

## EIR Feature

# Clinton, Zedillo defend sovereignty vs. one world order

by Valerie Rush and Dennis Small

“It is imperative for us to respect our friends and neighbors especially,” President William Clinton told the press during his May 5-7 state visit to Mexico. Setting the tone of defense of national sovereignty which dominated the entire historic trip, Clinton elaborated that he was referring to “respect for the patriotism and the integrity” of the Mexican people and their heroes.

With these simple words, months, if not years, of British conniving to provoke an uncontrolled conflict between the United States and Mexico, were sharply deflated. And they showed, more broadly, that there is a simple pathway available to sovereign nations, to lead the world safely back from the brink of global economic and political catastrophe, to which British policies have driven it.

During the early months of 1997, Britain and its co-thinkers in Washington—spearheaded by the notorious bankers’ lobby, the Inter-American Dialogue—had fanned the flames of conflict between Mexico and the United States, making use of the delicate issues of the war on drugs, immigration policy, and so forth, to bring the two neighbors to a 50-year nadir in bilateral relations. So tense were things, that in early 1997, calls were issued on the floor of the U.S. Senate for the overthrow of Mexico’s ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) and even for toppling the Zedillo government; while in Mexico, the British-sponsored left opposition was demanding that Clinton be banned from Mexico as *persona non grata*. The British were confident that they could force Clinton to cancel his trip altogether, or if not, to be met in Mexico by tens or hundreds of thousands of anti-American street demonstrators, and by violent incidents created by agents provocateur.

Britain’s immediate historical referent was Vice President Richard Nixon’s infamous late-1950s tour of Ibero-America, where he was met by violent protests and was literally spat upon by hateful crowds, enraged at U.S. policy toward the region.

Had such a scenario taken hold, the next step on the British agenda was to use the July 1997 mid-term elections in Mexico to drive the PRI out of office and to



*"I'm going there as a gesture of respect—not only respect for their lives, but respect for the patriotism and the integrity of the people who have served this country. . . . It is imperative for us to respect our friends and neighbors," President William Clinton (left) said during his visit, with President Ernesto Zedillo, to the "Child Heroes" monument in Mexico City.*

catapult the pro-Zapatista opposition into power—much as they have done in Zaire with the butcher Laurent Kabila. From there, the disintegration of Mexico as a nation-state would be just around the corner.

But this scenario did not play out, and credit is due to both Presidents Clinton and Ernesto Zedillo for that achievement. In contrast to Nixon's tour, President Clinton's trip evoked among Mexicans memories of John F. Kennedy's triumphal visit in the early 1960s, where he was warmly received as a respectful friend and ally of Mexico. Clinton and Zedillo accomplished this simply enough, by establishing a dialogue centered explicitly around mutual respect for each other's national sovereignty, and by rejecting most of the globalist agenda that the Inter-American Dialogue had tried to force upon them.

Predictably, the British policy advocates at the Dialogue and elsewhere are now gnashing their teeth in frustration over the Mexico results. Particularly pathetic was the May 11 editorial of the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's *Washington Times*, which berated Clinton for being "publicly obsequious" and "spineless" with Zedillo, by giving credence to the concept of "national sovereignty," which the *Times* described as a "Mexican code word for 'Yankee butt out of our affairs, unless you're carrying bags of cash.'"

### **'Dialogue' agenda in trouble**

Although not eliminated, the overall influence of the Inter-American Dialogue on Clinton's Ibero-American pol-

icy, was seriously weakened by the Mexico trip. This setback came on top of the dramatic defeat they suffered, just weeks earlier, when Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori rejected British/Dialogue pressure to capitulate to the MRTA narco-terrorists, and instead courageously retook the Japanese ambassador's residence by force.

Indicative of the shifting winds in Washington, is the recent announcement at the U.S. State Department that senior policy adviser and longtime "Latin America hand," Luigi Einaudi, is resigning. Einaudi, who brags that "I came into the State Department with Kissinger" 23 years ago, has virtually run U.S. policy toward Ibero-America on behalf of the British one-worldists for more than two decades. Under George Bush, in particular, the Dialogue defined every aspect of policy toward Ibero-America, and Einaudi was handed the strategic post of U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States. Now, Einaudi is finally leaving State and, according to press accounts, is moving over to the Inter-American Dialogue instead.

Einaudi's erstwhile mentor, Sir Henry Kissinger, also emerged from Clinton's Mexico trip with egg on his face. Just days prior to Clinton's departure, Sir Henry had gone out on a limb in a nationally syndicated column, urging Clinton to *not* forge any meaningful ties with Mexico's Zedillo, but to instead pursue a geopolitical alliance with the "remarkable" President of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, whom Clinton is scheduled to visit in October. Cardoso is a founding member of the Inter-American Dialogue; but Clinton was



*Tlaxcala is the first city on mainland America from which the conquest, evangelization, and colonization of the New World was begun. Left to right: Mrs. Zedillo, President Zedillo, President Clinton, and Mrs. Clinton are greeted by Mexican children during their visit to Tlaxcala.*

apparently unimpressed with Kissinger's advice.

The Inter-American Dialogue was founded in 1982 by McGeorge Bundy, David Rockefeller, and Robert McNamara, among other "establishment" luminaries. Today it claims among the ranks of its 100 "prominent" members former National Security Adviser Sir Brent Scowcroft (a former president of Kissinger Associates and national security adviser to George Bush), and Alan Batkin, the current vice chairman of Kissinger Associates. It promotes itself as "the premier U.S. center" for policy and communication within the Western Hemisphere, boasts of having members "on loan" to various governments in the Americas (e.g., the Presidents of Brazil and Bolivia), and coordinates the activities of the more than 100 Washington-based non-governmental organizations which deal with Ibero-America.

It also deploys key media figures in its ranks to help shape its aura of power. Among its members are the president of the *Chicago Tribune*, the publisher of the *Miami Herald*, Cable News Network's prime anchor and senior correspondent, the national news assistant managing editor of the *Washington Post*, the associate editor of *La Opinión* (the largest U.S. Spanish-language daily), and the chairman of Abril, S.A., Brazil's largest publishing company.

The Dialogue was the architect of every major feature of George Bush's policy toward Ibero-America, and, although it has lost significant ground under Clinton, it retains influence both in Washington, and across the continent. Until early 1996, for example, Clinton's Latin America director at the National Security Council was Richard Feinberg, a former Dialogue president.

### **Replace the nation-state with 'governance'**

Foremost among the Dialogue's goals is to replace the concept of *national sovereignty* with "multilateral" or "collective" governance. Former Dialogue President Feinberg was explicit about his hostility to the sovereign nation-state, when he told a June 1996 forum in Mexico: "In Latin America today, in the name of sovereignty, governments repress dissent, restrict civil society, violate labor rights, protect drug traffickers, and devastate the environment."

In its latest report on the Americas, entitled "Making Cooperation Work," the Dialogue demands that Ibero-America submit to "a convergence of interests and values" under the guidance of a multilateral institution, such as a revamped Organization of American States (OAS). The primary intent of the report, as stressed by the Dialogue, is to "redirect U.S. policy" toward the concept of regional government and away from so-called "unilateralism." In other words, the Dialogue is intent on eliminating the national sovereignty of the nations of Ibero-America — *and* of the United States.

Clinton's agenda with Mexican President Zedillo had a very different focus, though, with repeated emphasis on a "partnership" that takes into account both the unilateral and bilateral interests of their two nations, with full respect for national sovereignty. For example, on the issue of the *drug trade*, at the signing ceremony for the new Declaration of the Mexican/U.S. Alliance Against Drugs, President Zedillo emphasized that "the first principle which we mutually recognize is — and I will read it — 'is the absolute respect for the sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction of both Mexico and the United States of America.'"

The U.S. certification procedure, which the Dialogue has repeatedly demanded be abandoned in favor of “collective” criteria, and which the Dialogue-influenced media tried to ignite into a full-blown confrontation between the United States and Mexico, in fact scarcely figured in the discussions between the two heads of state.

On the issue of the *armed forces*, too, the anti-military lobbyists at the Dialogue were iced out. Despite a furious campaign by the British press and their media cohorts in the United States to smear the Mexican Armed Forces as corrupt and as human-rights abusers, the Clinton administration not only expressed an appreciation of Mexico’s defense forces as a bulwark against the drug cartels, but President Clinton personally praised that institution. During a visit to Mexico’s Niños Héroes monument, the first by a U.S. President in 50 years, Clinton paid homage to “the patriotism and the integrity of the people who have served this country.”

On the question of Mexican *political reform*, the watchword for dismantling the ruling PRI party as an institution vital to Mexican stability, the Dialogue went unsatisfied as well. Although President Clinton praised the Zedillo government’s commitment to “democratizing” Mexico’s political environment, and met briefly with representatives of the National Action Party (PAN) and Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) opposition, the net effect of the visit was to strengthen, rather than weaken, Mexico’s governing institutions.

Jorge Castañeda, an outspoken opposition figure linked to disgraced former Mexican President Carlos Salinas, and who travels in Dialogue circles and has most vocally publicized the demand that Clinton help sink the Mexican political system, complained after the visit that Clinton’s policy toward Mexico “is absolutely clear, decisive, unequivocal: to try at all cost to keep the system in power. . . . The timing of his visit was planned with clear electoral purposes. It’s obvious that they could have waited another three months. . . . Zedillo and the PRI will be the obvious winners.”

On *human rights*, the Dialogue was also left high and dry. Mexican Dialogue member Mariclaire Acosta, who is also president of Mexico’s Commission for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights, met with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and presented her with a document demanding that the United States and all Ibero-American countries submit to the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States in matters pertaining to human rights. This call for placing supranational agencies above the laws of sovereign nations has been a long-standing demand of the British one-worldists, and of the Inter-American Dialogue. Acosta complained that Clinton is not moving on this agenda item either.

President Clinton has not freed himself, however, from the Dialogue’s grip on the crucial issue of economic policy, although he is not implementing their directives at the speed the British would like. In remarks to Mexican businessmen on May 7, Clinton praised the Bush-initiated North American

Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as a success story, and stated that he was hoping to incorporate “more nations in our partnership” by seeking fast-track negotiating authority from the U.S. Congress.

The *Financial Times* of London complained on May 14, that Clinton’s “credibility” in Ibero-America “depends on Congress granting ‘fast-track’ authority . . . an issue on which there has been little progress to date.”

## Clinton’s encounter with Mexican history

by Carlos Cota Meza

President Bill Clinton’s state visit to Mexico May 5-7, and his meetings with President Ernesto Zedillo, held out a promise of the type of relations which could exist between sovereign nations, within the framework of a new and just international economic order.

To properly locate the Clinton-Zedillo meetings, recall the serious tensions which existed between the two countries in February and March of this year, as a result of highly provocative behavior by the U.S. Congress in opposing the administration’s certification of Mexico as a drug-fighting ally. At that time, President Clinton proceeded to certify Mexico in the face of opposition from practically every Congressional Republican, along with some Democrats. After the President’s decision, it was this same opposition group which demanded the imposition of an arbitrary time frame on Mexico, within which it would have to implement certain anti-drug policies, or otherwise be labeled an unreliable ally.

In reviewing the key elements of this conflict, Lyndon LaRouche stated that those in the United States who attacked Mexico’s certification, know virtually nothing about the Mexican political system or the history it embodies, including the history of U.S.-Mexican relations. Current relations between the two nations, LaRouche said, are similar to those of the 1861-65 period (see *EIR*, March 28, 1997, “The Certification of Mexico”).

It was precisely this positive environment which characterized the personal meetings between the two heads of state, and was a theme expressed in their speeches and in major events. It should also be said that this same 1861-65 period, highlights historical mistakes which the two Presidents must overcome between now and the year 2000, when both their terms in office end.

### Monument to the ‘Child Heroes’

President Clinton’s first official act in Mexico on May 6, has been characterized as “of historic proportions.” He paid