

gentina's great problem (internal strife) find a happy solution, then the common interests of Brazil and the United Provinces of La Plata must bring them together, to make triumphant on the rivers of our countries' interiors, the principles and freedom which guarantee our safety against the government of Paraguay."

Bartolomé Mitre shared Sarmiento's view that free trade represented "civilization." He wrote in the Sept. 4, 1864 edition of his newspaper, *La Nación* that "if the alliance were not possible, at least a complete agreement should be established among those governments which, in America, represent the principle of civilization against the aspirations and dark mistrust of the true representatives of barbarism"—meaning Paraguay. In 1861, Mitre revealed the Triple Alliance's true objectives, as well as the identity of its promoters, when he said, "We should be aware of this peaceful triumph [in the region]; let us seek the nerve center of this progress, and find the initial force which put it into motion. What is the force which drives this movement? Gentlemen, it is British capital."

Heroic resistance

The war against Paraguay was the biggest genocide in the history of this hemisphere. In five years, the Triple Alliance exterminated 50% of Paraguay's population, calculated at about half a million before the war. By 1870, the population totaled 194,000, of which 180,000 were women and 14,000 men. Of those, there were only 2,100 over the age of 20. Aside from those who died in combat, thousands more died as the result of wounds, hunger, and cholera epidemics.

But if it was the greatest genocide, the war was also an example of heroic resistance, which continues to be an object of great pride, not only among the Paraguayan people, but for all Ibero-American patriots. Despite the lack of resources, Paraguayans resisted until, literally, the last man, and in some cases, the last child. The devastation of the country was total: The war achieved what the "allies" could not obtain by any other means: the destruction of the country's military capabilities and the imposition of "democracy" based on free trade. For five years after the war, Brazil occupied the country militarily and imposed the Constitution of 1870. From then on, the nation suffered decades of political anarchy and economic chaos, the effects of which are still visible today.

In the final stages of the war, in June 1869, Gastón de Orleans, Count d'Eu, who was commander-in-chief of the imperial army and also son-in-law to the Brazilian emperor, described in his diary the "modernity" soon to be imposed on Paraguay. The Ibycuí ironworks, one of the Lópezes great achievements, "has been totally and definitively razed by engineer Jardim, who found a large quantity of still-usable machinery and some weapons. . . . Eighty men did the job . . . setting fire to the smelting, carpentry, turnery and foundry buildings . . . as well as the fuel warehouses. The job will be finished when the plant is destroyed, and the narrow valley in which the establishment is located, is subsequently flooded."

Brits boost 'model democrat' Samper

by Gretchen Small

What is a model democracy for the British oligarchy today? According to members of the British House of Lords, the drug cartel-run government of Ernesto Samper Pizano in Colombia, constitutes the kind of "responsible democratic government" under whose control drugs should be legalized, and one for which they will wield the power of the Crown, to keep in office.

The lords also point out that the current British deal with the Colombian cartels' political front men, continues an arrangement struck with the previous President, César Gaviria, who as secretary general of the Organization of American States, was instrumental in the recent supranational coup against Paraguay.

These are the same British aristocrats who use the cry of "democracy," to demand sanctions against Sudan and Nigeria, because those nations oppose free trade.

The House of Lords organized a public show of support for Samper Pizano's drug regime on April 2, with a debate attacking the Clinton administration's March 1 decertification of the Samper government. President Clinton ordered that measures be taken against Colombia, because of the evidence that the Samper regime had no intention of breaking its deal with the drug cartels.

In interviews in April with *EIR's* Spanish biweekly, *Resumen Ejecutivo*, various British lords reaffirmed that they support Samper.

Reached in his London offices on April 27, Viscount Montgomery of Alamein bragged that the debate in the House of Lords was staged to give the Samper regime means to resist pressure from the United States. "The Colombian ambassador in London was obviously delighted with this initiative," he said. "Of course, the Colombians would have used this themselves," to say that the British Parliament opposes decertification. "And, when it came out in Parliament, obviously, it was sent hotfoot to Bogotá."

Montgomery, son of Field Marshal Montgomery of World War II, organized the April 2 debate. Recognized as the activist on Ibero-America in the House of Lords, Monty, Jr.'s primary interest is free trade, key to expanding the grip of the British economic interests with which he is associated (among them, Canning House, Shell Oil, the Baring Puma Fund, Terimar Services, and the Antofagasta and Bolivia Railway Co., notorious for its role in provoking the 1879-83

War of the Pacific). Under the free trade banner, Montgomery reported, he has taken an even "more aggressive stance" against U.S. restrictions on trade with Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Bemoaning the possibility that Samper might be forced to resign because of the "arbitrary" action of the U.S. government, Montgomery complained that decertification "put Colombia in the same league as Nigeria . . . [and other] pariah states . . . a very orthodox, hardworking democratic country like Colombia . . . grouped with dictatorial states in other parts of the world. . . . Not a nice thing to have happen, to a country which has got such impeccable democratic credentials."

"I know that President Samper is in danger," he added, "but then . . . the drug barons probably suborned all the political parties." If Samper is forced out, he should be treated "with dignity," because he has been "an extremely efficient President. I think it's all very sad, really."

It was Viscount Montgomery who on April 2 asked Baroness Lynda Chalker of Wallasey, the Crown's Minister of Overseas Development, "Does my noble friend recall that when President Gaviria visited Britain in 1993, it was clear that we had a long-standing and warm relationship with Colombia?" (see *EIR*, April 26, p. 47). "We have excellent relations with Colombia," answered Lady Chalker, the very official who has taken the point in running genocide against Africa, in the name of the same "democracy" under which she defends Samper's cocaine rule. "There are accusations against certain members of the government of Colombia, but they are only allegations." She promised her "noble friends" that she would make "representations" to Washington.

Drug legalizers

Baron Pearson of Rannoch was another one proud to have spoken up for Samper in the debate on April 2, when reached on April 20. Pearson had been in Colombia last September, and plans to return in July; Colombia's ambassador to London had sent him "a nice letter" thanking him for his participation in the debate.

Pearson suggested the lords should next debate drug legalization, because "that *must* come to the surface more. . . . People have got to look at it." This could be organized by Lord Mancroft, a former drug addict who "feels strongly that everything should be legalized and taxed, and hard drugs available under prescription."

Montgomery reported that he, too, would be eager to participate, adding, "I would personally be in favor of legalization, because I think it is better to have it in the hands of responsible democratic governments."

Both lords pushed the line that the United States is the cause of the global narcotics trade, with the lie that, in Montgomery's words, "demand is what is causing the whole drug problem . . . and the biggest demand is something that exists in the U.S. It *comes from* the U.S., which is the world's largest area of consumption."

Inter-American Dialogue's 'hit list' targets armed forces

by Cynthia Rush

The supranational assault against Paraguay by the networks of the Inter-American Dialogue was publicly announced three months before it occurred. An article appearing in the Argentine daily *La Nación* of Jan. 27, named Paraguay's Gen. Lino Oviedo, as part of a hit list of military "problem cases" in Ibero-America that need to be eliminated, in order for the British one-worldist strategy to proceed unopposed.

The article purported to review the status of civil-military relations continent-wide, in the aftermath of the July 1995 meeting of the region's defense ministers in Williamsburg, Virginia, and with an eye to the October 1996 follow-up meeting of defense ministers in Bariloche, Argentina. The information and analysis came from "reliable sources in the ministry headed by Oscar Camilión." Camilión is Argentina's defense minister; he is also a long-standing member of the Inter-American Dialogue. The views presented in the *La Nación* article thus reflect the thinking and strategy of the Dialogue, and of its British sponsors.

What is the Dialogue's agenda leading up to the October defense ministers' meeting?

In most countries in Ibero-America, "leadership of the armed forces is still not under the firm reign of civilians," the article complains. "The only countries that have a proper relationship with their armed forces are the United States, Canada, and Argentina." The reference to Argentina is telling: That country's Armed Forces have been "restructured" out of existence. They are unable to defend the nation from any external threat; they have been deprived of a national mission or operating budget; and they are intended to serve only as a waterboy for the United Nations' supranational adventures.

The Dialogue's leading targets include:

Paraguay: "The head of the army, Gen. Lino Oviedo, has a personal style which is very much like that of a medieval boss." The Dialogue crowd objects to Oviedo's defense of "antiquated" concepts such as national sovereignty and the importance of the Armed Forces.

Peru: "President Alberto Fujimori rules, but no one knows how much is his own inspiration, and how much that of the Armed Forces." Of particular concern to the one-worldist crowd, is Army Commander Gen. Nicolás de Bari