

The truth about Carlos Andrés Pérez

by the Venezuelan Labor Party and
the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement

On May 19 of this year, one day before the Venezuelan Supreme Court was to announce its verdict on whether there were sufficient grounds for trying President Carlos Andrés Pérez (CAP) for corruption, the Venezuelan Labor Party and the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) jointly published a pamphlet entitled "The Truth About CAP." EIR is publishing the text of the pamphlet in six installments. The first chapter, entitled, "CAP Destroyed the Productive Economy," appeared in our July 30 issue.

"The Truth About CAP" is not only important for Venezuela and Ibero-America, but also for the United States. President Bill Clinton has continued to apply the major elements of George Bush's policy toward the continent, for which Pérez—currently suspended from the presidency—considered himself the spokesman.

Chapter 2: Washington's man and the New World Order

From the day he took presidential power in the sumptuous ceremony in February 1989 which many referred to as "the coronation," Carlos Andrés Pérez (CAP) announced his intention of turning Venezuela into the spearhead of then-U.S. President George Bush's New World Order. What CAP liked most about the idea then (who knows if he still likes it) was being compared with Mikhail Gorbachov and having the reforms he announced called "Perez-troika."

To the promoters of that New World Order, no one would

be more useful in Ibero-America than CAP, for CAP is Washington's man in Ibero-America. Every time Washington has taken steps over the past decade to destroy the sovereignty of nations, destroy the national armed forces of Ibero-America and replace them with corps of gendarmes, and to use any pretext to militarily intervene in another country, Washington has unconditionally counted on CAP.

This is one of the main reasons why Washington has given CAP its 100% backing, against the people's will to be rid of him. And where arguments have not prevailed, Washington has not hesitated to issue categorical threats. For example, Luigi Einaudi, until recently United States ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS), declared curtly in an Oct. 21, 1992 symposium entitled "Lessons of the Venezuelan Experience," held at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C. that "any interruption of the legal process in Venezuela . . . would provoke an extreme reaction." He added that "Venezuela is in a very important and unique situation; *it has an impact on the entire structure of United States-Latin American relations,*" and what occurs in Venezuela "*is absolutely vital for our collective regional future. . .*" (emphasis added).

● **Panama.** On Dec. 20, 1989, the United States militarily invaded Panama, after a slander campaign against the commander of the Panamanian National Defense Forces, Gen. Manuel A. Noriega, in which CAP played the central role. CAP never opposed the invasion, in which for the first time the U.S. Army "tested" its Stealth bomber against a civilian population. CAP's only objection was that the invasion ought to be headed up not only by the U.S. Army, but

by an expeditionary force in the name of the OAS. Since the invasion of Panama, CAP has wasted no opportunity in insisting that this OAS military force be set up, in order to invade any nation that might oppose the new order.

● **Middle East.** Slightly over a year later, in 1991, the United States, with the support of Britain and France and with the complicity of the United Nations, invaded Iraq and used that war to test new "smart weapons" against the civilian population, as they did in Panama. CAP completely supported the invasion, and lost little time in joining the expedition, as did his colleague, Carlos Menem of Argentina. The invasion was so much to his liking, that in a speech given during his 1990 European trip, CAP said that regional organizations (like the OAS) should create an entity similar to the U.N. Security Council to intervene in regional affairs. CAP formally took that proposal before the U.N. and OAS, saying that an expeditionary force had to be created to intervene in any country whose government might be changed in ways other than the ballot.

● **Haiti.** The following year, on Sept. 30, 1991, the Armed Forces of Haiti deposed the Marxist butcher Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who had the habit of executing his political enemies by putting them in the hands of his fanatical followers to be "necklaced": gasoline-filled tires placed around the neck of the victim, and then set afire. "Human rights" did not come into consideration here. CAP received Aristide in Caracas like a king, and lodged him in the presidential suite at the Caracas Hilton, spending millions to support not only Aristide but his retinue of aides, secretaries, bodyguards, etc.

Meanwhile, the Haitian people, one of the poorest on the continent, if not the poorest, suffer the consequences of the economic sanctions dictated by the United States and imposed by the OAS, at Venezuela's request. On Oct. 8, 1991, all members of the OAS agreed to impose a total trade embargo against Haiti, including food and fuel, and to send a "security force" to protect an OAS "civilian" force for the purpose of reinstating Aristide. On Dec. 2, 1991, the Presidents of 13 member-nations of the Rio Group met in Cartagena, Colombia, and urged that the blockade against Haiti be "inflexibly" applied, and that Europe get behind that blockade. CAP said that the fact that "the blockade hurts the Haitians" was unimportant, because it is "better that the people suffer now under an embargo that must become a blockade to force the assassin soldiers to yield to the democratic process."

In 1992, CAP again tried to organize a military expedition to reimpose Aristide in the government, but the Feb. 4 military rebellion in Venezuela cut short his plans. After that, CAP, together with Aristide, intensified the campaign to create an OAS expeditionary force to protect those governments that were imposing the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) economic programs, and the creditors. According to a news story published on March 26, 1993 in the Lima daily

Expreso, CAP blamed the European Community for the situation in Haiti, saying, "The truth is that the blockade was imposed on Haiti to force the Haitian military and the group of oligarchs benefitting from the dictatorship to open their doors to democracy. But the EC did not want to respect the norm adopted by the OAS and violated the blockade."

● **Peru.** On April 5, 1992, Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori, backed by the Peruvian Armed Forces, dissolved the parliament and the judiciary because those institutions had become a major obstacle to the war against the narco-terrorism of Shining Path. CAP immediately responded by breaking diplomatic relations with Peru, ignoring the criticisms coming from every political party, including his own. That was not all. CAP moved to throw Peru out of the Group of Eight, trying to isolate the Fujimori government in the same way he had done to the government of Panama before the U.S. invasion. In an interview with the Bogotá, Colombia daily *El Tiempo* on Oct. 26, 1992, CAP said: "I broke relations with Peru because I wanted to signal my discontent with the fact that they were getting different treatment from that given to Haiti. . . . Peru is more perverse than Haiti, because Haiti's is a primitive, barbaric insurgency. What happened in Peru is betrayal by someone who received the popular mandate for heading a democratic process, and who has just now destroyed it."

In October 1992, CAP reiterated his opposition to President Fujimori's being invited to the Rio Group in Buenos Aires, because "Mr. Fujimori is not President. While there is no democracy in Peru, as the Rio statute establishes, we can see no reason for Peru to be in the Rio Group" (EFE wire service, *El Tiempo* of Bogotá, Oct. 19, 1992).

CAP has also been implicated in the coup attempt against Fujimori headed by retired Gen. Jaime Salinas Sedó in November 1992. Isabel Salinas, wife of Gen. Salinas Sedó, was in fact in Caracas when, on Nov. 20, she declared that "my husband and a group of democratic officials and patriots intended to overthrow the de facto regime installed in my country," according to UPI wire service. And close relations have been noted between CAP and his Social Democratic intimate, Peruvian ex-President Alan García, who publicly backed the failed coup of Salinas Sedó.

● **CAP supports the communist guerrillas.** Social Democrat CAP has used a large part of his government to give a wide field of action to a group of communist guerrillas in the region. While on the one hand he calls himself the pointman for the ferocious liberalism of the IMF in Ibero-America and the imperialist new order, on the other hand CAP is also the main orchestrator of the operation to deliver power to the narco-terrorists.

1) *Colombia.* First, he presented himself as the mediator between the Colombian government and M-19 guerrillas during the peace talks that brought that group into the government, and around the middle of April 1990, CAP met with the directorate of the narco-terrorist M-19, despite the fact

that they were continuing—and continue—to support drug legalization. Then, CAP extended that mediation to the rest of the Colombian guerrillas, whose leaders were officially in Caracas, gaining time and thumbing their noses at everyone. On April 28, 1990, one of the top leaders of the communist Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC), Jacobo Arenas—who has since died—announced that FARC had asked CAP and Jimmy Carter to intercede with the Colombian government in favor of the National Guerrilla Coordination (the umbrella group which joins FARC with the Army of National Liberation, ELN, and the People's Liberation Army, ELP). Arenas added that CAP was already making international gestures toward peace dialogues. Two days later, on April 30, in an interview given in New York to Colombia's Radio Caracol, CAP confirmed his support for the coalition headed by the FARC, and according to Reuters wire service, CAP added, "We are disposed to do whatever is in our power to open a frank dialogue among the government, opposition sectors, and the guerrillas."

On May 2, then-Colombian President Virgilio Barco rejected CAP's intervention. But the rebuff didn't matter to CAP, and he went right on intervening. At the beginning of 1991, he put on a show: Three Colombian guerrillas turned themselves in at the Venezuelan embassy in Bogotá and asked that the peace talks take place on Venezuelan territory, as finally happened. On Jan. 29, 1991, the Bogotá daily *La Prensa* reported that "the President of Venezuela, Carlos Andrés Pérez, announced yesterday in Caracas that the FARC and the Army of National Liberation (ELN) are ready to seek protection in the Colombian legislation [offering them amnesty] and to turn over their arms . . . with the purpose of being allowed to have representatives in the National Constituent Assembly." The daily added that CAP was continuing to meet with guerrilla spokesmen. On Feb. 7, *La Prensa* published an AP wire according to which CAP "said that he will do everything in his power to help achieve a pacification of the guerrillas in Colombia, but that he will not act as a mediator," and that everything that he might do would be with the consent of the Colombian government.

Nevertheless, in practice, CAP continued meeting with Colombian terrorists, and in May of 1991 CAP acceded to having Venezuela be the site for peace talks between the Colombian government and the Simón Bolívar Guerrilla Coordination.

As everyone knows, that Constituent Assembly was controlled by narco-terrorists, drug-traffickers, and Freemasons, and, among other things, established that Colombian drug-traffickers cannot be extradited, a demand that at that time, the drug-traffickers were calling for.

With all this going on, various politicians in Venezuela began to strongly criticize CAP's Colombian-Venezuelan accords and his mediation with the narco-guerrillas. *El Diario de Caracas* went so far as to say that CAP was opening up the border to the narco-guerrillas. In intelligence and security

circles, the version circulated that Colombian President César Gaviria and CAP would grant to the Simón Bolívar Guerrilla Coordination a status of belligerents, for the purpose of formally recognizing its control over territory and recognizing it as a legitimate government in the Colombian departments [administrative units comparable to states—ed.] of Arauca and Norte de Santander, which border on the Venezuelan states of Apure, Táchira, and Zulia.

CAP also has backed the constitutional changes in Colombia that have dramatically favored the narco-terrorists and Freemasons. On May 7, CAP said in Bogotá, before that country's Constituent Assembly, "Honorable Assemblymen, I am sure that this constituent assembly experiment, this revolutionary experiment, will be a model for modernization in Ibero-America and the world."

2) *El Salvador*. CAP has also constantly supported the terrorist and Marxist Farabundo Martí Liberation Front (FMLN) of El Salvador. CAP's intervention in favor of the Salvadoran guerrillas started when, as a member of the "four friends" group, he pressed for the suspension of oil shipments to El Salvador if the government did not agree to negotiations with the FMLN. It continued down to the participation of Reinaldo Figueredo, his ex-chief of staff—and one of his accomplices in the misappropriation of 250 million bolívares—as one of the three members of the infamous Truth Commission of the United Nations, which harbored the FMLN and lyingly accused the El Salvador Armed Forces of causing the civil war and violating human rights.

Among other things, on Feb. 6, 1991, CAP received an FMLN delegation in Caracas "to put forward steps concerning the concretization of a political conclusion to the Salvadoran conflict." CAP also offered to mediate in the dialogue of the Salvadoran government with the communist FMLN. With the intervention of the United States, the OAS and CAP tried in these negotiations to force the government of President Alfredo Cristiani to grant the guerrillas control of a large part of the nation's territory, that they be accepted as the recognized authority, to dismantle the Armed Forces, and jail the High Command for presumed violations of human rights.

"The United States suggested the creation of the group of 'friends' of the U.N. Secretary General, composed of Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela, to avoid resistance to the direct participation of the United States" in El Salvador, said the Nicaraguan Jesuit priest Rodolfo Cardenal, a high official of the Central American University of El Salvador, at the International Seminar on Peace Negotiations that took place in Bogotá on Nov. 24-26, 1992, under the auspices of CINEP [a Jesuit think tank]. Cardenal spelled it out: "I want to say and insist, as I have said in my conferences, that the pressure of the group of the 'four friends' has been fundamental to resolving the three crises that have been presented in the peace process. On these three occasions the Salvadoran government has refused to comply with the

accords, and the group of the 'four friends' economically blackmailed the government of El Salvador. Venezuela and Mexico threatened to suspend the sale of oil at a special price much lower than the market."

CAP has sought to impose that same model in Colombia, and now also wants to do it in Guatemala. On Feb. 23, 1992, the wire service EFE reported that guerrilla leaders of the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG) welcomed heartily the creation of a Group of Friends—formed by Colombia, Spain, Mexico, and Venezuela—to collaborate in the "pacification" of Guatemala.

3) *Nicaragua*. One of the most scandalous interventions by CAP in favor of Marxist guerrillas has been what he has done in Nicaragua, where he helped the Sandinistas to take power militarily, politically, and economically. Years later, when the Sandinistas were overthrown in the February 1990 elections, CAP again intervened on behalf of the Sandinistas, this time in open coordination with Henry Kissinger. When Violeta Chamorro assumed the presidency in April of that year, and wanted to fulfill her promise that Gen. Humberto Ortega would not remain in command of the Armed Forces, immediately CAP and Kissinger moved jointly to prevent her from being able to dismantle the Sandinista apparatus. CAP himself boasted that he later convinced Chamorro to maintain the Sandinista Humberto Ortega as commander of the Armed Forces of Nicaragua.

On April 30, 1990, the *New York Times* said that Chamorro's "most important outside friend is the President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela, whom she met when she and her husband were living in exile 30 years ago," and added that Pérez's "unusual influence with the new Nicaraguan leader has not been lost on the departing Sandinista President Daniel Ortega and his brother General Ortega. On the eve of Chamorro's inauguration, the brothers are believed to have approached Mr. Pérez directly for his support of Mrs. Chamorro's decision to leave General Ortega in power—a move that was under heated attack." Shortly afterwards, on a visit to Washington, CAP told the press on April 27 that keeping Ortega as head of the Nicaraguan army is something that "guarantees" peace. CAP also said that in his meeting with Bush, they had discussed the problems of Central America, and that "it is very gratifying and satisfactory to be able to affirm that President Bush and I are in full agreement on these matters." On May 3, the Caracas daily *Ultimas Noticias* said that CAP also consulted with Kissinger on his efforts to maintain Ortega in power, and added that "it was learned that Kissinger made gestures of joining in those concepts of President Pérez."

But CAP's methods of "convincing" are tortuous. On June 3, 1990, *Diario Las Américas*, which is published in Miami, reported that the imposition of Ortega as chief of the Armed Forces "was due to the immovable condition of Carlos Andrés Pérez of supplying oil to Nicaragua only if Humberto Ortega were maintained in his post."



The former Communist President of Nicaragua Daniel Ortega. After the Sandinistas were defeated in 1990, CAP blackmailed the new Nicaraguan government into keeping Ortega's brother on as defense minister.

With all this, it comes as no surprise that one of the two main agents who supported CAP against the coup attempt of Feb. 4, 1992, was totalitarian dictator Fidel Castro, who sent him the following telegram: "A profound concern seizes us. . . . In this bitter and critical moment, we recall with gratitude all that which has contributed to the development of bilateral relations between our countries."

CAP and the reform of the OAS

Since the General Assembly of the OAS that took place in Santiago de Chile in June 1991, CAP has been the key pawn in Washington's game of reforming the fundamental charter of the OAS, a reform whose objectives are:

a) To give the OAS "intrusive powers" in the member states when "democracy" may be threatened in any country; that is, to transform the OAS into a supranational instrument to intervene, violating national sovereignty, in any country where the United States may decide to do it.

b) To lay the basis for restructuring the Inter-American Defense Junta (JID) so that, from being an advisory body in military affairs, it will turn into the military expeditionary force of the OAS, along the model of the U.N. "blue hel-

mets." This is expected to be attained by the next General Assembly in June 1993, to be held in Nicaragua.

The most eloquent precedent of this plan was not discussed at a meeting of the OAS, but of the World Bank. In the April 1991 World Bank annual meeting, ex-U.S. defense secretary and ex-World Bank president Robert S. McNamara presented a document promoting the idea of "collective action," along the model of the Iraq invasion. McNamara proposed "an agreement of the [U.N.] Security Council that regional conflicts endangering territorial integrity will be dealt with through application of economic sanctions and, if necessary, military action imposed by collective decisions and utilizing multinational forces. . . . Such a world would need a leader. I don't see any alternative to the leadership role being fulfilled by the United States."

After this open proposal of imposing U.S. supranational power, McNamara added, "Regional organizations like the OAS and the OAU [Organization of African Unity] must come to function as regional arms of the Security Council."

That same month, at a seminar in Washington at the Woodrow Wilson Institute, on "the future of the OAS and hemispheric security," then-U.S. Ambassador to the OAS Luigi Einaudi, expressed his "great frustration in the ability to bring together the OAS and the Inter-American Defense Junta" in a specific mission. "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," added Einaudi.

The first step in that direction was taken in the OAS General Assembly in Santiago, Chile, in June of that same year, where Venezuela tried to revive the so-called "Betancourt Doctrine" under which any OAS member country where a coup d'état occurs must be suspended, aside from other punitive sanctions, such as economic and financial blockades, and including a military intervention in conjunction with the OAS. Pérez's proposal was not approved due to the opposition of Mexico and other countries, and only an "inexorable compromise" was reached, of activating mechanisms of the OAS to defend democracy in the region, whenever it is seen threatened.

On that occasion, Einaudi was more frank: "The U.S. is determined that the new international order should have an immediate derivative south of the Rio Grande: 'a new regional order.' It would be like killing two birds with the same stone that was intended for Saddam Hussein."

Faced with the overthrow of Aristide, the "Santiago Compromise" was put into action immediately: The OAS met and imposed the economic blockade against Haiti.

The Feb. 4, 1992 military rebellion against CAP was the pretext to accelerate the agreements. On March 24, the *New York Times* proposed the creation of a "inter-American military force" to provide a cover for U.S. military interventions in Ibero-America, more or less in the sense in which CAP had proposed for the case of Panama. According to the daily,

"a hemispheric intervention force is more likely to be more accepted if Washington maintains a low profile." Three days later, in the Rio Group chancellors' meeting that took place in Buenos Aires, Argentina's President Carlos Menem proposed that the OAS should have its own Security Council to intervene in the area when it might be necessary to "protect democracy." CAP approved this idea, according to the Caracas daily *El Nacional*, but the Rio Group rejected it.

The assault on national sovereignty

In his opening address at the symposium "Consolidation of Democracy in Latin America" that began in Caracas on Feb. 14, 1990, CAP launched what could be labeled the "CAP Corollary to the OAS," which would turn this organization into an inter-American police force.

CAP said: "On our continent we have witnessed situations in which the intervention of the regional organization has been admitted into the fight to uphold democracy. . . . In concordance with this we have to think of a permanent and operative mechanism which joins the continent's heads of state and permits them to conclude practical agreements for multilateral cooperation, which would strengthen the political, economic, and social bases of democracy."

One year later, in a speech given in Colombia on May 12, 1991, CAP said that "the concept of sovereignty must suffer some substantial changes so that the rights that today are establishing themselves as supranational may have full enforcement and value, rights which allowed the United Nations to order an intervention to restore the territorial sovereignty of the state of Kuwait. Consequently, I think that if we do not modify this concept of sovereignty, if we don't locate it inside the new realities of the world and subject it to the supervision of this organization which is called upon to take a supreme influence in the conduct of relations among all the countries in the world, i.e., the United Nations, we will not have succeeded in exchanging the bipolar scheme for a multipolar scheme."

In a speech to the U.N. Security Council Jan. 31, 1992, CAP proposed, among other things, that "we must adjust the classical concept of national sovereignty, give it nuances, in order to incorporate the transnational responsibilities that are implicit in the interdependence of all our nations. And the supranationality already fully recognized by the democratization of the world society for the entirety of duties of states and rights of peoples.

"This is evident in the environmental domain, or to broaden it, in what is related to natural resources that have been described as our collective heritage. Until an essential totality of human rights and promises of the states among themselves and for their peoples in the new conception of a democratic juridical philosophy. . . . That is to say, to give greater prominence to the protection and safeguarding of the common heritage and to the enforcement of fundamental human rights and to the containing and repression of the risks

that besiege our collective security: the proliferation of arms, drug-trafficking, terrorism.”

At a time when the U.N. Security Council has been practically converted into a dependency annexed to the George Bush White House, CAP went and proposed putting putting “transnational responsibilities” above the concept of national sovereignty. Once again, on that occasion CAP gave his personal backing to the body which has been tacitly turned into the policing or armed branch of the New Order.

In his speech, CAP proposed simply that:

1) Natural resources, which for Venezuela means oil, are a “collective heritage” of the entire world. On other occasions, CAP has explicitly referred to oil as the “heritage of humanity,” that is, not exclusively of Venezuelans. Consequently, no one may prevent *Petróleos de Venezuela, SA* (PDVSA) from falling into the hands of the international creditors.

2) Under the pretext of that “transnational responsibility,” the Security Council may be charged with “repressing the risks that set aside our collective security: the proliferation of arms, drug-trafficking, terrorism.”

CAP, the friend of Washington

In December 1990, CAP received President George Bush in Caracas, who behaved as if he were the Emperor Caligula. And CAP behaved as if he were his loyal flunky. During the dinner for Bush at the presidential residence, CAP did not quite reach the point of calling Bush the “Bolívar of the '90s,” but almost. “I sincerely think, Mr. President, that your initiative has made clear the solution to the historic misencounter that has confused and distanced us so many times. And that this still feeds those anti-North American residues, that give rise to the din of squalid protests that you will have found on your path, fostered by minds frozen in old and long-superseded confrontations,” said CAP.

Bush responded on Dec. 8, in a press conference, saying that “Venezuela, under the mandate of President Pérez, is a leader of those great movements that we are witnessing in Latin America to consolidate democracy, eliminate the barriers to economic growth, and liberate the free press. Also to break the trade barriers with respect to the Americas and above all, the movement toward a new hemispheric association.”

This interchange of praises occurred one year after the Panama invasion, and in the midst of the preparations for the war against Iraq.

Oil: Kissinger’s hemispheric reserve

When the war against Iraq was yet not over, CAP was already organizing for the United States to gain control of OPEC’s oil. On Feb. 13, 1991 the Caracas daily *El Nuevo País* reported the statements of Kissinger, who was again in Venezuela in order to advise CAP. Kissinger laid out for *Venevisión* journalist Leopoldo Castillo CAP’s entire strate-

gy for turning Venezuela’s oil into a “hemispheric reserve.” “The hemisphere could be self-sufficient in energy. If all of its nations were to agree on a common policy and even if this differs from the U.S. owners, this the direction to follow in the future,” said Kissinger.

According to Kissinger, this can be realized in the framework of the proposal made in Caracas by his chief, David Rockefeller, in February 1989, to create a free market from the United States to Argentina, a proposal that much later became Bush’s “Enterprise for the Americas.” Rockefeller made the announcement at the annual meeting of his Society of the Americas, which took place that year in Caracas, an occasion CAP took advantage of to honor Rockefeller, saying that “here in Venezuela we never forget the services so devotedly rendered to our country by the late, lamented Nelson Rockefeller,” but his brother David “has kept that tradition alive. . . . I can say that I am happy to share his judgments, and that I share the judgments that yesterday he laid out to us for all of Latin America.”

Kissinger made explicit some of those judgments on that occasion, when he said that “there are currently trade negotiations; a free trade zone was established between the United States and Canada, discussions are taking place to incorporate Mexico, and I consider that Venezuela must be offered the opportunity to be incorporated, and with time, to offer equal opportunity to other nations of South America, in such a way that here in the Western Hemisphere we may have a great market for what we produce and our own energy self-sufficiency.”

The then-Venezuelan Minister of Mines and Energy Celestino de Armas proposed openly to create a “hemispheric reserve” of oil, a proposal that did not get anywhere because of Mexico and Ecuador’s reticence to embrace that traitorous idea.

CAP’s foreign advisers

At the end of April 1990, at a meeting in New York with bankers and businessmen, CAP announced that he had contracted with Kissinger to form part of his Council of [foreign] Advisers for Foreign Investments in Venezuela. In addition to Kissinger, forming part of this council, were Italian Fiat magnate Giovanni Agnelli; satanist Luciano Benetton; Frenchman Jean Luc Lagardette, president of the Hachette publishing house, which publishes “soft-core” pornography for women; James Robinson of American Express, represented in Venezuela by CAP’s friend, banker José Alvarez Stelling; Spaniards Carlos March and José Angel Sánchez Asuain, from the group of financiers around Spain’s socialist Prime Minister Felipe González and from the so-called “Latin” Social Democracy.

In March 1991, these advisers proposed to CAP that he rig a total financial reform, opening the economy to foreign capital and without governmental controls. That reform is about to be voted on in the Congress.