

Uno Mas Uno that he did not understand what "all the noise" was about; "a few machine guns" will not determine the battle!

U.S. intervention precedent set

In contrast to the growing condemnations against genocide, U.S. policy toward the region stands clearly on record now as a cynical effort to ensure the continuation of the Somozan machinery, with or without Anastasio himself, in order to deliberately prolong the conflict in the area. National Security Council advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's strategy, on which present U.S. foreign policy is based, is to allow the Nicaraguan crisis to continue until Latin America bends to strict adherence to the principles of nonintervention, and capitulates to U.S. demands to impose a "regional" solution.

Brzezinski himself, quoted in the *Washington Post* Sept. 22, affirmed that the goal of U.S. policy in the Nicaragua crisis was to achieve "mediation" by Nicaragua's "friends and neighbors." Brzezinski indicated his support for "Somozismo" — if not Somoza himself — when he defined mediation as "some process of political accommodation to create resolution of the differences that led to the dispute."

The result, from Brzezinski's British-oriented standpoint, will be the establishment of the dangerous precedent of limited sovereignty, and the imposition of *supranational* solutions to any future regional crisis.

In practical terms, establishing such a precedent would provide Brzezinski with the ability to manipulate or trigger "crises" — even regional war — at will. This would create the pretext for outside intervention to effect changes in the internal policies of governments of any nation or group of nations targeted. South America — particularly the southern cone region — is a potential tinderbox of long-standing border and territorial disputes which, as detailed in the 1975 Rand Corporation scenario for a second "War of the Pacific" conflict, if triggered could produce a chain reaction leading to regional war.

The U.S. proposal to last week's OAS Special Meeting of Consultations, convened to consider the Nicaraguan crisis, explicitly called for regional "mediation" into the conflict. U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, speaking for the U.S. at the meeting, began by stating that the "reports" of "mass arrests and detentions, torture and even indiscriminate killing of civilians" should be "investigated fully." His recommendation came after Mexican Foreign Minister Roel had already characterized the Nicaraguan situation as perhaps the worst case of "filicide" ever in the region. Christopher then called for the "good offices of concerned governments" to be offered the chance to mediate between the "government of Nicaragua and the opposition groups within Nicaraguan society to help find an enduring and democratic solution."

A happy *Washington Post* immediately noted in a Sept. 27 editorial the implied foot-in-the-door for limited sovereignty. "With the U.S. quietly leading the way," the *Washington Post* commented, "the OAS is trying to manage the process of Nicaraguan political change."

Despite the *Washington Post's* eagerness, U.S. intervention proposals have thus far been roundly rejected by most Latin American nations, and particularly bluntly by Brazil and Mexico. The resolution supporting mediation was voted down by the Organization of American States. In fact, the only official acceptance of the U.S. proposal at this time has come from General Somoza himself, who gladly offered to have a "dialogue" with some of the opposition, providing that the "good offices" utilized are not those of Mexico or Venezuela — but only Argentina, Chile, Bolivia or the U.S.!

The U.S. policy is a prescription for continuing crisis — with all the regional and continental consequences. Somoza's extermination campaign has not pacified the country — and cannot. Representatives of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, constituting the armed leadership of the majority of popular forces, have announced that their forces are still intact, despite the two week National Guard campaign, and their present retreat is merely tactical, to be followed soon by a second offensive.

The saner forces in the U.S. should note the prescription of the Mexican proposal to the OAS: "Winning the peace" in Nicaragua will require the "feeding and development of the peoples" — not the "trafficking with war."

Latin Americans denounce interventionism

Despite pressure from the United States, leading Latin American nations have firmly rejected any approach to the Nicaraguan crisis which would tend to legitimize the Brzezinskian doctrine of "limited sovereignty." Key statements by Latin American leaders follow.

Mexico

Mexican Foreign Minister Santiago Roel, addressing the Sept. 21-22 Organization of American States meeting in Washington:

... The existing situation in the Republic of Nicaragua ... has endangered the peace of the region and gravely disturbed the tranquility of the border zone between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. . . .

In the last days, reliable reports from diverse sources have called attention to indiscriminate attacks on the civilian population, producing a holocaust in which women, youths and children have been victims, bordering on filicide without precedent in regional history.

Eliminate developing countries' central banks, Friedman says

Milton Friedman, Vice-president of the Mont Pelerin Society and author of the genocidal *Chilean Economic Model*, has issued his latest proposal to the developing sector: eliminate Third World Central Banks in order to ensure tight control of monetary supply and to reduce inflation. The plan — which would institutionalize the principle of limited sovereignty of nations in the Third World — was reported Sept. 17 in the Argentine daily newspaper *Clarín*.

Friedman's proposal was delivered to the Argentines by Professor Arnold Harberger, one of the economist's "Chicago Boys" directly involved in running the genocide in Chile since 1973, during a late July conference in Buenos Aires. *Clarín* reported that the Conference was sponsored by the monetarist Argentine Central Bank itself but Harberger denies this, insisting instead that the Conference was sponsored by the World Bank!

Friedman argues, according to the Buenos Aires daily, that there is no way a Third World country can cut inflation since, due to domestic political pressure, the Central Banks of developing nations are forced to increase their money supply

even against their will. He concludes that the best solution would be to eliminate Central Banks, the source of inflation.

Once this is done, Friedman continues, these countries' currencies would be "tied to" a stable currency of any developed nation. The monetary policy of the advanced sector nation would be imposed upon the developing nation. Harberger added that, in fact, the proposal was originated by F.A. Hayek, the German founder and current Honorary President of the Mont Pelerin Society. Friedman's only role, he said, is to publicize the idea.

Simultaneously, Argentine economist and Mont Pelerin member Alvaro Alsogaray has launched a campaign aimed at further cutting Argentina's money supply since "the current economic policy is not monetarist but . . . highly expansionist." By attacking Argentine Economic Minister Martinez de Hoz, a well-known British-pedigreed monetarist and the International Monetary Fund's loyal servant, Alsogaray is in fact calling for the complete destruction of the already credit-starved Argentine national industry.

. . . Nonintervention does not mean no emotion, or indifference. . . . The massive violation of human rights affects us in a most profound way. . . . The Mexican government, of popular and revolutionary origin, censures these actions. Mexico has insisted in international and national forums on the eradication of arms buildups, and condemned the indiscriminate use of conventional and nonconventional arms, censuring those who instead of winning the peace for the feeding and development of the peoples, traffic in war. . . .

Venezuela

Extracts of letter sent from President Carlos Andrés Pérez to President Carter, as reported Sept. 23 by various press agencies:

I have had the opportunity to speak today with your special envoy, Ambassador Jordan. From this conversation I have not obtained anything which permits me to be optimistic as to the attitude of the U.S. toward the bloody regime of General Somoza.

. . . the number of deaths, the massacre, and the genocide which lays waste to the Nicaraguan people. The Somozan dictatorship has unleashed a war to the death against the Nicaraguan people. . . .

I sincerely believe, President and friend, that the case of Nicaragua dramatically endangers your

human rights policy, which awakened such hopes in Latin America. . . .

Argentina

From an article by Enrique Alonso, appearing in the Argentine daily Clarín, Sept. 17:

Any careless observer could think that there is some kind of inherent justice in the fact that the Somoza dynasty could be dethroned by the same factors which contributed to carry it to power as a result of the United States intervention in the Central American country from 1912 to 1933. If that method were extended, it is evident that *other regimes could become the recipients of the same treatment*. But sharper thinking on the same subject would reach the opposite conviction: *the fate of the governments south of the Rio Grande cannot be conditioned by the modalities of foreign policy in Washington*. To prevent that, the hemispheric system has established *the principle of nonintervention* as a doctrinary axiom. This is the shield of the weak against the powerful and the sure guarantee of an ordered regional coexistence which does not accept the law of the jungle. . . .

In saying this, we are not going to battle in defense of Somoza. His regime is an anachronism in America and is a fiction to the same degree that his survival for

such a long time was conditioned by foreign support.

It is evident that the Washington government is trying to induce a hemispheric democratization. . . .

The problem is in how to implement the new policy. Destabilization of authoritarian regimes (applying the same methodology used against Allende in Chile but in the opposite direction) is not good enough, since it leads to unforeseen situations. The Nicaragua case is eloquent in this respect. It would be more reasonable to consider the underlying causes of the political distortions in the hemisphere. But this would lead to *changing all the criteria on cooperation between the underdeveloped countries and the United States*. . . . (all emphasis in original — ed.)

Brazil

Antonio Azeredo da Silveira to journalists at Brazil's Superior War College, Sept. 20, quoted in the Rio daily Jornal do Brasil:

"What I made very clear even to the North American ambassador when he sought me out last Wednesday (Sept. 13 — ed.) is our opposition to any interventionism. It is very dangerous, under any pretext, to accept interventions. Those times are now over."

Silveira was reminded by reporters that Brazil provided troops for the 1965 intervention in the Dominican Republic. The Foreign Minister replied, "But that was in another epoch. I am not trying to judge the past."

U.S. must dump outlaw Somoza regime

The National Executive Committee of the U.S. Labor Party issued the following statement in New York Sept. 21:

In light of the escalating massacre of thousands of civilians by the illegal Somoza regime in Nicaragua and the resulting extreme danger this situation presents for triggering a series of entangling events leading to regional war or worse, the U.S. Labor Party is urging U.S. government officials as well as private citizens to immediately force the Carter Administration to adopt a policy course that will avert a major disaster, and put an end to the Administration's disgraceful de facto support of the British-nurtured Somoza regime in that country.

Let there be no mistake: everything the outlaw Nicaraguan government stands for is inimical to the vital interests of the United States. It is a pawn of the same networks of the London-centered Black Guelph nobility that control the maniacal Israeli government and threaten to plunge the U.S. into World War III following the Camp David hoax. Not only is Somoza being deployed to create a geopolitical "hot spot" in parallel with the Zionist lunatics in the Middle East, but, as has been exposed on three separate occasions during the past week, it is Israeli intelligence and armed forces that are providing Somoza with crucial logistical support and weapons. If not stopped, Somoza will drag the entire region, and perhaps all of Latin America, into a hideous rerun of the Thirty Years' War of the 17th century.

The following steps must be promptly implemented:

First, the United States must immediately break all diplomatic relations with the Somoza government. The maintenance of an embassy in Managua provides tacit legitimacy for the Somoza dynasty. The current allegedly neutral stance of the Administration is a thin veneer for de facto endorsement of Somoza's genocidal policies.

Second, the Carter Administration must urge the United Nations to treat the Somoza regime as an outlaw government of the same calibre as those of Israel and Rhodesia. Total economic and diplomatic sanctions must be imposed, along with whatever other measures are necessary to hasten the downfall of this feudal, oligarchical vestige.

Third, a Dominican Republic-style military intervention in Central America under the guise of the Organization of American States would set a dangerous precedent, which must be strenuously prohibited. The OAS should limit itself to enforcing the Monroe Doctrine by expelling the Israelis and their provocative gun-running from the hemisphere.

Fourth, the only possible basis for a stable peace in the region is a comprehensive economic development program, led by Mexico and the U.S., which provides an alternative to the inhuman "credit conditions" forced on the impoverished countries of Central America and the Caribbean by the IMF. The U.S. must move quickly to implement such a program.