civilization?" Lukacs argued that the Bolshevik movement had failed to spread in Europe, precisely because of this region's dominant Christian culture. That culture, therefore, was to be targeted for destruction.

This was to be effected through the creation of a "demonic" movement recruiting individuals who believe that their actions are determined, not by "a personal destiny, but the destiny of the community" in a world "that has been abandoned by God," Lukacs specified. For the next several decades, the Frankfurt School dedicated itself to inducing a "culture of pessimism" within the West, immersing people in hatred and hopelessness, while simultaneously making them so stupid that they saw no other solution to their problems than wild, uncontrollable revolt.

One of the most potent tools developed by the Frankfurt School for this war was the establishment of the movie industry and television—both shaped by leaders of the Frankfurt School from the beginnning—as the new force which determines culture in the West.

Another of the most influential works of the Frankfurt School was its propagation of a theory of the "authoritarian personality." It is this specific theory, developed by one of the top ideologues of the group, Theodor Adorno, upon which the "psycho-social" analysis of the military by Rial et al., is based. Who is an "authoritarian"? Anyone who believes that human life must be guided by "metaphysical" concepts such as truth, morality, reason, or God!

In his 1947 work on "Elements of Anti-Semitism," written about the same time as his book on *The Authoritarian Personality*, Adorno made explicit that his work was driven by a violent hatred of Christianity. "Christ, the spirit become flesh, is the deified sorcerer. Man's self-reflection in the absolute, the humanization of God by Christ, is the *proton pseudos* [original falsehood]," Adorno wrote there. "The reflective aspect of Christianity, the intellectualization of magic, is the root of evil."

Thus, when the Bush Manual attacks the military for believing that they must take the side of the Good against Evil, this is one of the most fundamental issues underlying the battle over the military.

Rial identifies Michel Foucault as an important contributor to this school of military analysis. According to Rial, Foucault's book, *Discipline and Punishment*, contributes to the study of the military by identifying it as an authoritarian "total institution" which uses discipline as just another name for punishment, thereby shaping the "socialization" of its members in a manner that must urgently be changed.

Citing Foucault's work in *The Military and Democracy*, Rial discusses the problem posed by the military's existence as "a social body that is separated from the rest of society and that enjoys strong autonomy with regard to the state." The problem, according to Rial, is that "discipline is the 'soul' of the military organization, which sustains its hierarchy and, with it, subordination. This necessarily leaves little room for dissent and, as in all total institutions, favors authoritarian tendencies. Diverse forms of punishment are geared to the same end."

Who is this Foucault? A French communist, homosexual,

psychotic philosopher who was the teacher of the founder of deconstructionism, Jacques Derrida. Psychotic is used advisedly: Foucault was a pederast who during the time he taught in Paris's Superior Normal School, alternated between attempts at suicide and homicide. Like the leaders of the Frankfurt School, he was a fervent follower of the nihilist Friedrich Nietzsche. In his later years, he became a Maoist who preached mass extermination. One of his major "contributions" to philosophy was his doctrine that "we are all deviants." Moving to the United States later in his life, he frequented San Francisco's sado-masochistic homosexual bars until he died of AIDS in 1984.

Such are the fanatic ideologues which the U.S. government has hired to instruct Ibero-American military officers on how to reshape their institution to conform with "the new missions of the post-Cold War era." The ideologues of the "demilitarization campaign" come from the very group of ideologues which created the New Age narco-terrorist forces (the M-19, the FMLN, etc.) assaulting Ibero-America today.

Fantastic? Yes, but the infiltration of the Frankfurt School/deconstruction project into critical areas of U.S. government policy-planning is not a recent phenomenon. The Frankfurt School was moved wholesale into the United States in the late 1930s, and reestablished with the funding of the Rockefeller Foundation, Columbia Broadcasting System, Columbia University, and the American Jewish Committee, among others. During World War II, leading figures of the Frankfurt School were hired by the Research and Analysis Bureau of the Office of Strategic Services. Such was the case of Herbert Marcuse, whose later writings on "erotic liberation" and the need to reject "technological reason" and "ritual-authoritarian language" became the bible of the New Left and rock-drug-sex counterculture in the 1960s.

We will return to the Bush Manual and its ideologues later in our history.

The NDI Attacks Argentina

In early 1988, the Inter-American Dialogue published the conclusions reached by its military task force in its report, *The*

Americas in 1988: A Time for Choices (see Chapter 3). The primary concern expressed by the task force was the fact that the military in Ibero-America was still viewed favorably by its fellow-citizens, and morale in the ranks of the Armed Forces remained high. That combination means, they warned, that what the bankers fear the most—a *nationalist civic-military alliance*—continues to be possible.

Economic warfare against the military was demanded. "The level of resources that should be allocated to the military" must be reviewed and changed, the Dialogue insisted, as one of the most effective means to collapse morale and "curtail the influence of the Armed Forces" south of the Rio Grande. The economic flank quickly became the strong point of the bankers' war against the military.

Yet another project on "civil-military relations" was then initiated, this one targetting Argentina specifically. The National Democratic Institute (NDI), a branch of the NED, under the direction of Martin Edwin Anderson, director of the NDI's Latin American and Caribbean program, pulled together a group of collaborating Argentines to set up the mechanisms and ground rules for the destruction of Argentina's military. Over the next two years, through this NDI project, the U.S. government—directly—ran the rewriting of Argentine defense and security laws.

This was a coordinated offensive. Projects on "civil-military relations" proliferated, but it was one small group of "experts" that floated among them all. Thus it was no surprise to find that three top leaders of the *Bush Manual* project—Juan Rial, Carina Perelli, and the Brazilian "military sociologist," Alexandre Barros—were among the "experts" participating in the NDI's second conference on Argentina, held in Montevideo in July 1989.

Anderson's Latin American program at NDI prepared the working document for the Montevideo conference on Argentina. The obstacles to changing the role of the military "are old, enormous, and many," the document warned, listing as the first obstacle, military ideology. This part could have been lifted from the Bush Manual's Carina Perelli, or various of the Inter-American Dialogue's reports over the years. "Military ideology, known in Latin America as 'national security doc-

trine,' is the core of the problem," the NDI charged. "When there is no foreign enemy, the military turns its sights onto internal subversion. They might see the Fatherland as under attack from subversives who must be eradicated before they 'completely contaminate the body.' Meanwhile, personalist political parties, weakened and fragmented, appear unable to govern. The choice is thus 'us or communism,' or 'us or chaos.' Duty and honor demand military intervention."

Eliminating the Opposition

The next step was to clear out of the way those military and political leaders within the Western Hemisphere who refused to bow to the supranational condominium which the Bush administration, jointly with its Soviet allies, was intent on imposing the world.

In October 1988, in the midst of the U.S. presidential election campaign, the Bush administration indicted presidential candidate and *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche and six of his associates, including one of his spokesmen for Ibero-America, Dennis Small. The case was one of the most blatant political hatchet jobs ever run through the U.S. judiciary. The government rushed the case to trial in record time in a federal court notorious for its ties to the intelligence community; planted a high-level associate of Project Democracy asset Oliver North on the jury; and forbade the defendants from telling the jury of the pattern of government actions against LaRouche and his movement. The trial thus rigged, the government secured convictions barely two months after the indictments were handed down. One month later, the 66-year-old LaRouche was sentenced to 15 years in federal prison—a virtual death sentence—for a total *alleged* financial fraud of $294,000.

LaRouche was only released in January 1994, after serving five years in federal prison.

In the midst of his legal battle, LaRouche issued a dramatic call for a worldwide anti-Bolshevik resistance struggle. "Let those who refuse to submit to Soviet worldwide imperial aggression rally to the ranks of a new, global resistance move-

ment, prepared to fight the agents and accomplices of Soviet interest in the same spirit as anti-communist resistance organizations fought the fascist tyrannies of Germany and Italy," LaRouche wrote. "All who die or suffer otherwise in this war shall be to us as martyrs, whose honorable deeds in this cause shall be legendary in the tales told to future generations."

Others who were also obstacles to the escalating destruction of sovereignty were packed off to jail as well. On Jan. 10, 1989, the Mexican government of Carlos Salinas de Gortari, fully committed to the Bush administration agenda, staged a raid against the leadership of the Mexican Oil Workers Union, arresting its fiercely nationalist head, Joaquín Hernández Galicia ("La Quina") and dozens of secondary leaders on trumped-up charges of corruption. Those unionists remain in jail to this day.

Later, it would be the turn of Panamanian Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega.

By the end of 1989, however, the entire condominium project was turned on its head. Millions of Germans followed in the footsteps of the heroic Chinese students, and rose up against the communist dictatorships. The fall of the Berlin Wall on Nov. 9, 1989 remoralized people around the world.

The Anglo-American powers moved quickly to deliver a bloody message that they did not intend to give up their supranational project, despite the collapse of the Soviet Union. Little more than a month after the Berlin Wall had fallen, just five days before Christmas, President George Bush ordered Panama invaded.

Failing to kill General Manual Noriega during the invasion as expected, the Bush administration settled for sending General Noriega to jail for life. The night of the invasion, the invaders swore into office, on a U.S. military base, a group of bankers and lawyers, well known for their ties with the drug trade, as the new "government" of Panama. *The very first act taken by these puppets of Bush was to disband the Panamanian Defense Forces.* An untrained police force—and U.S. soldiers—were henceforth in charge of "defense."

The invasion of Panama was used to test a new generation of high-technology weapons. They functioned well: Some

4,000 Panamanians died in the operation; the exact number is unknown, as the invading troops disposed of bodies in mass graves. The occupying troops are still there, and open planning has begun in the U.S. to declare Panama a U.S. protectorate like Puerto Rico.

The passivity of Ibero-America in the face of the invasion only encouraged the Bush administration to push forward faster, in its campaign against sovereignty. The cowardice, pragmatism and ignorance of the basic principles of history displayed by leaders of national governments across the world allowed the Anglo-Americans to regain the initiative, despite the dramatic victories for human freedom of 1989 and 1990. A historic opportunity to crush the tyranny of the IMF along with its communist allies was lost, and has yet to be retaken.

But not all the voices against the New World Order project in the Western Hemisphere had been silenced. Determined to stop the steady disintegration of the Argentine Armed Forces, on Dec. 3, 1990 Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín led a new military uprising against the Army high command for its complicity with the destruction of the Armed Forces and national defense. As Colonel Seineldín later explained in his allocution before the Argentine court in August 1991, he had acted in order to defend Argentina from destruction under the New World Order, because "to enter it, we will have to enter unarmed, with our hands behind our heads, on our knees, and doubtless poor, dependent, and excluded."

The Menem government of Argentina, another firm ally of the Bush administration, moved with maximum force to crush the rebellion, going so far as to seek to apply the death penalty against Colonel Seineldín, the hero of the Malvinas War, in the hours after the rebellion had been put down.

The U.S. invasion of Panama was soon shown to be only the first of a series of wars against the nations of the South carried out under the banner of the New World Order. LaRouche had warned in 1982 that if Ibero-America did not deploy its most potent weapon, the debt bomb, to defeat the Anglo-American empire in the Malvinas War, NATO forces would later be deployed against all the South. His warning was now vindicated in spades.

Iraq was the next victim. Cornered economically, Iraq was set up by assurances from U.S. officials that the U.S. would remain neutral if action were taken against Kuwait, a "nation" carved out of Iraqi territory by the British in 1899 to prevent the planned Baghdad-Berlin railway from having a terminus on the Persian Gulf. Then, when Iraq moved into Kuwait in 1990, the U.S. led the United Nations into escalating an assault upon Iraq, first applying devastating economic sanctions *which have yet to be lifted,* and then bombing the country back to the stone age. U.S. air strikes singled out the country's basic infrastructure, civilian centers and ancient sites as primary targets, as the world hailed the massacre of an Arab nation as the first great test of the "New World Order."

The devastation was meant as a message to the entire developing sector. As a Brazilian general stated soon thereafter: "We are all Iraqis now."

Reforming the OAS and IADB

In December 1990, during a visit to the Southern Cone of South America, President Bush baptized this post-Cold War global project as the creation of a "New World Order." The project was to be imposed through "democracy," Bush announced. "The nations of the Americas are on the brink of something unprecedented in world history—the first wholly democratic Hemisphere," the butcher of Panama intoned. He warned, however, that this "new dawn" would not happen without its quota of suffering: "Change will not come easily. Economies now dependent on protection and state regulation must open to competition. The transition for a time, will be painful." Such changes, he added, would help end "the false distinctions between the First World and the Third World that have too long limited the political and economic relations in the Americas."

The drive to transform the Organization of American States (OAS) and associated bodies into the kind of supranational institutions of government which had been discussed since the great crisis of 1982, was now in full gear.

On Dec. 4, 1990, one day after the Seineldín uprising,

José Manuel de la Sota, Argentina's ambassador to Brazil, proposed that an alliance of the Southern Cone countries be formed to defend "democracy," under which sanctions and even armed interventions by members of the alliance would be used against any member country which did not maintain a "democratic" system. De la Sota proposed this at a luncheon attended by Brazilian President Fernando Collor de Mello and 21 ambassadors from other Ibero-American and Caribbean nations, held during a visit by President George Bush to Brazil.

The Argentine proposal was hailed warmly by London's *Financial Times* on Jan. 11, 1991. Argentine Finance Minister Domingo Cavallo was "trying to interest his neighbors in a regional security pact that would keep the generals out of politics and busy with non-threatening duties, such as protecting the environment and stamping out drug-trafficking," London's mouthpiece wrote.

The Argentine proposals were just the beginning of a six-month-long political offensive orchestrated by the United States, with the strong support of Venezuela, to reform the OAS Charter so as to give the OAS "intrusive powers" in member states when "democracy" was threatened in any country. Together with this, they sought to restructure the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB), to transform it from what it is now, a regional advisory body in military affairs, into an OAS expeditionary force, along the lines of the "blue helmet" forces of the United Nations.

In March 1991, Argentine Foreign Relations Minister Guido Di Tella held secret meetings with his Chilean and Brazilian counterparts to elaborate a strategy for forging a military wing of Mercosur to enforce "democracy" within the region, while simultaneously reducing both troops and conventional weaponry within each nation. Adm. Emilio Osses, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of Argentina, supported Di Tella's proposals, arguing that it is necessary in the "existing new international context" to "assume that the end has been reached for the model of Armed Forces which has existed for much of the current century."

On April 15, 1991, the State Department's top man in the Bush Manual anti-military project, Luigi Einaudi, then U.S.

ambassador to the OAS, stated during a seminar at the Woodrow Wilson Center on "The Future of the OAS and Hemispheric Security," that the current structures of the OAS and Inter-American Defense Board were not adequate to assure hemispheric security. He expressed his "great frustration in the ability to bring together the OAS and the Inter-American Defense Board, the civilian political authority and the military institutional authority. It is clearly time that we translated the democratic solidarity that we have achieved in the Hemisphere into a new definition and role for the military."

Einaudi went on to directly attack the concept of national sovereignty, noting that when some New World Order advocates, such as "my friend Carlos Andrés Pérez" of Venezuela address the OAS, "they will speak with such clarity that they send many people away reeling, looking for the protective veils of non-intervention, of the sovereign equality of states and of representatives."

The offensive paid off. When the OAS held its 21st Annual General Assembly in Santiago, Chile June 3-9, 1991, the foreign ministers of all the member countries signed the so-called "Santiago Commitment," which contains an "inexorable commitment" to defend democracy in the region. Concretely, they agreed that the OAS Permanent Council would immediately convene in the event of the overthrow of the government of a member state, and that a meeting of foreign ministers or the General Assembly itself would be called within ten days, to consider further action.

The attack on the military advanced on two additional flanks during this same period: El Salvador, and military finances generally.

In late November 1990, Gen. George Joulwan was named commander-in-chief of the Southern Command of the U.S. Army. One of his first orders was that the U.S. must force through acceptance of negotiations with the FMLN communists in El Salvador. Joulwan informed the U.S. military attaché in El Salvador, Col. Mark Hamilton, that his "new mission was to get a negotiated settlement."

Secret negotiations between the FMLN and the United States had been going on since Bush took office in January

1989. Now the project to unleash the communists against national institutions of Ibero-America *from inside the governments* was ordered to begin in full. El Salvador, through the United Nations, was to be the test case.

In April 1991, one of the founding members of the Inter-American Dialogue, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, opened the second flank. In a speech to the annual meeting of the World Bank in April 1991, McNamara (a former president of that institution) demanded that international financial institutions make aid programs conditional on drastic cuts in the military budgets of prospective recipient nations (see Chapter 14).

McNamara specified that such cuts would speed up the process of replacing national military institutions with United Nations supranational forces. The security doctrine of the New World Order, he intoned, must be that of "collective security" modeled on the United Nations intervention in Iraq. McNamara pressed the OAS to be transformed accordingly: "Agreement by the [U.N.] Security Council that Regional Conflicts, endangering territorial integrity, will be dealt with through the application of economic sanctions and, if necessary, military action, imposed by collective decisions and utilizing multi-national forces" is needed, he said. "Such a world would need a leader. I see no alternative to the leadership role being fulfilled by the United States. . . . Regional Organizations such as the Organization of American States and the Organization of African Unity, as well as the creation of such groups in Asia and the Middle East . . . would, ideally, come to function as regional arms of the Security Council."

1992: The Opposition Explodes

In August 1991, Colonel Seineldín was given one opportunity to address the court in his own defense during the trial of he and the officers who led the 1990 action against the Army High Command. He used that opportunity to issue one of the clearest calls to arms against the New World Order yet delivered (see Chapter 20).

In September 1991, opposition to this supranational as-

sault exploded in an unexpected country: Haiti. On Sept. 30, 1991, the Haitian military overthrew Marxist President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, outraged at his efforts to impose IMF looting by terrorizing and murdering his opponents through bestial mob violence. The Jacobin Aristide, favored by Washington because of his support for IMF economic programs, had also begun building up a private paramilitary force with which to eventually confront the Army.

Haiti became the first test case of the Commitment of Santiago, which had been signed four months before at the June OAS meeting. Yet, despite massive international pressure, including a criminal economic blockade organized by the United States and the OAS, the Haitian military and people have refused to surrender their sovereignty. Their continued resistance—more than two years later—has sent an unmistakable message across the continent: Even the smallest and poorest of nations is capable of standing up and resisting IMF genocide and the destruction of the Armed Forces.

When the U.S. sought to escalate with OAS *military* action against Haiti, they provoked the second major rebellion against their would-be New Order. In early February 1992, the Carlos Andrés Pérez government in Venezuela prepared to send troops into Haiti to snuff out the revolt, on U.S. instructions. Rather than accept this one-worldist role, the Venezuelan military revolted, and on Feb. 4, 1992 the country underwent its first attempted coup of the year, by the "Bolivarian Movement" led by Col. Hugo Chávez.

Although the uprising failed militarily, it decisively changed the continent's political landscape: Military revolts against the policies of the New World Order were no longer inconceivable in a major South American nation. Washington deployed desperately to keep Pérez in power, and to send its own message to other nationalists considering taking similar action: If you try, we will obliterate you.

But on April 5, 1992, President Alberto Fujimori of Peru, with full backing of the military, dissolved the corrupt Congress and Supreme Court of that country in order to carry out an all-out war against the Shining Path narco-terrorists. Here too, Washington yelled and screamed its opposition, with the

OAS obediently joining in, but so far Peru has held out, insisting on its sovereign right to defend its nation at war with a foreign-sponsored enemy.

On Sept. 12, 1992, the Fujimori government shocked the world by capturing Abimael Guzmán, the feared leader of Shining Path. His arrest and subsequent life sentence led to a wave of optimism in Peru, and across Ibero-America, that it was indeed possible to reassert sovereignty and stop narco-terrorism, even over Washington's active opposition.

Days later, on Sept. 29, the Brazilian chessboard was also kicked over, with the impeachment of President Fernando Collor de Mello on charges of corruption. Despite Washington and Wall Street's strenuous resistance, Collor was finally forced to resign on Dec. 29, 1992 by a combination of street demonstrations by over a million people, and vocal military insistence that Collor had to go—or else.

U.S. officials were by now definitely worried. Luigi Einaudi expressed the hysterical state of mind ruling Washington in his closing remarks to a symposium on "Lessons of the Venezuelan Experience," held at the Woodrow Wilson Center Oct. 21-23, 1992. According to U.S. Ambassador to the OAS Einaudi, the entirety of U.S.-Ibero-American relations now hung upon maintaining the hated Carlos Andrés Pérez in power. "The importance of Venezuela in international relations may be more due to democracy than to oil," Einaudi pronounced. He called the country's notoriously corrupt *partidocracia* (rule by parties) "the standard-bearer for the possibility of democracy in Latin America," and hailed Pérez in unusually personal terms as "a President with a personal charisma, history, potential of external reality . . . a projection still of vigor, of courage, of modernity, of adaptability."

What happens in Venezuela "is absolutely critical to our collective, regional future," Einaudi emphasized. Any "interruption" of constitutional order there would have "an impact on the whole scene of U.S.-Latin American relations."

Venezuelans were quick to prove just how vulnerable the entire "democracy" project is. Less than a month later, on Nov. 27, the second Venezuelan coup attempt of 1992 occurred.

Although President Pérez managed to survive this as well, his political support in the population continued to plummet.

By May of 1993, the crisis in Venezuela had once again reached the boiling point, and on May 20, Pérez was finally forced to step down from the presidency in order to stand trial on charges of multi-million dollar corruption—an important victory for nationalist forces in Venezuela and across Ibero-America.

Counterattack on the 'Bush Manual'

One of the primary issues driving the spreading rebellions against the usurers' "democracy" project is the growing realization within the military of every Ibero-American nation, that the policy of the U.S. government under the New World Order is to eliminate the military for all practical purposes as an institution south of the Rio Grande.

In June 1991, *EIR*'s *Resumen Ejecutivo* had issued the first of its special editions dedicated to the military battle under way. Entitled *Bush's New Order: Eliminate the Sovereignty and Armed Forces of Ibero-America,* the special issue documented the U.S. plan to "dismantle the Armed Forces of Ibero-America," with case studies on the status of its implementation. The magazine circulated widely in Ibero-America, and for many officers, the overview it presented of U.S. policy toward the region as a whole finally made sense of the attacks their institutions had suffered, but which they had not been certain came from a specific *policy.* At the center of *Resumen Ejectivo*'s special issue, was an exposé of the Bush Manual group set up by the State Department (see Chapter 2).

The exposé hit home. In November, a top Bolivian Mason and businessman, Guillermo Kenning Voss, then serving as president of the Electoral Tribunal of Santa Cruz, proposed that Bolivia no longer needed Armed Forces. To sell the package, he picked up Robert McNamara's lies that the money thus "saved" could finance health and education projects. Military circles in Bolivia reacted quickly. On Dec. 1, the Bolivian daily *Ultima Hora* reprinted in full *Resumen*'s article on "The Bush

Manual to Eliminate the Armed Forces of Ibero-America." A short introduction to the article connected Kenning's shocking proposal to the U.S. offensive.

For the next month, one issue dominated Bolivian politics and media: Was it true that the dismantling of the military was U.S. policy, and if so, what broader threat to the nation did this imply?

When it became clear that Bolivians, civilian and military, took the reported plan very, very seriously, the U.S. Embassy in La Paz was forced to respond. They resorted to an old tactic: lying. On Dec. 7, 1991, the U.S. Embassy issued an official communiqué which acknowledged that the now-infamous "Bush Manual" referred to the book *The Military and Democracy,* but then lied that the book "has no connection with the U.S. government"—despite the fact that the book's own preface reports that the U.S. government financed the project, and the U.S. Army, Department of Defense, and State Department advised and provided logistical support for its work! "The project could neither have been begun or continued without the financial support of a number of generous donors," the preface states. It then specifies: "Primary financial support was provided by the Office of Democratic Initiatives of the U.S. Agency of International Development"—an agency of the U.S. State Department.

The Embassy made the ridiculous claim that no U.S. government agency had even heard of any such discussion at all. "The Pentagon, as well as the White House and State Department, deny the existence of any plan or project to recommend the elimination of the Armed Forces of Bolivia or of any other Latin American country; therefore, it can hardly be construed as the personal intent of President Bush, as has been intentionally implied," they huffed.

The banner headline of Bolivia's leading newspaper, *Presencia,* on Dec. 11 demonstrated just how credible Bolivians considered the Embassy's pious denial: " 'There Is No Bush Plan,' but the Armed Forces Will Be Drastically Reduced." On Dec. 15, Army commander Gen. Oscar Escobar warned that the anti-military offensive "reveals a veiled tendency to divide up the country. . . . We are alarmed that the audacity of certain

bad Bolivians also encompasses other fundamental and meritorious institutions such as the Catholic Church and National Police which, in the end, are also targets of attack. This concerns us because it affects the integrity of our existence as a nation and could erode the very stability of the fatherland."

Bolivia was not the only country where the Bush anti-military project was challenged.

In March 1992, a revised translation of the infamous book was published in Spanish by PEITHO. Two new chapters had been added: the PEITHO project leaders, Rial and Perelli, expanded their chapters and the preface, and a postscript, briefly reviewing the changes that had occurred since the book was first published in English in 1990, was added. The changes revealed how the project viewed its own strengths and weaknesses at that time.

Attempting to boost their credibility as an important network *in* the Ibero-American military itself, some of the military officers from Ibero-America they considered to be part of the project were named in the book. Heading the list were three officers who, as defense ministers, had aided their work: Gen. Héctor Gramajo of Guatemala (an officer whose close working relationship with top State Department controller Luigi Einaudi was strengthened by his employment of Einaudi's daughter for a period of time); Lt. Gen. Hugo Medina of Uruguay, who according to the preface "steadfastly supported the project," and Col. J. Wilfredo Sánchez of Honduras. The book praised other "high-ranking officers in various posts [who] have been involved in its success": Gen. Jaime Rabanales, then-director of the Military Studies Center of Guatemala; Gen. Rodrigo Benavídez Uribe, then-director of the Higher Military Studies Center (CAEM) of Peru; Gen. Miguel A. Pinto, then-director of the Higher Studies Institute for National Defense of Venezuela; Vice Admirals Domingo Pacífico Castellano Branco Ferreira and César Flores of the Brazilian Navy, and Fernando Milia of the Argentine Navy; Colonels Andino (Honduras), Lloret and Moncayo Gallegos (Ecuador), Mugnolo (Argentina), Quilo, Ríos and Termas (Guatemala). "The special participation" of then-Col. Mauricio E. Vargas of El Salvador was also noted.

The authors also emphasized that their task force was an ongoing one. They had sponsored a conference for "academics" and military officers in 1991 in Montevideo, Uruguay, and work is under way on a second volume of the manual, this one discussing how the dramatic changes in the former Soviet bloc allegedly "have initiated a process of [military] identity or existential crisis of a scope which deserves specific treatment." In sum, they insisted the military was on the defensive, concentrating on its own problems.

But there have been obstacles in their way as well. One of the new chapters in the Spanish edition, authored by Peruvian Guillermo Thornberry, introduced a theme which has increasingly occupied the anti-military network: how to package their globalist "new agenda" so that it does not provoke a nationalist backlash.

Thornberry's concern was that international discussion of the Amazon had been handled so badly that the Brazilian military was now convinced that international ecological plans represented a threat to national sovereignty. "The lack of political realism and absence of diplomatic tact has provoked a strong reaction in the Brazilian military, which still retains an important share of power in that country, putting the debate on the level of national sovereignty over the Amazon territories and making it easier for Brazil to carry out a diplomatic offensive which has forced the other countries of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty to back a model of territorial occupation and resource exploitation which not all of them agree with and which, in some cases, they have not yet adequately analyzed," Thornberry complained.

Thornberry also implied that conflicts could be generated between Brazil and its Amazon neighbors, citing the need for the countries bordering Brazil to carefully watch the "occupation policy" which Brazil is carrying out within its Amazon territory.

The very last item in the second edition of the Spanish-language book, a small print footnote to the Post Scriptum, reveals one of the main reasons that project participants were now focusing their attention on applying "political realism" and "diplomatic tact" in the selling of their agenda. The ner-

vous and infantile footnote complains that their book received "a curious commentary . . . in a publication of restricted circulation called *Iberoamerica* [sic]. Entitled 'The Bush Manual to Eliminate the Armed Forces of Ibero-America,' and signed by Small & Small, [the commentary] attempts to discredit the book on the basis of who financed the researchers."

Since the source of their financing—the U.S. government—could hardly be denied, the authors insist instead that "a careful reading [of their book] is sufficient to indicate the diverse viewpoints therein presented, which, as is obvious, do not represent the official opinion of any government." The authors claim that they are just independent "academics," and that in any case, "it is evident that many of the articles, among them some of those most referenced by the Smalls, do not support the hypothesis suggested in the title of their article."

"The fact that some of the colleagues who have written in the book have received protests from members of the Armed Forces, when interviewing them, caused us to write this clarification," they explained. As two of the authors "most referenced by the Smalls" are the Uruguayan couple Rial and Perelli, it is clear that some officers in Uruguay had indeed done a "careful reading" of the book—and found it to be exactly what *Resumen Ejecutivo* had said it was: a manual for the destruction of the Armed Forces.

The Package as Democratic Professionalism

Such "clarifications" were evidently not sufficient to silence anger in Uruguay, or elsewhere, over the anti-military project. On May 25 and 27, 1992 Rial and Perelli were interviewed on the radio program, "In Perspective," and the interview was later published in *Círculo Militar* of Uruguay. The interview had been arranged by their supporters to give the duo an opportunity to clear themselves—and the U.S. government which pays their bills—of the charge that they or the U.S. government were committed to any project to destroy the military.

The interview played out the same game used in Bolivia

a few months earlier. Since it was no longer credible to flat-out insist that "there is no Bush plan," Rial and Perelli acknowledged that, indeed, "demilitarization" was under discussion in the advanced sector. But *they* opposed it, of course, criticizing pressures coming from the United States, the IMF and the World Bank which seek to "block Third World countries from having a substantial or important military force." Perelli—whose writings in the Bush Manual are one long attack on Uruguay's military for its successful war against the Tupamaros—suddenly claimed to be a friend of the military. "It begins to appear as if they want to disarm us, that they wish to transform us into a police force, to reduce us to the role of patrolling, with orders imposed from abroad," Perelli protested.

But, Perelli quickly added, disarming us "is not an official position" of the United States. Rial agreed, insisting that "U.S. policy is neither linear nor simple, and it is false to attribute omnipotence to the State Department and to claim it is behind everything. . . . There is no single center of power . . . there are very varied positions; in fact, there are some who totally disagree with this position and, particularly in areas of the Defense Department, there are those who consider this type of attitude against the Armed Forces to be nonsense."

Their argument of what changes are required is exactly that put forward by the so-called "opponents" of the "demilitarization project" in the Defense Department and U.S. Army: Oh yes, nations need Armed Forces, but they must be "restructured" along the lines demanded under the New World Order—draconian cuts in their budgets, cutbacks in the ranks, abandoning their historical mission of defending the nation-state, participating in supranational forces, etc. Exactly as *Presencia* had stated five months before: " 'There Is No Bush Plan,' but the Armed Forces Will Be Drastically Reduced."

"The Armed Forces will have to accept that things cannot continue as they have until now, that certain changes must be made," Rial argued, because there exists "a very strong change at the global level which shows that large state organizations are in crisis. . . . The Armed Forces, as a state institution, are suffering the same fate as all the other state bodies;

they are losing power, money, position." Agreeing, Perelli advised the military to work to ensure that these changes "do not remain an imposition from abroad." Rial insisted again, "The restructuring of the Armed Forces will have to be discussed. . . . [We have to] discuss what kind of force we want to have, for what purpose, and how we want it. . . . The Armed Forces will also have to be prepared to lose some areas of influence."

In plain language: The military's only choice is to adopt the enemy's agenda as its own.

As opposition has grown in the Ibero-American military to the open discussion of dismantling the military, U.S. personnel working on the project have also attempted to repackage the plans in a more acceptable way. One of the participants in the Bush Manual project, Dr. Gabriel Marcella, for example, has been campaigning for the United States to help the Ibero-American military develop "democratic military professionalism." Marcella, a professor of Third World Studies and director of Regional Appraisals at the U.S. Army War College, and former International Affairs Adviser to the U.S. Southern Command, argues that the military "will remain an actor in national affairs," provided it adheres to the anti-national tenets of Project Democracy. Again, the old, tired litany is repeated: The doctrine of "national security has taken on a negative connotation . . . as a code word for authoritarian/military government." Thus, new roles for the military in "contemporary society" include fighting the narcotics traffic, arms control, and peacekeeping.[9]

Marcella also praises the work of Rial and Perelli and the "small intellectual movement among a few scholars—in Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay" who have set out to expand "the study of military sociology" and "the new professional missions of the military."

So what do Rial and Perelli consider "the role of the Latin American Armed Forces today" to be? Asked this question in

---

9. "The Latin American Military, Low Intensity Conflict, and Democracy," by Gabriel Marcella. In the *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 32, No. 1, spring 1990.

the May radio interview, Rial answered bluntly: "In the forces of South America, basically, to survive." A limited mission indeed!

The school of "democratic military professionalism" which purports to establish, in Marcella's words, "a legitimate professional mission within a democracy" for the military, proceeds, in fact, from the same premises of lunatic deconstructionism which underlie the project to eradicate western civilization and the nation-state from the globe. Consider, for example, *why* Rial argues that the military now faces "an existential crisis," a constant theme of the Bush Manual project:

"The military function, viewed from a global standpoint, loses prestige and position," he told his Uruguayan listeners in May. "Heroic operations today are not highly considered in any society in the world, and little by little other values and functions are predominating. In a society which many call post-industrial or post-modern, it is not clear what the function of the Armed Forces should be in a society which constantly proclaims the need for peace and the banning of war."

Commandos and Middle-level Officers

By now, the Bush Manual project had zeroed in on those sections of the military they had found to be most resistant to their New Age project. Of particular concern to Rial and Perelli were those trained as commandos, who embody the "heroic values" which they are so intent on burying forever. On various occasions, both note that commandos formed the backbone of Argentine Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín's feared *carapintada* movement.

This concern is evidenced in the Spanish edition of the Bush Manual. Perelli's revised chapter on "The Legacy of Transitions to Democracy in Argentina and Uruguay," for example, now includes a diatribe against the commandos and their training. She charges that this training was what allowed Colonel Seineldín to keep "the entire sector active, not only

politically but through 'paramilitary' training, under the command, 'harsh training, easy combat.' "

Likewise, in the May 1992 radio interview, Rial identified commando units throughout the continent as potential supporters of a *regionwide* resistance movement to their scheme. Rial was asked by his interviewer if *carapintadas* existed inside the Uruguayan Armed Forces. "It would be risky to speak of *carapintadas* existing in our country," he answered. But "what we could say is that . . . in almost all the countries of the region, because of the type of mission which the Armed Forces had to assume in the so-called internal war of the 1960s and 1970s, new forms of training military personnel appeared, and this is common to almost all the countries."

"It should be remembered," he continued, "that in Argentina, almost all the *carapintadas* came from a specialized force: commandos. These function under different names in other countries of Latin America. They are called commandos in Ecuador, rangers in Peru, lancers or *kaibiles* in Guatemala, etc. In our case, [Uruguay], we have not specifically created this specialization, but there are people who have been in other countries and who have exactly the same specialty."

Rial defines a commando as "an individual who receives special training so that he can face very difficult circumstances. That is, it is assumed that this is a person who can survive the worst circumstances possible." Thus, Rial concluded, "it is not surprising that there should be this same kind of, shall we say, communion, of training and outlook which exists in other countries of Latin America."

Similarly targeted as a center of resistance is the entire corps of middle-level officers, the group which Perelli charges are a bastion of the belief that the military's mission is to be "the saviors of the Nation." By October, 1992, the anti-military crowd was calling openly for this entire command group within the military to be purged of officers even *potentially* opposed to the U.S. project to reduce their institutions to U.S.-run national guards.

This was a major theme of a three-day symposium chaired by two editors of the Bush Manual, Louis Goodman and Jo-

hanna Mendelson, held at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C. Oct. 19-21, 1992. The symposium was entitled "Lessons of the Venezuelan Experience," and was concerned with the impact, regionally as well as within Venezuela, of the Feb. 4, 1992 military uprising against Carlos Andrés Pérez's *partidocracia.* More frank than on most occasions, symposium participants identified the military as one of the major factors keeping alive the hated "culture of economic nationalism" in Ibero-America, and thus, also, the possibility of rebellion against the bankers' free trade dictatorship.

Organizers noted from the outset that the symposium was the brainchild of the Rial-Goodman-Mendelson "Democracy Project" which produced the Bush Manual. Bush Manual participants dominated the proceedings. Speaking in addition to Goodman and Mendelson were two other authors from the project, Brazilian "military sociologist" Alexandre Barros and State Department academic Richard Millet, while the *éminence grise* of the project, then-Ambassador to the Organization of American States Luigi Einaudi, delivered marching orders at the symposium's end.

Barros took the lead in targetting middle-level officers during the opening panel. Arrogantly boasting that collapsing pay levels, prestige, and morale in the military throughout the continent have created a profound "identity crisis," Barros asserted that "the gap between the young and the old generations" in the military is increasing, as "the younger generation of officers" are indoctrinated in our view of "civil society."

"The great problem now is, what do we do with the people in the middle?" Barros then asked. "The generals are going to be retiring pretty soon, and the younger lieutenants and captains are getting in with the new view. What do we do with the majors and colonels? It seems to be the serious problem. How do we solve it: By attrition? By dismissing these people?" This is the major issue which must be addressed, Barros argued, "because this will be where the major source of frustration of military movement would lie at this point."

Barros again emphasized that the military has been targeted, because it opposes the economic policies of looting imposed by the bankers. "As the new democracies go along

with neoliberalism, the military tend to have a backward view of looking for nationalism, and for going back to old policies," Barros complained. This will change, however, when "the military profession . . . becomes a profession like any other" as its "quasi-monopoly" on training of its members in values and purposes is finally ended, he predicted.

Despite the obstacles, the anti-military project has continued to steadily advance. Several areas of enemy activity constitute immediate dangers.

The Economic Front

Continued acceptance of IMF rule in Ibero-America has allowed the enemy to strangle the Armed Forces economically, exactly as outlined by Robert McNamara in April 1991.

That this is a systematic policy of the international financial institutions was made clear by a report appearing in the IMF's newsletter, *IMF Survey*, in its Dec. 14, 1992 issue. The newsletter reported on a forum held at IMF headquarters in Washington, D.C. to discuss the issue of whether and how bilateral donors and international financial institutions "have the responsibility, and the means, to press countries . . . to reduce the level of their military expenditures."

Forum participants emphatically answered that they do. Pierre Landell-Mills, a senior policy adviser at the World Bank, bragged that the World Bank has pressured at least 20 countries to reduce military expenditures and is assisting several "to demobilize large armies" and convert military-industrial complexes to civilian uses. The World Bank has an ongoing research project on "the best ways to down-size armies," Landell-Mills told the IMF forum.

He cautioned, however, that for political reasons the World Bank must couch its anti-military objectives as merely part of a global effort to reduce "non-productive" expenditures, and he urged that a similar approach be adopted by national governments. He suggested that debate be encouraged over the tradeoffs between different types of expenditures, where it can be argued that "military expenditures were crowding out essential social spending." Bilateral lenders and

"donor consultative groups" should also withhold aid from "heavy military spenders" as another means of forcing through military changes, he added, because if bilateral aid is cut off, "these countries would no longer be able to draft a viable financing plan and would in turn be ineligible for structural adjustment lending."

Nicole Ball of the Overseas Development Council called upon the IMF, the World Bank, and other international financial institutions to "assume an activist stance" vis-à-vis military reform. They must "establish common security-related criteria" for granting aid, and then use the "many, subtle and varied" mechanisms available to them to yield the desired ends, she said. "Policy dialogue, financial and technical support, rewards for good behavior, efforts to set expenditure and performance targets in non-military areas (which can imply reductions in military aid), and encouraging countries to make the military sector subject to the same standards of accountability and transparency that apply to civilian sectors," were among the "subtle" mechanisms proposed.

Russell Kincaid, chief of the IMF's Special Facilities and Issues Division, focused on the strategic objective underlying the drive to reduce military expenditures. Echoing the central thesis of McNamara's 1991 speech, Kincaid argued that the objective to be sought is that "collective security . . . replaces a reliance on individual security arrangements," adding that someone will still have to "play global policeman."

A Supranational Military Force

The anti-military project seeks to make significant changes to the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), to grant it "intrusive powers" into member nations' affairs on the basis of a broad range of internal matters now labeled as important to "hemispheric security" (armaments control, human rights, democratic institutions, protecting the environment, drug-trafficking, etc.).

To achieve these ends, two major changes have been proposed. The first is to amend the charter to establish mechanisms for suspending or expelling from the OAS any nation

whose government is considered "undemocratic." The second is to place the Inter-American Defense Board under the direct control of the OAS. Today, the activities of the IADB are restricted to that of an advisory body of representatives of member states. With this charter change, promoted by the U.S., Argentine, and Venezuelan governments, in particular, the IADB could be transformed into a supranational military force, deployed by the OAS in similar fashion to the United Nations' "blue helmets."

Plans to turn the revamped IADB into a NATO-style alliance are well advanced. In an Oct. 27, 1992 teleconference on "Civil Military Relations" produced by the U.S. Information Service (USIS), Gen. John Galvin, former head of the U.S. Army's Southern Command, specified that a hemispheric alliance similar to NATO would lead to a reduction in the size of national military forces. With this, "we could avoid the need to think of such large air forces, navies and armies to protect us from neighboring countries," he stated.

Another consequence of such an alliance would be to establish formal U.S. command over what remains of the "restructured" Ibero-American militaries.

The preparation of OAS multinational forces is already operational, despite the fact that it is illegal under the current OAS charter. Documents obtained by *EIR* show that as of February 1993, military officers from a number of countries in Ibero-America were already being trained at Fort Benning, Georgia to operate as a multinational military force in Central America under the command of the OAS.

The project was initiated in September 1991, when the Nicaraguan government requested OAS assistance in training its army to remove mines left over from the Sandinista-Contra war. OAS Secretary-General João Baena Soares asked the IADB to draw up a plan for the operation, and to put together a list of qualified military officers from each of the area's countries who would be trained for the operation.

Three delegations, including that of Mexico, protested strongly. The Mexican government charged that "the IADB has no authority to carry out this kind of operation, since its consultative character does not allow for operational or

logistical activities. . . . The IADB has no authority to carry out this kind of operation; nor does the OAS secretary general have the authority to ask for it." Nonetheless the project went through, and since then, Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Guatemala have requested similiar assistance.

Pressure for the creation of an inter-American force escalated in 1992, as it became clear that national opposition to the new supranational order was growing, not subsiding. On March 24, 1992, a *New York Times* editorial initiated a public campaign for the plans which were otherwise being drawn up privately. "There is little time to lose. . . . In Venezuela, military nationalists challenge democracy," it wrote. "A hemispheric intervention force is more likely to be accepted if Washington maintains a low profile. . . . The time has come to create a new inter-American military force that could intervene to protect democratic governments from hijacking by armed terrorists."

The March 1992 issue of *Proceedings,* the publication of the U.S. Naval Institute, also promoted this idea, writing that "the next logical step in the maturing of the OAS as an effective tool for collective action by the nations of the Hemisphere would be for it to develop a quick-response force to deal with regional crises—natural as well as political. . . . The creation of the framework for such a force might not be too far off, considering the OAS actions related to Haiti."

That same month, Argentine President Carlos Menem proposed to a meeting in Buenos Aires of foreign ministers of the Rio Group nations (a sort of rump caucus of eight Ibero-American countries) that the OAS create a security council to intervene in the countries of the Hemisphere to "protect democracy." According to the Mexican daily *La Jornada* of March 27, 1992, Menem "reiterated his proposal that the OAS should have a multinational force to intervene in cases of coups d'état."

Then President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela backed Menem's proposal, complaining that the Rio Group rejected it on the basis of a mistaken defense of the principle of non-intervention. "I have insisted [that] the concept of non-intervention which should essentially be supported, should accept

the presence of supranational rights which must be defended by the region. . . . One of these rights is that popular sovereignty as expressed at the voting booth by the inhabitants of a country be respected and this right should be defended multilaterally," Pérez stated.

Numerous justifications for the creation of multinational defense are on the table, including that of "fighting drug-trafficking" and "defense of human rights."

In October 1992 Abraham Lowenthal of the Inter-American Dialogue suggested a regional force might soon be required to invade Peru. Lowenthal told the Argentine daily *Clarín,* on Oct. 18 that in the case of Peru, "I do not believe that a joint intervention with the countries of Latin America can be discarded should the problem spread." He added: "If the situation in Peru continues to deteriorate, all the Latin American countries, the United States and Canada will have to see how to work together to assist human rights forces in Peru."

Robert Pastor, National Security Council adviser on Ibero-America for President Jimmy Carter and an adviser to the Clinton transition team, published an article in the fall 1992 issue of *Foreign Policy,* the influential magazine of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which proposed at least four reasons for building a regional military force. These ranged from an "OAS drug force," to OAS supervision of ceasefires, "an inter-American peace force to restore democracy" and occupy the target country "during a difficult transition," and the use of "a small, inter-American force" to defend the Panama Canal—now that Panama no longer has its own military.

Pastor, who continues working for Carter at The Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia, outdid even the Inter-American Dialogue in the number of proposals for supranational mechanisms packed into one article. He proposed, for example, that an "independent center with the authority to compile detailed information on all arms sales and militaries throughout the Hemisphere" be established for the region. "Governments would have one year to plan 50 percent cuts in their arms purchases and defense expenditures," he specified, *except for*

the U.S., which has "global responsibilities." The OAS would then monitor the reductions "and institute sanctions against violators." Military leaders will object, he noted, but that can be contained: "The best way to give them a stake in the new democratic order is to use them in a modern and legitimate way, as international peacekeepers."

Fomenting Border Conflicts

In his article, Pastor also raised the specter of one of the oldest, and most dangerous, strategies used to keep the nations of Ibero-America from uniting against the New World Order: border conflicts. Since independence, fomenting border conflicts has been a favored strategy of the British empire in the area, based on the simple principle of "divide and conquer."

Pastor proposed that territorial disputes also be subjected to supranational control. He listed the territorial disputes between El Salvador and Honduras, Peru and Ecuador, Bolivia and its Pacific neighbors, and Venezuela and Colombia, as among the disputes which are like "dry tinder awaiting a spark" in the region.

On the face of it, Pastor's concern was to create a supranational mechanism to end these conflicts. He wrote: "A Hemisphere-wide effort is needed to bring all disputants to accept binding arbitration within a fixed period. An arbitration team would be composed of five people; each party would recommend one member, and the OAS secretary-general would recommend the others, all with the understanding that either party could veto any of the nominees. All states that agree to the process would also be bound to accept the results. The process should begin as soon as possible, and all agreements should be ratified by the year 2000."

But Pastor's real intent is clear: For supranational controls to be activated, first the "dry tinder" must be lit, and border conflicts must be fomented. Trilateral Commission ideologue Samuel Huntington was more blunt about the *active contingency planning* now underway in Trilateral circles for provoking border conflicts in the region, should it become

necessary to derail unified opposition to their plans. Huntington wrote:

> For good reasons you may wish to resolve conflicts with other countries. The absence of a foreign threat, however, may leave your military devoid of a legitimate military mission and enhance their inclination to think about politics. Balance gains from the removal of foreign threats against the potential costs in instability at home.

Ethnic Conflicts, Separatist Movements

Separatist movements, feeding off the economic and moral collapse of the central governments, have begun to flourish in several countries, including in the agricultural states of southern Brazil, various provinces of Argentina and states of Mexico, and parts of Colombia. In virtually every case, the origins of the project can be traced back to the 19th-century networks of the U.S.-based Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite Freemasons which ran the secessionist Confederate rebellion against the United States.

One of the most dangerous of these movements deployed to fragment the nations of Ibero-America is the so-called "Indian rights" movement, groups of which operate now in virtually every nation in the region. (Where there are no native Indians, foreign anthropologists and missionaries have set out to reconstruct them!) As we document in this book, this movement is financed, directed, and promoted from abroad as a force explicitly deployed against the nation-state—by the international financial institutions themselves! (See Chapter 11.)

Provocation of ethnic warfare is now one of the enemy's highest priorities. In February 1993, the Inter-American Dialogue set up a separate task force focused on "Ethnic Divisions and the Consolidation of Democracy in the Americas." The stated goal of the project is "to stimulate a debate among the peoples of the Hemisphere on the relationship between governments and indigenous peoples," and they intend to is-

sue "practical policy recommendations" to governments on this matter.

Heading the project is Dialogue staff member Donna Lee Van Cott, a specialist in "ethnic conflict." Serving on the advisory committee for the project are leaders of several "indigenous peoples' " NGOs, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Organization of American States.

Project director Van Cott published an article Nov. 4, 1992 in the *Christian Science Monitor,* dedicated to Guatemalan terrorist mouthpiece Rigoberta Menchú, which explicitly identified the so-called indigenous movement as a tool to eradicate "the very concept of national identity and national culture." Van Cott wrote:

> In virtually every country in Latin America, indigenous cultures are challenging the legitimacy of nation-states that exercise dominion over their ancestral territory. They challenge not just the state's disposition of their lands, languages, resources, and heritage, but the very concept of national identity and national culture. . . . In Bolivia and Ecuador, federations of Indian peoples have challenged the legitimacy of the Hispanicized state, demanding that their governments acknowledge the local autonomy and cultural separateness of the indigenous peoples. As these nations and others in Latin America struggle to consolidate recent democratic gains, they must also address the indigenous groups' assertion of a variety of nationalisms, an assertion that requires a more tolerant and pluralistic model of democracy.

U.S. Military Occupation of Ibero-America

The deployment of U.S. military forces themselves into the region is quietly increasing. The invasion of Panama, and preparations to stay beyond the year 2000, are only the most visible case. Special U.S. forces have been deployed into Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Honduras, and Guyana, under the cover of carrying out anti-drug activities

and training. In this way, U.S. troops have received on-the-ground training in irregular warfare in the Amazon region.

Although generally small in numbers, each operation has allowed the testing of a regional capability of broader scope. Exemplary of this was the deployment of 120 U.S. soldiers into the Departments of Beni and Pando in the Amazon region of Bolivia in July 1992. The U.S. reportedly has repeatedly requested that the government allow the construction of a U.S. military base in Bolivia. The official reason for this deployment is to build a school and a series of latrines—a job which might require one foreman and 15 workmen, when Bolivia itself has more than enough seeking work.

The head of the U.S. troops in Bolivia admitted the real purpose of the military deployment: "They are seeking to perfect their training. . . . We have communications with the U.S., with Panama, La Paz and Santa Cruz, where there are troops supporting this project," he said. The troops deployed were themselves members of elite forces which had operated before in Honduras, in the invasion of Panama and in the Gulf War. According to a Bolivian congressional on-site investigation, the troops were carrying out exercises in rapid disembarkation in the Amazon. They also found that in a period of days, almost 100 tons of freight had been brought in from U.S. military bases in Panama on a great number of huge transport planes, providing a test of the efficiency of transporting massive equipment into the Amazon region.

The number and size of such jungle exercises has expanded. In May 1993, some 7,000 U.S. Special Forces soldiers deployed into Guyana for three weeks of jungle-survival training execises—right on Guyana's border with Brazil.