

'Williamsburg II' flops: Time to dump Bush's defense policy for the Americas

by Gretchen Small

The second Defense Ministerial of the Americas (DMA), which brought most defense ministers of the Western Hemisphere to Bariloche, Argentina, on Oct. 7-9, reached no conclusions of substance on regional defense strategy or policies, nor did it produce even a semblance of that condition so beloved by diplomats, a "consensus." Mexico, once again, did not send its defense secretary, and empowered its lower-level delegation to participate only as observers. Not even a date or host country for a next defense summit was firmed up, despite U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry's proclamations that the "Williamsburg process"—a term invented out of the first defense ministers summit held in Williamsburg, Virginia, on July 24-26, 1995—has been accepted as an institution by all involved.

Pentagon officials like to spin a different story, but what participation has occurred, has been achieved through diplomatic and economic pressure, and that old Teddy Roosevelt standby, the threat of unilateral military intervention against nations which refuse to go along with the takedown of their military capabilities demanded by the so-called "globalization" of the world economy.

Secretary Perry's "Williamsburg process" is a failure, creating more distrust and hostility in Ibero-America than acceptance, while wreaking havoc on the capabilities of the nations in the region to defeat growing narco-terrorist forces. The insanity of the policy is epitomized by Perry's proclamations in Bariloche that the Williamsburg process has produced "dazzling victories for peace and security in the Americas," and that the Williamsburg principles, which assert that democracy is the number-one security concern, "are now . . . promoting stability and security throughout the hemisphere."

There is no "peace and security" *anywhere* in the Americas today, and, thus, little democracy worthy of the term. The nations of Ibero-America, looted to the bone by International Monetary Fund policies, face imminent disintegration from spreading war, misery, and British-sponsored indigenist separatist movements, while the breakup of Canada, and the United States itself, is being pushed by the agents of the British Crown as well. Colombia faces a nationwide offensive by 10-15,000 well-armed narco-terrorists, which are backed from the Presidential Palace by the drug cartel's Samper Pizano government. Colombia's insurgents are but a local branch of a continental force, the São Paulo Forum, operating

under the immediate command of the Castro regime in Cuba, whose allies now deploy sufficient force in Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela, that civil war could begin at any moment in these countries, too.

In a campaign strategy paper, *The Blunder in U.S. National Security Policy*, issued in October 1995, then-U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. warned of the catastrophic global consequences for U.S. security which would result from continuing these Bush-era free trade and democracy policies, and laid out the basic hypotheses upon which a competent U.S. national-security doctrine and policy must be premised, if the United States is to survive the ongoing global financial and strategic firestorm.

The failure of Bariloche, coming on the eve of the likely election of a second, strengthened, Clinton administration, opens an opportunity for the United States to dump the whole supranational "Williamsburg process," inherited wholesale from the despised Bush administration, and return to a defense strategy based on those classical principles of military defense of sovereign nation-states outlined by LaRouche, before the utopian ideologues hand over the Western Hemisphere to narco-terrorism and chaos.

A creepy-crawly from under London's rock

Secretary Perry's "Williamsburg process" was, from its start, conceived as a central feature of the drive to create a Western Hemisphere Free Trade Area (WHFTA), the equivalent for the Americas of the Maastricht Treaty, whose implementation in Europe has led to widespread mass protests. The proposal for a WHFTA was drawn up under Sir George Bush's administration, and first presented under the name of the "Enterprise for the Americas." As Sir Henry Kissinger reiterated most recently in his remarks to the Inter-American Press Association on Oct. 9, the concept behind WHFTA is not merely a free trade zone, but "the creation of an economic and political system of the Western Hemisphere" (emphasis added).

The number of "Sirs" promoting this project is no coincidence. As the global financial system disintegrates, the London-centered international financial interests are ever more strident that supranational structures must replace national governments, because even the weakest nation can, at a time of such crisis, become an instrument of its people to defend

national existence. Because of the military's active role in Ibero-America historically as a central national institution, a project was started back in the mid-1980s, to silence, reduce, and destroy national militaries, as a necessary flank in the war to weaken, reduce, and eventually eliminate nation-states in the region.

London has been overt in its support for the anti-military project. The London *Economist* magazine greeted the Bariloche conference in its Oct. 5 issue, as an opportunity to rewrite the "mechanisms of defense cooperation in the Americas." Under the headline, "Toys for the chicos?" the *Economist* argued that the expansion of free trade in the region raises the question, "What use are the weapons anyway?" London's financiers assert that defense needs have changed, and so, "Latin America could use a framework to decide what they are, and how to meet them through military collaboration—under civilian control." The *Economist* specified that Bariloche should also consider setting regional "guidelines on weapons purchases."

And as Bariloche concluded on Oct. 9, London's International Institute of Strategic Studies released its annual global study, *Military Balance*, which likewise argued that Ibero-America's armed forces must make "uncomfortable readjustments to their political roles, as well as reducing and reorganizing their force strength."

The Williamsburg game

The idea for the "Williamsburg process" itself was drafted by the Inter-American Dialogue before Secretary Perry was ever named to his post. The Dialogue, ever since its founding in 1982, has been the primary Anglophile policy-making body for the region on this side of the Atlantic.

The Dialogue's December 1992 report, *Convergence and Community: The Americas in 1993*, outlined the policies demanded of the incoming Clinton administration by the London-centered financier interests for which the Dialogue works. The centerpiece of the program was that the Clinton administration expand Bush's Enterprise for the Americas into a WHFTA, in order to "lock in" Ibero-American nations to free trade policies. International treaty agreement "restricts national sovereignty and . . . constrains national responses to special problems . . . precisely to limit the sovereign choice of the contracting nations," it wrote.

Should treaties not be sufficient, however, the Dialogue specified that it is crucial that the WHFTA "club of nations" be empowered with political and military powers, including for "multilateral military intervention" should any nation decide to leave their "club." All this, in the name of "democracy," of course.

Key to achieving this goal, *Convergence and Community* insisted, is to curtail the influence of the armed forces, and to establish, as law, the principle that the military has no voice in national life or policy-making in the region. To do so, the Dialogue proposed that "the Organization of American States

(OAS), its individual member states, and non-governmental organizations should foster national and regional dialogues among civilian and military officials to take a fresh look at their armed forces—their mission, size, weapons, and cost."

The Dialogue specified:

"The OAS should consider organizing a permanent forum of civilian defense ministers, armed service commanders, and key members of legislatures, to develop regionwide norms of civil-military relations and the evolving missions of armed forces in the Americas. Clearly, such norms would not be immediately adopted by all armies, but they could lead to a growing convergence of attitudes and behavior as has happened on such matters as the conduct of elections and economic management."

Because the member-states of the OAS have continued to balk at transforming what serves as an inter-American forum, into a supranational institution, with its own powers, advocates of this policy finally proceeded—unilaterally. The "Williamsburg process" initiated by Perry is intended to become the "permanent forum" proposed by the Dialogue, sneaked in through the back door by a crude diplomatic ruse.

Invitations were issued to the Williamsburg summit, with the promise that the intent was simply to exchange views on hemispheric security, without any commitments required. Pentagon officials insisted no joint declaration would come out of the conference, but said that Secretary Perry would issue a "chairman's declaration" summarizing what he saw as the major themes and "commonalities" discussed.

Lo and behold, however, at the summit's end, Perry announced that the nations had accepted his chairman's declaration as their own, and adopted six "Williamsburg principles," all based on the premise that the number-one security issue before the region was "democracy." Perry admitted no vote had been held on his principles. "I passed out the draft of these principles this morning," he told the press at the conclusion. "Each of the delegates had an opportunity to read them, and then I invited comments for changes and amendments." And because no delegation stomped out, Pentagon officials now repeat, over and over, that every nation in the hemisphere, minus Cuba, adheres to said principles!

'Join me, or I'll shoot you'

If Williamsburg was a fraud, the final declaration issued from the Bariloche summit was flat-out ridiculous. Signed by no one, it reports that delegates had "discussed a wide range of security concerns and interests of participating states," during which discussions, the delegates had "recalled . . . the conference held in Williamsburg"; "stressed the necessity of deepening inter-American cooperation"; "considered that the measures to promote mutual confidence are appropriate"; "urged all countries . . . to promote, through an active and voluntary participation [sic], the success of [UN] peacekeeping missions"; and lastly, "took note of the initiatives proposed during this conference."

“Recalled,” “stressed,” “considered,” “urged,” and “took note”: verbs appropriate to a modern t-group session, but which do not connote action or agreement, and certainly do not carry diplomatic weight.

Most sharply rejected, were proposals for the creation of a multinational military force for the Americas. The U.S. delegation reportedly “informally” raised the idea of a regional anti-drug military force in various bilateral meetings held during the summit. Proposals viewed as thinly disguised stepping-stones to a multilateral force were presented to the full meeting by Panama—an occupied nation which no longer has a military, since Bush’s 1989 invasion—and by Argentina’s Williamsburg toadies. Panama proposed a counter-drug center be set up in Panama; Argentina circulated a proposal to establish a regional peacekeeping training school.

Frontal attacks on the principle of sovereignty are still politically explosive in Ibero-America, despite more than 14 years of IMF economic dictates, and proposals to create any regional multinational force have repeatedly been rejected. Even the Inter-American Dialogue cautioned in its 1992 *Convergence* report that, while “many of us believe” that the OAS should establish “a modest security or peacekeeping capacity . . . to respond to actual or threatened breakdowns of democratic order,” discussion of creating an inter-American security force “should be deferred . . . [because] a divisive debate on the subject might well weaken the emerging hemispheric commitment to collective action in favor of democracy.”

But the worsening global crisis has put the issue of a supranational military force to police the region back at the center of the globalist agenda.

Before the meeting in Bariloche convened, senior State Department policy adviser Luigi Einaudi (who brags that he “came in with Kissinger” at the State Department and stayed to set U.S. policy for Ibero-America for over 20 years) was chosen to deliver that message. Writing in the special package on “The Security of the Americas,” published by the U.S. National Defense University’s *Joint Force Quarterly* in its Spring 1996 issue, Einaudi threatened that Ibero-America must learn the lessons of Panama and Haiti. Ibero-America had better authorize creation of “a military arm” for the OAS, because if it does not, “armed peacekeeping activities will be left either to the United Nations or to unilateral action by the United States,” he wrote.

Einaudi left unsaid that such foreign interventions stripped Panama and Haiti of their militaries altogether.

Equally devoid of subtlety, Perry centered his opening at Bariloche on what he claimed were “dazzling victories” won for the Williamsburg principles over the past year—and they were all supranational gains. The first and most important victory repeatedly cited by Perry was the ouster and jailing of nationalist Gen. Lino Oviedo as Army commander in Paraguay in April 1996. That so-called victory for “democracy,” had been accomplished under the explicit threat conveyed to the Paraguayan government and military, that General Lino

be ousted, or Paraguay would be militarily invaded, by either the United States, or Brazil and Argentina.

Likewise, Perry hailed the proliferation of international peacekeeping exercises in Ibero-America as “dramatic symbols of the change which has swept our hemisphere.” Dramatic, indeed. Whereas, before Williamsburg, no multilateral exercises had been held under the rubric of peacekeeping in Ibero-America, since August 1995, five such exercises have been held, most sponsored by the U.S. Southern Command “under the United Nations umbrella—its doctrine, organization, and vision,” according to the deputy commander for operations of the U.S. Army South, Col. Alfred Valenzuela.

Perry also claimed “peace is breaking out” in Guatemala, with Williamsburg’s help. There, what Perry calls “peace” is a formula for unending ethnic war, as the UN directs the reshaping of Guatemala’s Constitution to establish indigenist bantustans, cut the military by one-third in force strength and strip it of all political power, and grant the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Union (URNG), allies of the Colombian narco-terrorists, major political powers.

Formation of a multilateral force, under whatever guise, nonetheless, was rejected. Mexican Foreign Ministry Undersecretary Sergio González Gálvez, who headed their observer delegation, told the press afterwards, “under no circumstances” would Mexico support any multinational force, because it “violates the principle of self-determination.” González Gálvez cautioned that Panama’s proposal for an international anti-drug air traffic control center in Panama, had been “sponsored” by the United States, and would only “be admissible if it is limited to multilateral information-sharing.”

Pentagon Public Affairs spokesman Lt. Col. Arnie Owens assured this reporter on Oct. 18, after checking with higher-ups, that “there are no plans for any sort of international force, peacekeeping, counter-drug, or otherwise.” So, what about the *Joint Force Quarterly*’s publication of Einaudi’s knuckle-dragger demand? Owens tried to dismiss the senior State Department official’s article as one of “a whole lot of ideas being floated by all sorts of think-tank people. . . . What I’ve just given you is where we are, officially, on it,” he insisted. “It’s not anything that’s been floated in official channels.”

‘Bush manual’ made official

Perry’s major initiative in Bariloche was the announcement that the United States will establish an Inter-American Center for Defense Studies (ICDS) in Washington, “to foster a cadre of civilians” who are to run defense in the region, and thus ensure a “commonality of approach [on] . . . military strategy,” and “institutionalize civilian direction of the armed forces.”

This is a sweeping proposal, indeed. Until now, the globalizers’ anti-military project has been run out of non-governmental organizations and “academic centers,” working with government officials such as Einaudi, but in a way such that it could be denied that these projects were official U.S. policy.

The most notorious example of this is American University's Democracy Program, which produced the book *The Military and Democracy; The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*, which *EIR* made famous in the region as the "Bush manual."

Now, that whole "Bush manual" project is being made official U.S. policy—with all the resources and power that entails. Perry specified that officials working on defense matters, "mostly civilians drawn from the Defense Ministries, Foreign Ministries, and legislative defense staffs," will be brought up to Washington to receive "on-the-job training courses" in quick three- or four-week programs. At the same time, "teams of instructors" will go to Ibero-America, "and set up courses there." Research fellows will also be sponsored throughout the Americas.

This proposal, too, has met strong opposition. A Pentagon official, speaking at a pre-summit briefing, insisted that the Pentagon is "very sensitive to . . . the views of many of the countries in the region" that defense establishments must be built up in each country nationally, "and that it cannot be done in any sense by the United States, or for them, by any outside power." The final report from the working group where Perry presented the proposal, states that the delegations agreed to "carry out consultations" on how the Center should function.

Consultations may be held, but they are for window-dressing only. According to the Pentagon's Colonel Owens, preparations for the Center are already well-advanced. The new Center is funded for Fiscal Year 1997 (by reallocating \$2 million from the Army budget), and the first class is expected to get under way in June 1997. The National Defense University (which publishes *Joint Force Quarterly*), has been handed control over the project, and is already drawing up the curriculum. Next year, the Pentagon will submit a funding request to cover the full expenses of all the foreign students involved. Ibero-American countries suggested that the Center be placed under OAS control, but, as Owens emphasized, this Center is "a [U.S.] Department of Defense operation."

Colombia haunts Williamsburg

Leading Ibero-American countries object to the blatant attempt to use "the Williamsburg process" to create a de facto permanent regional defense institution. For the second time, Mexico refused to send its defense minister, deploying a diplomatic delegation as observers only. The president of the Defense Commission of Mexico's Chamber of Deputies, Gen. Luis Garfias Magana, reiterated on Oct. 15, that that decision had been taken at "the highest levels" of the Mexican government. What generates "distrust" in Ibero-America, is the U.S. intention to head an intercontinental military strategy, he noted.

The Chileans reportedly informed other governments in advance that they do not wish to "institutionalize the Defense

Ministerials." At the Pentagon's pre-summit briefing, the U.S. official found it necessary to assert, "We have no objective to create an institution of defense ministers, an alliance, [or] anything like that at all."

Perry, once again, left such niceties aside. "There will be a consensus to have a third meeting," he declared in Bariloche.

The final communiqué, however, announces no date, and no host country, for the next meeting. Colombia's defense minister told the press that they had been chosen as the host for the next summit, but, when asked by this reporter whether it would not discredit "the process" if the next host were the narco-terrorist regime of Ernesto Samper Pizano, the Pentagon's public affairs spokesman insisted no such decision had been taken.

Colombia's crisis has haunted the Defense Ministerial

'Democrat' Sarmiento: an Anglophile racist

"[Advances] in civilization, instincts, and ideas, are not carried out by mixing the races. . . . Anyone who carefully studies the instincts, [and] industrial and intellectual abilities of the masses in Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, and elsewhere, has occasion to experience the effects of that inevitable, but damaging amalgam of races [which are] unsuited for civilization. . . ."

"All of the colonizations carried out in the last three centuries by European nations, have crushed the savages populating the lands they came to occupy. The British, French, and Dutch in North America established no community whatsoever with the aborigines, and when, over time, their descendants were called upon to form independent states, they were found to be made up of pure European races, with their traditions of Christian and European civilization intact. . . ."

It is impossible to glean anything other than the crudest racism from these words, written by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, President of Argentina during 1868-74. Yet, on Oct. 8, speaking at the Defense Ministerial of the Americas in San Carlos de Bariloche in Argentina, U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry expressed the desire that a new Inter-American Center for Defense Studies would be "infused" with Sarmiento's "democratic" spirit.

This goes well beyond racism, however. Perry's embrace of Sarmiento confirms that the plot to demilitarize Ibero-America is rooted historically in the British colonial doctrine of free trade and destruction of the institution of the nation-state. Sarmiento was an agent for Italian Giu-

from its outset, exposing the disaster contained in the “democracy” agenda adopted by its sponsors. Even as the drug scandal grew over the Samper Pizano government, U.S. Vice President Al Gore used his keynote to the Williamsburg summit on July 25, 1995, to attempt to stop the scandal from bringing down the Samper government. Gore stated that “we can applaud the work of those like President Samper and Defense Minister [Fernando] Botero in Colombia, who are standing up to traffickers often at tremendous personal risk, demonstrating tremendous personal courage.”

Perry backed up Gore all the way in his defense of the Samper regime, telling a press conference the next day, “I strongly agree with the vice president’s statement. In fact, I helped prepare his text in that regard. And it’s based on . . . solid information. . . . The relationship between Colombia

and the United States is very good . . . at the Presidential/vice-presidential level . . . and exceedingly good at the Defense Ministry level.”

Their timing proved exceeding bad. The day Perry delivered his paeon to Samper and Botero, Samper Pizano’s Presidential campaign treasurer, Santiago Medina, was arrested by the Colombian Prosecutor General’s office, which then, as now, has worked well with U.S. anti-drug officials. Medina turned state’s witness, and named Defense Minister Botero as one of the people who had ordered him to meet with the Cali Cartel to arrange campaign financing. On Aug. 1, 1995, an official of the Prosecutor’s office requested an investigation begin into Botero’s activities, and on Aug. 2, Botero resigned. He is now serving a 63-month sentence for his crimes, and on Oct. 9, the United States cancelled his visa.

sepe Mazzini’s “revolutionary” Young Italy and Young Europe movement, whose agents were deployed throughout Ibero-America to impose these British-dictated policies. The same forces were behind Britain’s attempt to dismember the United States during the 1861-65 U.S. Civil War.

In the late 1830s, Sarmiento belonged to Mazzini’s Young Argentina lodge, later known as the Association of May, and spent decades trying to achieve Argentina’s economic and political submission to British geopolitical goals. From exile in Chile, he collaborated openly with the Anglo-French alliance which tried for almost three decades to overthrow the 1828-52 government of Juan Manuel de Rosas, because of the latter’s resistance to free trade. He conspired with the French-speaking *literati* who operated against Rosas from their bases in Santiago, Chile and Montevideo, Uruguay.

At the center of Sarmiento’s Mazzinian philosophy was the British-created Black Legend, the lie that Ibero-America’s economic backwardness is a product both of dirigistic (“authoritarian”) state and economic structures set up by Spain in its colonies, and the alleged inferiority of Catholic culture. Argentina could better prosper and industrialize, he asserted, if its people possessed the same qualities as the “pure” Anglo-Saxon race which had populated Britain’s North American colonies.

This is the same drivel put out by Lawrence Harrison, one of the chief ideologues of the plot to demilitarize Ibero-America. In his presentation “The Genesis of Latin American Underdevelopment,” published in the National Defense University’s 1989 book *Security in the Americas*, Harrison bragged that he belonged to a school of thought which “views Latin America’s condition as a consequence of traditional Hispanic culture, profoundly influencing a Latin American culture that is anti-democratic, anti-social,

anti-entrepreneurial, and anti-work.” Canadians and Americans “attach more importance to work—and work harder—than in Latin America,” he raved.

On Spain itself, Sarmiento wrote in his essay *Popular Education* that “the South American states belong to a race which is at the tail-end of civilized nations. In the theater of the modern world today, Spain and its descendants are destitute of all those qualities which life in our era demands . . . due to their radical lack of knowledge of natural or physical sciences, which in other countries of Europe have created powerful industry.”

Sarmiento is infamous in Argentina, and Ibero-America, for equating “civilization” with free trade, and “barbarism” and “slavery” with economic protectionism. In his 1845 work *Facundo*, he attacked the Rosas government for refusing to grant Britain its chief demand, the right of free navigability of Argentina’s rivers. Only Buenos Aires, dominated by British trade interests, is “civilized,” Sarmiento argued. Only Buenos Aires, “in contact with European nations; she alone exploits the advantages of foreign trade; she alone has power and income. In vain, have the provinces been asked to allow a bit of civilization, of industry and European population to enter; [but] a stupid and colonial policy offered deaf ears to the clamor.”

Sarmiento also used the demand for “opening up” the economy, the same one wielded by today’s globalists, against Paraguay. The Argentine “democrat” labeled Paraguay’s rulers as “tyrants” for daring to apply protectionist economic policies to achieve internal industrialization. Sarmiento was President during the last two years of the 1865-70 Triple Alliance War, in which Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, under Britain’s direction, allied to slaughter Paraguay’s population and impose free trade.

—Cynthia R. Rush