
Peru-Ecuador Conflict

Einaudi's 'peace' talks are a trap

by Gretchen Small

Under the personal direction of senior U.S. State Department adviser Luigi Einaudi, border conflicts, and supranational mediation to resolve them, are quietly being made into the centerpiece of regional diplomacy in the Western Hemisphere. The pretext for this dangerous turn of events, is the asserted need to "permanently" settle the Peru-Ecuador border dispute, as the precedent for settling all border conflicts in the Americas.

For more than two centuries, border disputes have been used as a primary instrument of British geopolitical warfare against the region. This time is no different.

With the international financial system tottering at the brink of disintegration, the central strategic issue facing every nation in the Americas is *not* how to settle, once and for all, their long-standing border disputes, but, rather, how to replace the bankrupt International Monetary Fund (IMF) system with one fostering physical-economic development, and how to defeat the drive toward United Nations-centered world government.

The border agenda, a recipe for renewed conflict, is an attempt to ensure that no serious threat to the IMF and the U.N. ever emerges.

'Mr. Plot'

In mid-1995, Einaudi was put in charge of the Peru-Ecuador border conflict, as his full-time job at the State Department. Ecuadorans, and others, who believe Einaudi is looking out for their interests, had better look again. Einaudi has been one of Henry Kissinger's top globalist strategists within the State Department permanent bureaucracy for more than 20 years, rightfully known as "Kissinger's Kissinger" for Ibero-America.

Sir Henry Kissinger, a self-professed agent of the British Empire, was knighted by Queen Elizabeth in 1995, in recognition of his long years of service to the British Crown.

Like Kissinger, a utopian one-worlder in outlook and training, Einaudi's single-minded focus throughout his work has been the destruction of the institutions which form the backbone of the nation-state in Ibero-America: the military and the Catholic Church. In the late 1960s, Einaudi directed

the RAND Corp.'s two seminal studies on the Catholic Church and the Peruvian and Brazilian militaries.

His 1971 RAND Corp. report, "Latin American Institutional Development: Changing Military Perspectives in Peru and Brazil," examined how and why the militaries of those two countries had allegedly deviated from "professionalism," when they elaborated national security doctrines premised on the military's responsibility to assure "the attainment of national potential and well-being" in their countries, and the right to lead "movements for technology and industrialization."

In 1986, as head of the State Department's Latin American Office of Policy Planning, Einaudi set up and ran the project (which is still ongoing) for the demilitarization of Ibero-America, which produced the infamous book, *The Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*. In Ibero-America, that book is now better known as the *Bush Manual*, the name it was given in *EIR*'s widely circulated exposé, *The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and Nations of Ibero-America*, which detailed how Einaudi's *Bush Manual* project is targeting the institution of the military in Ibero-America, as a leading obstacle to globalization, and International Monetary Fund rule.

LaRouche warned you

The imposition of the border-resolution agenda, is an escalation of the *Bush Manual* project. The strategy was outlined in the September 1995 Pentagon report, *U.S. Security Strategy for the Americas*, which detailed the existing series of border conflicts, and called for the United States to adopt "a variety of mechanisms" to resolve them.

In November 1995, the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA, a nest of globalist nuts) used a Regional Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures, sponsored by the Organization of American States in Santiago, Chile, to get governments of the Americas to sign a statement that long-standing border disputes should be settled "as soon as possible." An ACDA spokesman stated after the meeting, that they considered the border discussion at the meeting "historic," because, for the first time, nations in the region had accepted the idea of imposing a timetable upon resolving these conflicts, even if initially non-specific.

U.S. Democratic Party Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche had warned of the strategic madness of adopting the border agenda, in his October 1995 campaign document, "The Blunder in U.S. National Security Policy," issued as a rebuttal to the strategic premises which underlie the Pentagon's *Security Strategy for the Americas* document.

The Pentagon report "not only fails to grasp the intrinsic connection of the new international terrorism to border disputes, but proposes Hobbesian 'conflict resolution' approaches both to terrorists such as [Mexico's Zapatista National Liberation Army] EZLN and to border disputes which

can have no effect but to accelerate the destruction of the sovereignty and national security of every nation affected, including the United States itself," LaRouche wrote. This Pentagon bungling will lead to the spread of international terrorism, because, "if the resolution of a border dispute is taken out of the sovereign hands of the nation-state parties, the disputed area becomes a region of 'extra-territoriality,' in which terrorist/separatist operations thrive."

Each against all

Einaudi's work has entered a new phase. According to diplomats in the region, one of the primary items on the agenda of Secretary of State Warren Christopher during his early March visit to Ibero-America, was to present a scheme, cooked up by Einaudi, for U.S.-sponsored negotiations for a "final" settlement of the dispute, to Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, the three other nations which, along with the United States, are guarantors of the Rio Protocol of 1942, the international treaty signed after the 1941 war between Peru and Ecuador.

On March 6, after months of behind-the-scenes diplomacy, representatives of Ecuador and Peru presented, at a meeting in Brasilia with the guarantor nations, a list of issues each government considers must be resolved for a final peace settlement to be reached. Reportedly with Einaudi's direct encouragement, the Ecuadoran government presented two obstacles: its belief that the Rio Protocol is partially "not executable," and the need for "free and sovereign Ecuadoran access to the Marañón-Amazon" rivers. The latter would require Peru to yield territory beyond the 78 kilometers now in dispute, which both sides agree has not yet been demarcated.

Whatever the immediate self-interest which the Ecuadorans perceive they might gain from this, the strategic question raised is, what is it that the Einaudi-Bush Manual crew seek?

Under current conditions, no Peruvian government could yield *sovereign* access to the Marañón-Amazon without being toppled—as Einaudi knows full well. In a recent U.S. Army War College study, *War and Peace in the Amazon*, Einaudi associate Gabriel Marcella stated that any acceptance of this demand "would be political suicide for a government in Lima." Yet, Marcella urges that Peru-Ecuador conflict be taken up by the Inter-American community as a "case study of conflict resolution."

The authors acknowledge that their demands are unacceptable. Is "peace," then, their objective, or, perhaps, renewed fratricide in Ibero-America?

In addition, were the Peru-Ecuador conflict to be resolved through the negotiation of new borders, under the aegis of some supranational forum outside the Rio Protocol Treaty, the precedent would be set, that *all* borders of the Amazon can be renegotiated under international mediation, thus reviving one of Great Britain's most long-standing geopolitical designs.

New prime minister of Sweden: a 'lion tamer'

by Ulf Sandmark

The new leader of the Swedish governing Social Democratic Party (SAP), Göran Persson, has been hailed by the London *Financial Times* as a "lion tamer." He is the former finance minister, who is to continue to deliver the austerity demanded by "the markets," now as the chairman of the party and prime minister of Sweden.

The party congress that elected Persson on March 15-17, was the culmination of a long and dirty selection process that started when then-chairman Ingvar Carlsson, during the kickoff of the election campaign for the Sept. 17, 1995 election of Swedish members of the European Parliament, for unknown reasons, announced his resignation. Carlsson's choice for his replacement was his vice prime minister, the "punk woman" and party secretary Mona Sahlin. She was discredited in a credit-card scandal, mainly fueled by leaks from Social Democrats in the government bureaucracy. The trade unions mobilized an open revolt against Sahlin. The national trade-union federation, LO, had a banner headline in its newspaper, which read: "Mona, You Are Not Good Enough!"

With Sahlin and other possible candidates out of the way, Persson was "talked into" taking the job as chairman, even though he had "absolutely" refused the offer before.

The trade union revolt continued, first in the form of tough wage demands. Then, the unions made an open challenge to the party leadership, trying to "take over" the party congress by electing only their own people as delegates. With this prelude, the SAP extra party congress became the center of Swedish domestic political life, a dominating affair reminiscent of the former one-party systems in the East bloc. The SAP, even though in power, defused the revolt, and succeeded, just like those old communist parties, in making a comeback, shooting upwards in the opinion polls.

By resigning, Carlsson succeeded, first, in winning the election, and, then, in coopting the revolt against austerity. (He is an example of how today's politicians can become popular only by resigning.) Carlsson's resignation marks the end of the Olof Palme-era of Swedish high-flying international stunts to promote the U.N. system, and various flanking maneuvers in the Third World, on behalf of British world domination. The election of Persson has been characterized as bringing the SAP into a situation that would have prevailed, if Palme had not been elected as SAP party leader in 1969. It