

After the Malvinas war: Latin America's options

by Robyn Quijano, Latin America Editor

In the aftermath of the final battle in the Malvinas islands, governments throughout the world must confront a harsh reality: the Malthusian policies described in the State Department's *Global 2000 Report*, a policy of racist genocide targeting half of the world's population, has become official policy of the United States government, NATO and the European Community. This policy is backed officially by the military might of the NATO countries, the most advanced "technetronic" capabilities, and the blackmail of tactical nuclear strikes against any developing nation that dares to fight back. The British, using U.S.-supplied technology being tested in battle for the first time, decimated the Argentine army with infrared goggles permitting night surprise attacks and missile launchers guided by laser guidance systems.

Maggie Thatcher, after making the fight for liberty for the 1,800 Kelpers on the Malvinas "a matter of principle," asserted that she would hold 11,000 Argentine soldiers hostage until she gets the kind of surrender the Empire demands. This includes billions of dollars in reparations, according to various sources, and the absolute denial of any further Argentine claims to sovereignty over the islands the British stole from Argentina in the 19th century.

For the British, their colonialist war has only begun. The international oligarchy intends to make a horrible example of the nation that dared to fight British colonialism. The new stage of oligarchist war against the American continent will require "wars, pestilence, and famine" to cut the population in half, beginning quickly with Mexico (see article, page 53).

Lyndon LaRouche, Chairman of the Advisory Board of the National Democratic Policy Committee, warned in Mexico during the last week of May that the nations of Latin America must understand that every Argentine pilot that lost his life was doing so to save the entire continent. He warned that the British adventure in the Malvinas would be only the first step.

Now, after the continental defeat at the battle for Port Stanley (Puerto Argentina), events are proving LaRouche right. While factions within the Argentine military dampened their forces' efforts weeks before that defeat for fear of suffering excessive losses, it has become clear that total war must be fought against those determined to impose genocide on the entire continent.

Crisis in Argentina

Before Argentine President Galtieri was forced to resign, he described the reasons for the defeat: "Our troops fought with more courage than weapons against the overwhelming superiority of a power supported by the military technology of the United States, which surprisingly [became] the enemies of Argentine and her people." The Argentine military had been led to believe that the United States would remain neutral in the conflict, and correctly assumed that without U.S. backing for the colonialist war, they could have defeated the United Kingdom. The Argentine daily *Convicción* editorialized on June 14 that the Argentines had very good reasons to believe that Washington would remain neutral. The fact that the State Department deliberately misled the Argentine government in order to launch the

war that would start NATO out-of-area deployments, set up a large military base in the South Atlantic, and will force devastating conditions on Latin America, is being widely and bitterly discussed in Buenos Aires.

Galtieri, who refused to sign any terms of surrender that would commit Argentina to give up claims of its sovereign rights over the islands, was forced to resign, handing over the presidency for a short interim period to Interior Minister Alfredo Oscar St. Jean, until the Junta meets to choose a new President. St. Jean is known as a hard-line nationalist with the same intolerance as Galtieri for U.S. betrayal.

Long mooted as a possible presidential contender, he had developed a working relationship with the opposition parties, arguing for an orderly institutional transition to representative government.

St. Jean, like Galtieri, argued that Argentina must fight to the end, and is therefore not acceptable to either London or the State Department.

The Anglophile press in the U.S. reports that the real powerbroker in the new government will be General Cristino Nicolaides, who replaced Galtieri as Chief of Staff. Nicolaides, former head of the Buenos Aires-based First Army Corps, represents the grouping within the army which contends that the costs of the war were too high, therefore Argentina should accept defeat and strike a deal with Alexander Haig, who promises to pressure Britain to be moderate in victory, if Argentina acts "reasonable."

According to the *Latin American Newsletter* of London, General Nicolaides is a close friend of Haig's special Latin American adviser Vernon Walters, an Averell Harriman protégé. Sources agree that Nicolaides's "military-only" policies would provoke the civilian parties. Argentine diplomatic sources in Europe have expressed concern over Walters's activities in subverting the war effort and preparing a State Department government for Buenos Aires. Any such government would quicken the current popular unrest, fostering civil-war conditions. Such circumstances are high on the list of strategic aims within the State Department, which supports the Global 2000 plan for slashing the developing-sector population.

Regional wars

The Aspen Institute, which was so energetic in promoting the installation of the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran, issued a blueprint for the post-Malvinas subjugation of Latin America a week before the final battle at Port Stanley. The report, entitled "Governance in the Western Hemisphere," identifies the enemy as "the persistence and depth of such concepts as nationalism, *Hispanidad*, fears of dependency, and competitive feelings between the developed and developing worlds." The study predicts that border conflicts will persist

during the 1980s; profiles potential regional wars; and recommends a dictatorship of international agencies such as GATT to impose British free-trade economic looting.

The authors of the report include operatives from the Brandt Commission, Club of Rome, and World Bank, as well as members of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, the strategists of oligarchical policy internationally.

The accelerated move to blow up Latin America in regional conflicts was further confired by an agent of Britain's IISS who discussed British plans to continue their war against Argentina by provoking border conflict throughout the continent. The old State Department "War of the Pacific" scenario developed by British agent Luigi Einaudi will be exploded, with Peru and Chile fighting a war which would draw in Argentina. Guatemala and neighboring Belize will begin hostilities which will threaten the Mexican border and be used as an excuse for U.S. troops to invade Mexico on the pretext of protecting U.S. strategic oil supplies. The other flash-point is the disputed territory between Guyana and Venezuela. The Port of Spain accord, a pact on border stability, ran out on June 18, leaving easily manipulated tensions between the two nations.

The Chilean-Argentine territorial dispute is heating up. On June 17 the *New York Times* filed a story from Santiago reporting Chilean fears that Argentina will make up for its defeat by attacking Chile. "Chile says it will treat any aggression as complete war, and will retaliate by sea, ground, and air anywhere along the country's 2,000-mile border as well as anywhere else in Argentina," states the *Times*.

The British are openly fueling these tensions by putting out a televised report that the British established a special deal with Chile to install a system of electronic surveillance in Chilean waters of Argentine bases. "Chile will continue to deny this connection formally, but during the crisis, its government responded with the spirit of friendship and collaboration towards England," the program reported.

American-wide response

LaRouche's message to the Argentine people and the rest of the population of Ibero-America, that they must unite and continue the war by creating new economic institutions for the continent, using the combined threat of defaulting on multi-billion-dollar continental debt against London was broadcast on TV, radio, and press in Buenos Aires, where *EIR* Latin America Editor Dennis Small is meeting with political, military and business circles.

"Try U.S. Secretary of State Haig for Treason" was the headline of an interview with Small in the June 14 edition of *Convicción*, a Buenos Aires daily, where he

detailed LaRouche's views.

The nations of the Americas must jointly create the kind of pressures which will force a change in U.S. policy; they must create shocks that will force the United States back to reality, asserted LaRouche.

The nature of NATO's plans and Alexander Haig's role in Britain's genocidal undertaking has become clear to many political figures who back Argentina's fight for sovereignty. One remarkable statement of this came from Panamanian President Arístides Royo (excerpted below), who lamented the U.S. destruction of the inter-American system, "one of the few established and ongoing institutions for North/South integration," and called for "a Latin American security system" without the United States.

Former Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez in mid-June made a similar proposal in Caracas: "I believe, that without rejecting the existence of the Organization of American States and the Rio Treaty, the Latin American countries must exclusively write a new treaty of security and defense. The conflict in the Malvinas has demonstrated that when we have problems with a country from the North, even extra-continental problems, we will not have the backing of allies or even the United States."

The following are excerpts of the speech given by Dr. Arístides Royo, President of Panama, to the second United Nations General Assembly session on Disarmament on June 14:

It need be said, so that there will be no mistake in this regard, that the peace desired by all humanity is not the false peace imposed by force of arms, nor the precarious peace based on the fallacy of an arms balance, but a deep and lasting peace, rooted in a new economic order which offers security to all nations. . . .

The member powers of the Atlantic Alliance split shortly after the [Second World] War into two forces which a growing rivalry would define as two antagonistic blocs. Thus the arms race began, involving nuclear arms as well as those which, by convenient and perverse euphemism, are labeled "conventional arms." . . .

One cannot underestimate these factors. Eighty percent of weapons costs consist of non-nuclear "conventional" arms. In 1980, Third World countries had already doubled their military expenditures in respect to 1971, and currently 75 percent of all arms sales in the world goes to the underdeveloped countries. . . . These arms and military technology are imported by diverting resources and foreign exchange from peaceful development. . . .

As long as the superpowers continue to violate their fundamental international obligation to eliminate colon-

ialism and other forms of hegemony, [to practice] non-interference, and to respect the self-determination, independence, sovereignty, and integrity of our nations, these powers will force us to arm to defend ourselves from their overt and covert abuses. . . .

We do not view disarmament as the elimination of armies, but as the proper reformulation of the army's role in society. What we do criticize is the obstinate insistence of privileged minorities and foreign interests on humiliating the military institutions by involving and committing them to anti-national and repressive projects, in defense of unjust and obsolete structures. . . . We want military institutions committed to the integral development of the nation, patriotic and active among their respective peoples and in the service of technical, productive and social development tasks in their own countries. These are the military forces that can best contribute to security, stability, and peace. . . .

Inter-American system shattered

The Malvinas crisis has shattered the inter-American system, one of history's few systems of North-South political unity, by demonstrating that reciprocal agreements between the northern powers have pre-eminence over continental solidarity.

We wish to preserve the best of relations with the United States, a country to which we are tied by a long history of cooperation. . . . But it would be useless to try to hide the fact that recent experience has forced . . . us to realize that the concept of reciprocal assistance for collective defense and security in our America must be an essentially Latin American concept, and that it must be institutionalized as such, for we have seen that including a northern power within this family can be tantamount to bringing in a Trojan horse. . . .

The hostile, aggressive, and bellicose actions carried out by Great Britain against Argentina have caused just indignation and resentment among all the Latin American nations, worsening the United Nations' institutional crisis, irreparably traumatizing the inter-American system, and destroying the Rio Treaty's collective-security system. . . .

It has been rightly said that in Latin American countries, the concepts of militarism and independence are linked from the moment our republics were born, and that the first citizens of our free homelands were the soldiers who fought for them. The disillusionment suffered by Latin America because of the unexpected United States decision to render TIAR [the Rio Treaty] useless has made it clear that Latin America has neither reason nor desire to belong to any of the military alliances of the East or the West. Latin America must therefore proceed to take up again the values which presided over her independence struggle. . . .