

The most notorious example of this is American University's Democracy Program, which produced the book *The Military and Democracy; The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*, which EIR made famous in the region as the "Bush manual."

Now, that whole "Bush manual" project is being made official U.S. policy—with all the resources and power that entails. Perry specified that officials working on defense matters, "mostly civilians drawn from the Defense Ministries, Foreign Ministries, and legislative defense staffs," will be brought up to Washington to receive "on-the-job training courses" in quick three- or four-week programs. At the same time, "teams of instructors" will go to Ibero-America, "and set up courses there." Research fellows will also be sponsored throughout the Americas.

This proposal, too, has met strong opposition. A Pentagon official, speaking at a pre-summit briefing, insisted that the Pentagon is "very sensitive to . . . the views of many of the countries in the region" that defense establishments must be built up in each country nationally, "and that it cannot be done in any sense by the United States, or for them, by any outside power." The final report from the working group where Perry presented the proposal, states that the delegations agreed to "carry out consultations" on how the Center should function.

Consultations may be held, but they are for window-dressing only. According to the Pentagon's Colonel Owens, preparations for the Center are already well-advanced. The new Center is funded for Fiscal Year 1997 (by reallocating \$2 million from the Army budget), and the first class is expected to get under way in June 1997. The National Defense University (which publishes *Joint Force Quarterly*), has been handed control over the project, and is already drawing up the curriculum. Next year, the Pentagon will submit a funding request to cover the full expenses of all the foreign students involved. Ibero-American countries suggested that the Center be placed under OAS control, but, as Owens emphasized, this Center is "a [U.S.] Department of Defense operation."

Colombia haunts Williamsburg

Leading Ibero-American countries object to the blatant attempt to use "the Williamsburg process" to create a de facto permanent regional defense institution. For the second time, Mexico refused to send its defense minister, deploying a diplomatic delegation as observers only. The president of the Defense Commission of Mexico's Chamber of Deputies, Gen. Luis Garfias Magana, reiterated on Oct. 15, that that decision had been taken at "the highest levels" of the Mexican government. What generates "distrust" in Ibero-America, is the U.S. intention to head an intercontinental military strategy, he noted.

The Chileans reportedly informed other governments in advance that they do not wish to "institutionalize the Defense

Ministerials." At the Pentagon's pre-summit briefing, the U.S. official found it necessary to assert, "We have no objective to create an institution of defense ministers, an alliance, [or] anything like that at all."

Perry, once again, left such niceties aside. "There will be a consensus to have a third meeting," he declared in Bariloche.

The final communiqué, however, announces no date, and no host country, for the next meeting. Colombia's defense minister told the press that they had been chosen as the host for the next summit, but, when asked by this reporter whether it would not discredit "the process" if the next host were the narco-terrorist regime of Ernesto Samper Pizano, the Pentagon's public affairs spokesman insisted no such decision had been taken.

Colombia's crisis has haunted the Defense Ministerial

'Democrat' Sarmiento: an Anglophile racist

"[Advances] in civilization, instincts, and ideas, are not carried out by mixing the races. . . . Anyone who carefully studies the instincts, [and] industrial and intellectual abilities of the masses in Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, and elsewhere, has occasion to experience the effects of that inevitable, but damaging amalgam of races [which are] unsuited for civilization. . . .

"All of the colonizations carried out in the last three centuries by European nations, have crushed the savages populating the lands they came to occupy. The British, French, and Dutch in North America established no community whatsoever with the aborigines, and when, over time, their descendants were called upon to form independent states, they were found to be made up of pure European races, with their traditions of Christian and European civilization intact. . . ."

It is impossible to glean anything other than the crudest racism from these words, written by Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, President of Argentina during 1868-74. Yet, on Oct. 8, speaking at the Defense Ministerial of the Americas in San Carlos de Bariloche in Argentina, U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry expressed the desire that a new Inter-American Center for Defense Studies would be "infused" with Sarmiento's "democratic" spirit.

This goes well beyond racism, however. Perry's embrace of Sarmiento confirms that the plot to demilitarize Ibero-America is rooted historically in the British colonial doctrine of free trade and destruction of the institution of the nation-state. Sarmiento was an agent for Italian Giu-

from its outset, exposing the disaster contained in the “democracy” agenda adopted by its sponsors. Even as the drug scandal grew over the Samper Pizano government, U.S. Vice President Al Gore used his keynote to the Williamsburg summit on July 25, 1995, to attempt to stop the scandal from bringing down the Samper government. Gore stated that “we can applaud the work of those like President Samper and Defense Minister [Fernando] Botero in Colombia, who are standing up to traffickers often at tremendous personal risk, demonstrating tremendous personal courage.”

Perry backed up Gore all the way in his defense of the Samper regime, telling a press conference the next day, “I strongly agree with the vice president’s statement. In fact, I helped prepare his text in that regard. And it’s based on . . . solid information. . . . The relationship between Colombia

and the United States is very good . . . at the Presidential/vice-presidential level . . . and exceedingly good at the Defense Ministry level.”

Their timing proved exceeding bad. The day Perry delivered his paean to Samper and Botero, Samper Pizano’s Presidential campaign treasurer, Santiago Medina, was arrested by the Colombian Prosecutor General’s office, which then, as now, has worked well with U.S. anti-drug officials. Medina turned state’s witness, and named Defense Minister Botero as one of the people who had ordered him to meet with the Cali Cartel to arrange campaign financing. On Aug. 1, 1995, an official of the Prosecutor’s office requested an investigation begin into Botero’s activities, and on Aug. 2, Botero resigned. He is now serving a 63-month sentence for his crimes, and on Oct. 9, the United States cancelled his visa.

seppe Mazzini’s “revolutionary” Young Italy and Young Europe movement, whose agents were deployed throughout Ibero-America to impose these British-dictated policies. The same forces were behind Britain’s attempt to dismember the United States during the 1861-65 U.S. Civil War.

In the late 1830s, Sarmiento belonged to Mazzini’s Young Argentina lodge, later known as the Association of May, and spent decades trying to achieve Argentina’s economic and political submission to British geopolitical goals. From exile in Chile, he collaborated openly with the Anglo-French alliance which tried for almost three decades to overthrow the 1828-52 government of Juan Manuel de Rosas, because of the latter’s resistance to free trade. He conspired with the French-speaking *literati* who operated against Rosas from their bases in Santiago, Chile and Montevideo, Uruguay.

At the center of Sarmiento’s Mazzinian philosophy was the British-created Black Legend, the lie that Ibero-America’s economic backwardness is a product both of dirigistic (“authoritarian”) state and economic structures set up by Spain in its colonies, and the alleged inferiority of Catholic culture. Argentina could better prosper and industrialize, he asserted, if its people possessed the same qualities as the “pure” Anglo-Saxon race which had populated Britain’s North American colonies.

This is the same drivel put out by Lawrence Harrison, one of the chief ideologues of the plot to demilitarize Ibero-America. In his presentation “The Genesis of Latin American Underdevelopment,” published in the National Defense University’s 1989 book *Security in the Americas*, Harrison bragged that he belonged to a school of thought which “views Latin America’s condition as a consequence of traditional Hispanic culture, profoundly influencing a Latin American culture that is anti-democratic, anti-social,

anti-entrepreneurial, and anti-work.” Canadians and Americans “attach more importance to work—and work harder—than in Latin America,” he raved.

On Spain itself, Sarmiento wrote in his essay *Popular Education* that “the South American states belong to a race which is at the tail-end of civilized nations. In the theater of the modern world today, Spain and its descendants are destitute of all those qualities which life in our era demands . . . due to their radical lack of knowledge of natural or physical sciences, which in other countries of Europe have created powerful industry.”

Sarmiento is infamous in Argentina, and Ibero-America, for equating “civilization” with free trade, and “barbarism” and “slavery” with economic protectionism. In his 1845 work *Facundo*, he attacked the Rosas government for refusing to grant Britain its chief demand, the right of free navigability of Argentina’s rivers. Only Buenos Aires, dominated by British trade interests, is “civilized,” Sarmiento argued. Only Buenos Aires, “is in contact with European nations; she alone exploits the advantages of foreign trade; she alone has power and income. In vain, have the provinces been asked to allow a bit of civilization, of industry and European population to enter; [but] a stupid and colonial policy offered deaf ears to the clamor.”

Sarmiento also used the demand for “opening up” the economy, the same one wielded by today’s globalists, against Paraguay. The Argentine “democrat” labeled Paraguay’s rulers as “tyrants” for daring to apply protectionist economic policies to achieve internal industrialization. Sarmiento was President during the last two years of the 1865-70 Triple Alliance War, in which Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, under Britain’s direction, allied to slaughter Paraguay’s population and impose free trade.

—Cynthia R. Rush