

Hermoza Rios, whose leadership was central to the successful anti-terrorist offensive launched by the Armed Forces against the Shining Path narco-terrorists, and who continues to defend a significant role for the military in national life. The international “human rights” mafia and its local adjuncts have long sought General Hermoza’s removal. A headline in the Peruvian leftist daily *La República* on April 26, reporting on General Oviedo’s fight with President Wasmosy, is revealing: “The Paraguayan Hermoza Rebels.”

Colombia: “The issue of drug trafficking shapes the rest of the relationship with the state.” This is a protest over the fact that the Colombian Armed Forces, under the leadership of Army head Gen. Harold Bedoya, have played a prominent role in the war against the drug cartels. General Bedoya has also drawn the line against the narco-terrorist apparatus in the country, much to the dismay of the British-sponsored human rights network which is pushing for UN-supervised “peace negotiations,” under which power-sharing with the guerrillas would be arranged. Because of his firm stand against the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and “European powers” meddling in Colombia’s Urabá region, Bedoya has been slated for political and/or physical elimination by the British.

Brazil: “There is no Defense Ministry; every arm has its own cabinet post, because the Constitution so prescribes.” The proponents of demilitarization have long viewed the existence of a single, civilian-controlled Defense Ministry as a crucial step toward emasculating the military and undermining its political power. Brazil has for years been a target of this strategy, because its Armed Forces remain relatively strong, compared to those of other Ibero-American nations, and they maintain four separate cabinet posts in the government. Budget cuts, however, have dug deeply into the institution’s operating capacity, while strategically important military-run companies have gone on the chopping block for privatization.

Chile: “The Armed Forces have their own source of funds. . . . Here, the presence of Gen. Augusto Pinochet is decisive. . . . President Eduardo Frei rules, only up to the barracks doors.” General Pinochet is a willing collaborator in British geopolitical machinations, but he remains an important obstacle to the plot to dismantle or weaken the Armed Forces. Since a certain percentage of the revenues of the state-controlled copper company, Codelco, goes directly to the Armed Forces, the defense budget cannot be held hostage the way it is in other nations.

Mexico: “They didn’t send their defense minister to the Williamsburg meeting,” the Dialogue crew protests. Mexico sent a low-level delegation, because it has historically opposed any form of supranational military deployment, or any attempt to establish the concept of limited sovereignty. These were two of the major topics on the Williamsburg agenda, and which the Dialogue now intends to fully impose at the upcoming Bariloche gathering.

EIR warned you about ‘The Plot’

In July 1993, EIR published a 460-page Spanish-language exposé, The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and the Nations of Ibero-America, detailing how the offensive against the militaries of Ibero-America was intended to destroy the nation-state and impose world government. The book’s preface was written by Argentine nationalist Col. Ali Mohammed Seineldín, and the introduction was by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. An English-language edition was published in 1994, and is available from EIR News Service. The following excerpt is taken from the first chapter, “The History of the Anti-Military Project.”

The project to dismantle the Armed Forces is a matter of importance not only for the military. At stake in this battle is nothing less than the continued existence of the nation-state itself. If this vile plot is not stopped, the disintegration of the economy and national institutions that it will unleash will bring genocide of unimaginable proportions. Entire nations will disappear.

Therefore, it is imperative that civilians also join this battle. In June 1991, *EIR*’s Spanish-language magazine, *Resumen Ejecutivo de EIR*, published a special issue, entitled “Bush’s ‘New Order’: Eliminate the National Sovereignty and Armed Forces of Ibero-America,” which detailed the anti-military project. There we warned that the policy of destroying the Armed Forces “is not only directed against the institutions of the military, but also against the Catholic Church, the trade unions, national industry, and any institutionalized force which could offer resistance to the final objectives of George Bush’s New World Order: colonial subjugation, looting of natural resources and genocide against the supposedly excessive population of the South.” . . .

The underlying premises upon which the anti-military project is based are three:

1. International Monetary Fund (IMF) rule over the world economy remains sacrosanct. In other words, usury and its constant companion, malthusianism, must govern all economic activity.

2. Sovereignty is passé, an outdated concept replaced by the “globalism” of the so-called post-modern era. This is not some minor shift of emphasis in world affairs, but a commitment to *eliminate the nation-state itself as the form in which human social life is organized.*

3. Communism is dead, leaving the Anglo-American

combination—British brains deploying U.S. muscle—as the sole superpower worldwide. All nations are expected to adapt to a world run by one superpower, and therefore, the argument goes, they no longer need a national military. . . .

To defeat an enemy, it is necessary to understand what the enemy's goal is, what strategies he is employing, and most important, his most vulnerable flanks. It is also necessary to have most clear what it is that one is fighting for, because only on those grounds can the whole population be mobilized in the defense of the nation. A crucial part of this book, therefore, is the chapter on "How to Survive Without the IMF." . . .

Reforming the OAS and IADB

From the outset, the [Inter-American] Dialogue proposed that supranational structures be created to monitor military activities in the Hemisphere. In its first report, titled *The Americas at a Crossroads*, the IAD proposed that the Organization of American States (OAS) be given oversight over national military activities, and that human rights be accepted as a cover for OAS intervention. Presaging what has now become a major campaign of the United Nations, the Dialogue asserted that "carefully considered multilateral action to protect fundamental human rights is not intervention but an international obligation." . . .

In December 1990, during a visit to the Southern Cone of South America, President Bush baptized this post-Cold War global project as the creation of a "New World Order." The project was to be imposed through "democracy," Bush announced. "The nations of the Americas are on the brink of something unprecedented in world history—the first wholly democratic Hemisphere," the butcher of Panama intoned. He warned, however, that this "new dawn" would not happen without its quota of suffering: "Change will not come easily. Economies now dependent on protection and state regulation must open to competition. The transition for a time, will be painful." . . . The drive to transform the Organization of American States and associated bodies into the kind of supranational institutions of government which had been discussed since the great crisis of 1982, was now in full gear.

On Dec. 4, 1990, one day after the Seineldín uprising, José Manuel de la Sota, Argentina's ambassador to Brazil, proposed that an alliance of the Southern Cone countries be formed to defend "democracy," under which sanctions and even armed interventions by members of the alliance would be used against any member country which did not maintain a "democratic" system. De la Sota proposed this at a luncheon attended by Brazilian President Fernando Collor de Mello and 21 ambassadors from other Ibero-American and Caribbean nations, held during a visit by President George Bush to Brazil.

The Argentine proposal was hailed warmly by London's *Financial Times* on Jan. 11, 1991. Argentine Finance Minister Domingo Cavallo was "trying to interest his neighbors in a

regional security pact that would keep the generals out of politics and busy with non-threatening duties, such as protecting the environment and stamping out drug-trafficking," London's mouthpiece wrote.

The Argentine proposals were just the beginning of a six-month-long political offensive orchestrated by the United States, with the strong support of Venezuela, to reform the OAS Charter so as to give the OAS "intrusive powers" in member states when "democracy" was threatened in any country. Together with this, they sought to restructure the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB), to transform it from what it is now, a regional advisory body in military affairs, into an OAS expeditionary force, along the lines of the "blue helmet" forces of the United Nations.

In March 1991, Argentine Foreign Relations Minister Guido di Tella held secret meetings with his Chilean and Brazilian counterparts to elaborate a strategy for forging a military wing of Mercosur to enforce "democracy" within the region, while simultaneously reducing both troops and conventional weaponry within each nation. Adm. Emilio Osses, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of Argentina, supported Di Tella's proposals, arguing that it is necessary in the "existing new international context" to "assume that the end has been reached for the model of Armed Forces which has existed for much of the current century."

On April 15, 1991, the State Department's top man in the Bush Manual anti-military project, Luigi Einaudi, then U.S. ambassador to the OAS, stated during a seminar at the Woodrow Wilson Center on "The Future of the OAS and Hemispheric Security," that the current structures of the OAS and Inter-American Defense Board were not adequate to assure hemispheric security. He expressed his "great frustration in the ability to bring together the OAS and the Inter-American Defense Board, the civilian political authority and the military institutional authority. It is clearly time that we translated the democratic solidarity that we have achieved in the Hemisphere into a new definition and role for the military."

Einaudi went on to directly attack the concept of national sovereignty, noting that when some New World Order advocates, such as "my friend Carlos Andrés Pérez" of Venezuela, address the OAS, "they will speak with such clarity that they send many people away reeling, looking for the protective veils of non-intervention, of the sovereign equality of states and of representatives."

The offensive paid off. When the OAS held its 21st Annual General Assembly in Santiago, Chile June 3-9, 1991, the foreign ministers of all the member countries signed the so-called "Santiago Commitment," which contains an "inexorable commitment" to defend democracy in the region. Concretely, they agreed that the OAS Permanent Council would immediately convene in the event of the overthrow of the government of a member state, and that a meeting of foreign ministers or the General Assembly itself would be called within ten days, to consider further action.