

Once Again, the Inter-American Dialogue

Turning the OAS into a supranational government has been the hobby-horse of Einaudi's current employer, the Inter-American Dialogue, for almost as long as that body has pushed for the legalization of drugs. The Dialogue was set up by the leading lights of the Anglo-American establishment in 1982 to secure their control over the Americas, which had been shattered by the combination of Great Britain's Malvinas War against Argentina and the outbreak of the great debt crisis. In 1986, it launched its big drive for the legalization of drugs, arguing that the "substantial foreign exchange" from the drug trade was needed to pay the foreign debts. That same year, it set up a task force to prepare the take-down of the national militaries of the region.

In May 1995, the IAD pulled together a Study Group on multilateral "governance," made up of 14 "scholars and practitioners." They met formally six times, with a final meeting in February 1997. Their conclusions were published in April, under the title *The Inter-American Agenda and Multilateral Governance: The Organization of American States*. It proposes basic reforms and changes needed for "effective regional governance," restructuring the OAS such that it has increased governmental powers in all areas—economic, social, military, and political—as soon as possible.

In essence, the project is the continuation of the "Redefining Sovereignty" project begun by the Dialogue under Richard Feinberg. The Dialogue had announced in 1992 that it was preparing to publish a book under that title, but the project was quickly buried for all public discussion when it became too hot, politically. As the then-co-vice chair of the Dialogue, Rodrigo Botero, admitted in a December 1992 press conference, it is "difficult for any government to endorse a statement that national sovereignty has disappeared." But governments were induced to accept the principle that there are "limits to sovereignty," when they adopted Resolution 1080, he said. "That's what is behind the term, collective defense of democracy."

The Dialogue adopted the terminology of "multilateralism," and used "regional governance" instead of regional *government*, for the same reason that Dame Margaret Meade argued in the 1970s, that the drug legalization lobby should speak of "decriminalization," because people who could not accept drug legalization, could be made to accept the less emotionally charged term "decriminalization." Despite the unintelligible globaloney gobbledygook style employed (for example, "a region-wide governance pattern pyramiding up to the 'central hub' concept"), the task force's final report derides sovereignty as a "symbol" to be abandoned: "Multilateralism . . . clashes directly with the notion of sovereignty and the desire of nations to control their own destiny and to have a free hand to do so. . . . Rising nationalism and appeals to sovereignty are in some sense a reaction to the driving forces of interdependence, globalization, and technological

change. Nationalism and sovereignty have become comforting established symbols—something to cling to against the disturbing forces of change."

And so we arrive back where we started: the project to overthrow Peru's President Fujimori. The Dialogue report revealed that the project to turn the OAS into a regional government is well-advanced from the standpoint of plans, if not political acceptance, and that that planning has been centered at the OAS, under Colombia's Gaviria, who was elected Secretary General in 1994, with the public sponsorship of Einaudi. The Dialogue task force picked up and elaborated on several of the studies prepared by Gaviria's OAS.

Serving on the Inter-American Dialogue's "regional governance" task force, was Diego García Sayan, the Peruvian drug-legalization activist from George Soros's stable who today serves as a top adviser to opposition leader Alejandro Toledo.

The Beam in the U.S. State Department's Eye

by Edward Spannaus

While the U.S. State Department is never hesitant to criticize other countries for any speck of a shortcoming in their election processes—including demanding that other countries must provide fair media coverage to opposition candidates—it seems to have a beam in its own eye when it comes to elections inside the United States.

When the question of the theft of Lyndon LaRouche's votes in Arkansas was raised at the May 31 State Department press briefing, spokesman Philip Reeker didn't want to touch the issue with a ten-foot pole. During a back-and-forth around the emergency Organization of American States (OAS) meeting on Peru held in Washington that day, *EIR* correspondent William Jones pointed out to Reeker: "Today at the OAS there was also a complaint issued about the situation in Arkansas, where a legitimate political candidate, Lyndon LaRouche, won 22% of the vote, and that the delegates which he would be entitled to were given to Al Gore, an obvious violation of free and fair elections."

"I'm going to stop you right there," Reeker said, "because I don't comment on domestic U.S. political things."

Pointing out that the complaint is going to the OAS, Jones asked, "Isn't this something of an embarrassment, where the U.S. would get on its high horse talking about free and fair elections, while there's an obvious case where they haven't cleaned up in their own stables?"

Reeker retorted, "We're talking about Peru here." He

claimed to be unaware of the Arkansas situation—although it was described in the State Department’s own U.S. election newsletter issued that day—and he declared that “it’s not something that would be appropriate for discussion from this podium,” going on to talk about “some clear flawed processes that took place in Peru in terms of their election process.”

Jones persisted: “But couldn’t this still lead to accusations from many Latin American countries that it’s a case of the pot calling the kettle black?”

“You’d have to ask them that,” the spokesman demurred.

‘Democracy at Work’ in the United States

In fact, the State Department does comment regularly on the U.S. election process. Its Office of International Information Programs (the successor to U.S. Information Agency) publishes a weekly newsletter called *Election 2000 Campaign Spotlight*. The Department says that the newsletter is provided “to help explain to overseas audiences the 2000 election campaign in the United States,” and is circulated to

all U.S. embassies abroad. It provides information “that will help explain this complex but fascinating example of democracy at work.”

The May 24 issue contained the following item:

“—Primaries: Arkansas, Idaho, and Kentucky held their primary elections May 23, selecting Congressional candidates for the November general elections, and delegates to the Presidential nominating conventions, balloting that has become meaningless since Democratic Vice President Al Gore and Republican Texas Governor George W. Bush already have sewn up their respective nominations.”

A few days after the publication of the “meaningless” analysis, this reporter queried Stuart Gorin, the editor of the newsletter, about that analysis, and asked if he was aware of what had happened in the May 23 Arkansas Democratic primary, pointing out that “the 53,000 people that voted for Lyndon LaRouche, and against Gore, wouldn’t consider it so ‘meaningless.’” Gorin said that he intended to report the Arkansas results, and the fact that the Democratic Party is

No My Lai Massacre Here, Sy!



Gen. Barry McCaffrey

In the May 22 *New Yorker* magazine, Seymour Hersh penned a 25,000-word attack against Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.), the Director of President Clinton’s Office of National Drug Control Policy, accusing him of directing a massacre of retreating Iraqi troops at the close of the 1991 Persian Gulf War. Hersh “documented” the purported Desert Storm carnage through interviews with dozens of U.S. military officers, all but one of whom have now written letters, complaining that they were misquoted in the Hersh piece. According to one source who spoke to *EIR*, but not for attribution, Hersh’s initial article was supposed to be an even longer piece, not only assailing McCaffrey personally, but assailing the Clinton Administration for its support for the ongoing anti-drug efforts in Colombia. For reasons unknown to the source, the original article was abbreviated, and focussed exclusively on the allegations of McCaffrey’s overzealous actions in Iraq.

On May 14, simultaneous with the release of the *New*

Yorker article, McCaffrey released a statement, in which he reported, “Five months ago, Seymour Hersh began an inquiry apparently seeking to attack the Administration’s proposed counter-drug assistance package for Colombia. However, the Gulf War allegations that he recycles were long ago investigated and fully cleared—a fact he is compelled to acknowledge in the article.”

“The incidents Hersh recycles were the subject almost ten years ago of no less than four complete investigations, including two which were separate, independently led and exhaustive—one by the Army Inspector General and the other by the Army’s Criminal Investigations Division. These events have also been the subject of a Congressional hearing, hundreds of news media accounts and several scholarly books. In every instance, all of these investigations and analyses have determined that these allegations were completely unfounded.”

McCaffrey noted that he had provided the *New Yorker* with 32 pages of answers to questions from Hersh, and had offered to provide a detailed briefing on the Administration’s National Drug Control Strategy, and the specific U.S. efforts to back up anti-drug police and military units in Colombia.

Several other sources noted the coincidence of the appearance of the Hersh article with efforts, led by Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), to block emergency U.S. anti-drug aid to Colombia, and with the efforts of George Soros and others in the drug legalization lobby, to bring down the Fujimori government in Peru.

—Jeffrey Steinberg

challenging LaRouche's delegates, in the next issue. *EIR* pointed out that the Democratic Party is doing more than challenging it—they intend to give LaRouche's delegates to Gore, and that if that sort of thing happened in some other country, where 53,000 votes were just thrown out, or taken from one candidate and given to another, the State Department would have a lot to say about it. The tight-lipped Gorin demurred, saying: "I'd have to have our policy people figure that one out."

In the May 31 issue, the *Election 2000* newsletter did report on LaRouche's vote in Arkansas, on the Democratic Party's refusal to recognize delegates for LaRouche (and threw in the obligatory "racist and anti-Semitic" slanders), and that there will be a fight in the credentials committee at the Democratic National Convention, as follows:

"—LaRouche: Lyndon LaRouche, who is running for President as a Democrat but has been called a 'political extremist,' captured 22% of the vote in the May 23 Arkansas primary and earned at least 10 state delegates to the Democratic National Convention, although Democratic Party officials ruled last January that he would be barred from the nominating process.

"The U.S. Supreme Court upheld that ruling in March without comment. Party officials said they took the position because of LaRouche's 'explicitly racist and anti-Semitic views.'

"A LaRouche spokesman said these allegations were 'absurd' and would not be substantiated. The spokesman added that the party can 'count on a credentials fight' at the Democratic convention as the LaRouche campaign attempts to have its delegates seated."

The 'Government-Approved Candidate'?

One of the publications featured on the website of the U.S. State Department's Office of International Information Programs (IIP) is a USIA pamphlet entitled, "What is Democracy?" Its chapter on "Elections" includes the following:

"All modern democracies hold elections, but not all elections are democratic. Right-wing dictatorships, Marxist regimes, and single-party governments also stage elections to give their rule the aura of legitimacy. In such elections, there may be only one candidate or a list of candidates, with no alternative choices.

"Such elections may offer several candidates for each office, but ensure through intimidation or rigging that only the government-approved candidate is chosen."

Ironically, the IIP's own Internet web page on the U.S. elections lists only one Democratic Party candidate for President (although it lists two Republican candidates, George W. Bush and Alan Keyes). Even the U.S. Federal Election Commission lists two Democrats: Gore and LaRouche. Are we to take the State Department's blackout of LaRouche to signify that Gore is the "government-approved candidate" in the U.S. Democratic Presidential primary elections?

The LaRouche Campaign Complaint to the OAS

To: Organization of American States
Amb. Jorge E. Taiana, Executive Secretary
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
1889 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

May 30, 2000

SUPPLEMENT to the May 16, 2000 Complaint to and Request for Investigation by The OAS's Inter-American Commission on Human Rights Concerning Gross Violations of and Interference with Free and Fair Elections in the United States of America

This communication is a Supplement to our formal Complaint and Request for Investigation filed with your offices on May 17, 2000, and acknowledged by your letter dated May 22, 2000. As your acknowledgment letter stated our petition is "under study" by the OAS's Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), it is of the utmost urgency that you consider the newest evidence of acts being perpetrated to defraud over 53,000 American citizens of the state of Arkansas, and Presidential Candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. It is incumbent upon OAS IACHR officials to act on this Complaint before the June 24, 2000 Arkansas Democratic Party conventions at which the national convention delegates from Arkansas will be selected.

The facts detailed below, make it quite clear that should the OAS turn a blind eye to the ripping up of legally cast votes here in the U.S.A., it then would cast doubt on the OAS's professed concerns to protect democracy in this hemisphere.

I. New Facts

On May 23, 2000, the state of Arkansas held its primary elections. In the Democratic Presidential preference primary, mandated by Arkansas law (Code §7-7-201, and 7-8-201), candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. is reported to have so far received 53,280 votes, with 2,789 precincts reported out of 2,834 precincts all together. Mr. LaRouche's only opponent, Vice President Al Gore, reportedly has received 194,171 votes. Thus, Mr. LaRouche's current statewide percent of the vote is 21.53.

There are four Congressional Districts. Mr. LaRouche's vote, so far, in those CDs is:

CD 1: 20.3%