

The Dialogue's insistence on denying the danger of communist insurgency, goes so far as to propose that any foreign training provided to Ibero-America's military be shifted from the United States to the heavily Soviet-penetrated Canadian and Scandinavian militaries. This, because U.S. training programs have fed into "the concerns of Latin American officers over 'indirect aggression and communist subversion,' which reflects the attention given by the United States to Soviet power and policy, a preoccupation which few civilian governments in Latin America fully share."

Not surprisingly, these fellows also insist that the phenomenon of narco-terrorism has yet to be proven as a reality in the Hemisphere.

The targeting of Panama's Defense Forces as the embodiment of the military self-conception and mission which must be eradicated from the region, strips away any illusion that these fellows are concerned with "human rights violations," or the "dirty war" problem.

Panama's Defense Forces are known throughout Ibero-America, as the leading military institution which adheres, in practice and theory, to the idea that the military is re-

sponsible for the defense of national sovereignty as a whole—including the country's right to development. The PDF has implemented extensive civic-action programs, which the officer corps has adamantly refused to cancel, despite foreign pressures.

This conception, and all classical military thought, is what the Dialogue seeks to eradicate root and branch from the region, as the only means to permanently emasculate the military. The Dialogue complains that in Ibero-America:

Traditional views of the military's role in politics still prevail. Most officers see the armed forces as the ultimate guardians of national interests and guarantors of national security. . . .

Military schools still define national security to include a wide range of political, socioeconomic, and international factors. Policy decisions which normally are reserved to civilian authority in the United States or Europe are viewed in Latin America as having military implications. Accordingly, officers feel their views should count heavily.

The economics of satanism

It would be wrong to solely attribute the Dialogue's protection of the dope trade to mere greed or interest in maintaining Western bank profits; there are deeper philosophical issues at stake in this war. The Dialogue prides itself as being a body of "pragmatists," followers of the school of amoral philosophy concocted by the American theologian, William James. Many members carry moral pragmatism to its lawful conclusion: They are avowed satanists, seeking to suppress morality altogether.

Take the case of Mexican Dialogue member Carlos Fuentes. "There's only one creature in all of the universe who never sleeps. Not God—he nods constantly, as we all know—but Satan," he told the *Washington Post* on May 5. Fuentes added that he has tried to emulate the writing of British writer Charles Dickens because, "he's the novelist of the Devil."

Peruvian member Mario Vargas Llosa is a follower of fascist philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, and an adamant opponent of "Western religion and morality," because it has "barbarously oppressed" hedonism throughout the centuries. Likewise, member José Peña Gómez, from the Dominican Republic, is a notorious practitioner of witchcraft and the occult.

U.S. members include former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, a member of the Lucis Trust-Temple of

Understanding, a satanist association based at the United Nations. Under the direction of Dialogue member Father Theodore Hesburgh, Notre Dame University was turned into a hotbed of the so-called American heresy, the U.S. twist upon Gnostic liberation theology. McGeorge Bundy was inducted into Yale University's freemasonic-styled secret society, Skull and Bones, back in the 1940s.

This, then, is the crew which declares that it will ensure no political combination emerges in Ibero-America which can threaten the iron rule of the International Monetary Fund, the institution most responsible for transforming most of the economies of the region into mini-Hells.

"With presidential elections scheduled throughout much of Latin America in the next two years, pressures will intensify to ease austerity and curtail interest payments in order to promote short-term economic expansion," they worry. "There is little willingness in any sector to accept further sacrifices."

But more sacrifices must be made, the Dialogue insists. Debt relief may be needed to head off "extremist positions"—the majority of Dialogue members support proposals for creating some international mechanism to repurchase commercial loans at their deflated market values, *A Time for Choices* reports—but any debt relief scheme cannot be allowed to lessen the IMF's control over national economies.

"No country's debt," they insist "should be exchanged until that country gains World Bank and IMF approval for a multi-year development plan incorporating structural and policy reforms."