

International Caucus of Labor Committees
Brief on
Rockefeller's
'War of the Pacific'
Strategy

December 13, 1974

National Caucus of Labor Committees

P.O. Box 1972 General Post Office New York, New York 10001

Phone: (212) 279-5950

TWX 710-581-5679

Latin American Labor Committee

P.O. Box 1972 General Post Office New York, New York 10001

Phone: (212) 279-5950

European Labor Committees

ELC Weisbaden 62 Weisbaden, Schiersteiner Str.6,
West Germany

Phone: (6121) 377081

Telex. 841-4186838 ELC D

Contents

I. Rockefeller Family Operations

II. The War Scenario

III. Psychological War Against Chile And Peru

IV. Defusing Rockefeller's Time-Bomb

Appendices

A. Background of Top Rockefeller Latin American Strategists

B. The Center for Inter-American Relations

C. Background: Creation of the Peruvian Regime

Rockefeller's 'War of the Pacific' Strategy

I. Rockefeller Family Operations

The Rockefeller Family is planning a war between Peru and Chile to reorganize Latin American governments for a streamlined centralized control of investment and development policies in Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina. This restructuring is crucial to the Rockefellers' political and financial survival as the world plunges into the most severe economic and social collapse since the bankruptcy of the Spanish empire almost 400 years ago. In preparation for the inevitable contraction in social production, the Rockefeller interests are building what they call a "new world order": Economic activity is being deliberately shut down in the industrially advanced sectors and transferred to "development" projects in the so-called Third World. In South America, the areas chosen for the transplant of factories and workers — financed by petrodollars extorted by the Rockefellers from the drained advanced economies — are the Amazon basin, the Rio de la Plata basin, and what is known as the Pacific Project.

The new Rockefeller order is being implemented by a multi-tiered supranational agency, directed from the top by the Trilateral Commission, of which David Rockefeller is the Chairman. The Trilateral Commission is composed of well-known international members of the Rockefeller cabal; at the present time it is in effect more powerful than any government in the Western world. Existing national regimes and institutions are mere satrapies in the drive for the creation of what the Commission calls "The Trilateral World."

Requirements for efficient operation of the Rockefeller development projects in South America are ease of commodity and labor flows and a highly centralized financial structure. These basic strategic considerations are handed down from the Trilateral to the second-level coordinating bodies of the Rockefeller's supranational government, such as the Center for Inter-American Relations (CIR) (also chaired by David Rockefeller). At the Dec. 9 meeting of the Trilateral Commission in Washington, D.C., Richard Gardner, also a CIR member, delivered a deliberately vague statement on the requirements of "North-South" relationships. Such general policy statements become more concrete as they filter down through the command structure. For example, Felipe Herrera, ex-president of the Inter-American Development Bank and member of the CIR, at a recent bankers meeting in Brazil called for the formation of a central Latin American bank and the creation of a single regional Latin American currency, noting, "We could resolve by telephone the economic problems of Uruguay." Herrera also recommended converting Latin American into a single federation. Aurelio Peccei, president of the Club of Rome, another second-level Rockefeller planning body, was more conservative — he said Latin America should be re-grouped into seven or eight "macro-states."

The Center for Inter-American Relations is the nerve center for the implementation of The Trilateral World in Latin America. Channels from Rockefeller-controlled institutions — like the Commission on Critical Choices, the Council on the Americas, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Hudson Institute (which conceived the Pacific Project and the "development" of the Amazon basin), the Rand Corporation, the World Bank, Brookings Institute, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency, to name a few — all converge in the CIR. Through this network of key intelligence and operations organs complete array of conditions and "solutions" is established throughout the hemisphere, ranging from "right" (hardline) to "left" (softline). By playing off one side against the other, the Rockefeller family can be assured that political and economic events in Latin America are kept within Trilateral guidelines.

This is the dynamic behind fabricating a war between Peru and Chile. While the Peruvian military regime is no less a creation of the Rockefeller forces, working through the CIA and assorted "think tanks," than is the Chilean junta, the politics of the entire hemisphere are being polarized behind one or the other of these "alternatives." Alternative A (Chile) is a target for mobilizing political forces behind Alternative B (the populist "progressive-radical, anti-imperialist" Peruvian corporatist model). It is the latter alternative that the Rockefeller Family requires for carrying out Third World "development." Only the "progressives," led by Mexico's Echeverria, Venezuela's Perez, and Peru's Velasco, can co-opt the range of the population of Latin America and focus in "against the U.S." as a cover for Rockefeller-directed regionalization. Exemplary of this process is Echeverria's proposed Latin American Economic System (SELA), financed by Venezuela's petrodollars, which the "anti-imperialist" Perez conveniently places at the disposal of leading CIR member Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank.

A Second War of the Pacific would accomplish two principal goals for the Rockefeller cabal. First, the climate of emergency would force specific political crises. With a defeat of the Chile-aligned hardliners virtually guaranteed, the status of the softline "opposition" in various countries would be immensely strengthened. A politically homogeneous continent of "progressive" regionalizing governments would be set up in the wake of the war. Additionally, a war would provide the pretext for Nelson Rockefeller's well-known goal of establishing a "hemispheric security force" to replace the woefully inadequate OAS apparatus. A conflict on the scale of the probable eruption between Peru and Chile would reveal the OAS as incompetent to stop anything larger than a "soccer war." The hemispheric umbrella replacing the OAS would ensure that no political elements went beyond the boundaries of the CIR's "alternatives."

There can be no doubt that the ideas of the Latin "progressives" originated with Rockefeller operatives and planners affiliated with the CIR. Moreover, the hardliners who are pushing the "right-wing" alternative are also from the Rockefeller camp. For example, Echeverria's SELA explicitly calls for the exclusion of the U.S. and the integration of Cuba into the "inter-American system." These same points were pushed by Rockefeller protege and Hudson Institute Fellow William D. Rogers when he functioned as George McGovern's advisor on Latin America in 1972 — at the same time CIR "hardliner" James D. Theberge attacked McGovern for proposed defense cuts. While throughout this past year Latin America's "radicals" have been calling for an end to sanctions against Cuba and for reestablishing relations with Fidel Castro, Rockefeller cabal members have been doing likewise through the Commission on U.S./Latin American Relations, headed by Sol M. Linowitz of the board of directors of the CIR. Rogers, the first president of the CIR, was a member of the Linowitz commission. The "new dialogue," the policy by which the U.S. government tolerates the CIR-bred "anti-imperialist" ravings of Echeverria et al., was created essentially by Luigi Einaudi as consultant to the State Department from the Rand Corporation.

It is these operatives, through the same hard/soft manipulation, who are organizing a War of the Pacific for the Rockefellers. Theberge has been supplying the hardline forces in Latin America with cold-war red scares from his latest book, *Soviet Presence in Latin America*. Mario Busch, a reporter for the Brazilian daily, *O Estado de Sao Paulo*, warned of Soviet "military intentions" and of "Marxist world conquest," explicitly basing his comments on Theberge's writings. Peru is built up as a menacing "revolutionary pro-Soviet" regime. Nathaniel Davis — also of the CIR — through his association with the CIA's overthrow of Allende in Chile maintains the old image of the cloak-and-dagger CIA as a convenient foil to Rockefeller's Latin radicals. Full advantage has been taken of the "exposures" of CIA activities in Chile in order to further encourage the "anti-imperialists" at the November OAS meeting in Quito and last week's Ayacucho conference in Peru. This interaction between two equally controlled alternatives has created such a series of psychologically programmed responses around the split between Peru and Chile over the Ayacucho meeting that one member of Einaudi's staff observed, "Both sides were boxed."

While the hardline talks freely of the developing war — thereby increasing tensions — the softline cannot afford to let it be known that they are part of the Rockefeller plan. To have the "anti-imperialist" forces in Latin America publicly connected to Rockefeller would destroy both the story that the Peruvians are "revolutionary" and the straw-man target of self-publicized CIA activities in Chile. For this reason, various members of the softline who are presently working in the U.S. State Department have denied all knowledge "beyond what is in the papers" of steps towards war, when asked by IPS. Richard Bloomfield, head of Latin American Policy Planning, who just returned from Peru and Chile, denied that the U.S. government was even monitoring these developments. Bloomfield's trip was part

of a semi-secret tour by member of the Policy Planning Staff to precisely those countries that would be drawn into the conflict in some way: Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil. The key operative on these visits was Luigi Einaudi, the virtual founder of the "revolutionary" Peruvian dictatorship. IPS was told repeatedly that this tour had nothing to do with mounting tensions in the area.

We have since learned that the opposite is true, as Charles Frank of the same staff let slip to IPS that, while in Latin America, "We talked about it (the war) an awful lot, especially in Chile and Peru." Frank also revealed that Einaudi made a separate solo trip to Bolivia at the end of the tour, no doubt to calm down the Bolivians, who have shown themselves to be particularly worried about getting caught in the crossfire. When Sol Linowitz was informed that the connection had been established between Theberge's war-mongering and Frank and Einaudi's hushed activities in the planned war zone, he tried to smother the whole affair. "What we've got to do is stop peddling the thing, be quiet about it," he said. "There's no need to make a newspaper story out of this." He was urged to expose the fact that a war is being planned and that it must be stopped, but Linowitz tried to brush the reports aside as "rumors." "We have to verify these things," he said, to which IPS answered that with his expertise he should know better. "Even if I did, I don't have to tell you," pouted Linowitz. Finally, it was recommended that if he were serious about preventing a war, he should speak with Theberge and the Planning Staff. Connecting the two opposite hard/soft poles of Rockefeller's rigged game short-circuited Linowitz's composure, as he blurted, "I just spent all morning at the State Department, my friend, so I don't think I need any of your recommendations."

The softline of Einaudi's "new dialogue" and Linowitz's "radical" proposals, and the hardline of Theberge's red scare and Davis' CIA intrigues, are two features of a single operation controlled from the top by the Rockefeller Family.

II. The War Scenario

The Soviets and the Cubans have fallen into the Rockefeller trap of chosen either of the two alternatives presented, rather than exposing the entire set-up. Fidel Castro has gone so far as to compare Peru to Cuba and proclaim recently that Peru is the "second free territory of the Americas." The Soviets have sold Peru several hundred tanks in the last year after the U.S. refused to sell arms to Peru on reasonable terms, and Peru is now the only country besides Cuba to receive Soviet military assistance.

Rockefeller's success in trapping the socialist countries into backing the Peruvian junta has had two devastating effects. First, it renders Cuba and the USSR impotent to turn around the push for a new war. Second, it provides the perfect foil for hardliners like Theberge and the rabidly anti-communist rightwing regimes on the continent. Theberge, in particular, has been quoted in the Latin press as saying that the Soviets are supporting Peru in order to "reconquer lost positions," referring to the defeat the Soviets suffered when Allende was overthrown. The *New York Times* echoes the same red-baiting line and in a recent editorial accuses Velasco of letting himself be pushed around by "sycophants and Communists."

And then, of course, the Chileans complete the picture as Gustavo Leigh asserts that the friction between Chile and Peru is the work of "the international communist conspiracy" and that at the head of the pack is the USSR, which is waging an attack on Chile that is "today political, soon economic, and tomorrow military." Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa reinforced the entire picture when he threw a macho temper tantrum while in Lima and indulged himself by calling Pinochet a "hijo-de-puta" on Colombian radio.

As calculated psychological battering takes its toll on both the Chileans and Peruvians, sources close to both governments have expressed increasing fear that the other side is planning to launch an opening attack.

On Dec. 5 James Theberge was contacted by IPS and asked for his estimation of the war rumors. In response to questions about the imminent outbreak of war, Theberge replied, "Of course. The Peruvians are planning for a lightning strike against Chile." He elaborated by citing an article in the strategic studies journal of the Argentine military, *Estrategia*, by Peruvian Prime Minister General Mercado Jarrin which he characterized as "a scenario for a strike against Chile." He said that Peru was planning to strike quickly, securing its military objectives immediately, and then push for a settlement. This, Theberge continued, would avoid a war of attrition in which the U.S. could intervene and turn the balance by supplying arms to Chile. A swift move by Peru would also make it difficult for the OAS to intervene. And finally, Theberge pointed out that Mercado advocates using the Soviet Union as a "shield" or counterbalance against the "other superpower."

When asked for his evaluation of the scenario he had just described, Theberge replied that "the probability is rather high" that such a course of events will occur, characterizing the situations as "very serious." Theberge was asked by IPS how, his analysis was correct, would the Chileans and Peruvians, who have been expressing their respect for each other and their desire to avoid war, suddenly start fighting. Theberge replied: "That's not very difficult. They could create a border incident — dress up Peruvian soldiers in Chilean uniforms. It's no obstacle. This would be accompanied by a barrage of Peruvian propaganda." One of Theberge's "left" counterparts in the State Department, Charles R. Frank, saw things in much the same way when he was contacted by IPS Dec. 9.

He said that the Peruvians feel isolated in Latin America and that this together with "Chile's paranoia" is "just the kind of situation that leads to wars." The Peruvians, said Frank, "feel war is inevitable, and it might be better to have it earlier than later." He concluded that "the slightest thing could set it off." Frank echoed Theberge when asked about the Peruvians' motivation for attacking Chile: "There is lots of dissension in the Peruvian military — a war would pull the regime together." He added that Peru enjoys an enormous superiority of arms, and there is a "tremendous temptation to use them."

Most knowledgeable observers agree with Frank's general assessment of the relative balance of forces. Peru would seem to have military superiority in the air and on the ground, based on her 12 to 14 French Mirage jet fighters and recent

purchase of more than 200 Soviet tanks. This would more than offset what appears to be Chile's advantage at sea. Special mention has been made of Peru's tank capability because of war-mongering journalists' propensity for likening the desert territory on either side of the Chile-Peru border to the Sinai. Ecuador and Bolivia will probably not be significant in a strictly military sense given that their armed forces are quite small and their equipment for the most part obsolete. But their common borders with Peru would obviously be a significant factor if the conflict spread to other countries in the area.

The big question of course is whether or not Brazil and Argentina will become militarily involved and how the U.S. would react. There has been much speculation in the press, but given the several options open to the Rockefellers, it is certainly too early to say which contingency is most likely.

In the interview cited earlier, Charles Frank discussed the contingencies he foresaw. He said that "the feeling" was that if Peru attacked, they would take territory and there was no way to stop that. But, he added, they would probably not move much farther south than Arica. He estimated that in any event a war would create "50 years of tension," and would strengthen the Peruvian regime. Asked what the U.S. would do in the event war broke out, Frank insisted that the State Department has been trying to calm the situation, but there are "plans for every conceivable option."

Sources such as Frank and Theberge, as well as the writings of Latin American military strategists, indicate that the war would involve two criss-crossing axes: the conservative Brazil-Chile axis opposed to the "anti-imperialist" Argentina-Peru alliance. It is doubtful whether Brazil and Argentina would intervene, although reports have been published comparing their military capabilities.

The Road to Ayacucho: Psychological Warfare

On Dec. 5 it was reported in the international press that Cuban foreign minister Raul Roa had accepted an invitation from the Peruvian government to attend the commemoration of the battle of Ayacucho, to be held in Lima. As a formality, invitations of this sort are generally extended to other Latin American governments, although only the San Martinian and Bolivarian countries can participate in the summit meeting; Roa is to be merely an "observer" of the ceremonies. The next day Peruvian and Chilean officials in New York informed IPS that Chile's junta chief, Augusto Pinochet, had suddenly changed his plans and was not going to Lima, precisely because of Roa's presence. This reaction was immediately interpreted in international circles as a crisis in relations between the two governments.

Pinochet's retreat from Lima was no accident. It was the predicted reflex of a regime whose suspicions have been carefully cultivated into paranoia by a steady flow of rumors and counterrumors over the past year. The forces fomenting war knew very well beforehand that Chile's anti-Cuban hysteria would prevent Pinochet

from going to Lima; it is obvious that a conscious choice was made between a nonessential observer and a crucial participant at the Ayacucho conference. The intentions behind this choice are even more clear when seen in light of the fact that both Peruvian and Chilean officials had publicly claimed that Pinochet's trip to Lima would "prove" that rumors of a developing war were false. The opposite has been proved.

Both sides, aware that any sort of armed conflict would be a profound disaster and suspecting that they are being pushed into something, have tried to dismiss these war-rumors as fabrications of an irresponsible press. But the war-mongering reporters are mere conduits: The source of the rumors is irresponsible military strategists, particularly those writing in the strategic studies journal of the Argentine military, *Estrategia*.

Estrategia is the primary military-counterinsurgent publication in South America. Top U.S. CIA/Rand Corporation planners like Luigi Einaudi are regular contributors. Last March Argentine General Fernandez Cendoya published an article entitled "A Second War of the Pacific?" in which he discusses the possibility of a Peruvian "pre-emptive" attack on Chile, and the ramifications for other regional powers, especially Argentina and Brazil. Military officers throughout Latin America are quite familiar with this article, as they have indicated in discussions with IPS. Peruvian Prime Minister General Mercado Jarrin wrote on Peru's "strategic perspectives" in the spring issue of *Estrategia*. James Theberge, Latin American specialist on the Rockefeller Family's Commission on Critical Choices and a member of their Center for Inter-American Relations, told IPS that Mercado's article is essentially a "blueprint for a quick, limited war against Chile."

The other "document" that has supplied the "irresponsible press" with ammunition for its rumor mill is Theberge's own book, *Soviet Presence in Latin America*, published earlier this year. Theberge builds up Peru as a belligerent "leftist" regime and a foothold for "aggressive" Soviet intentions in the area.

The current press campaign actually began this past summer when Hernan Uribe, an exiled member of Allende's Unidad Popular, wrote in Mexico's *Excelsior* about mounting hostilities in Chile towards Peru. His article came in response to Chilean rightwing hysteria about an impending Soviet-sponsored invasion of Chile. The next major step in the campaign came out of the Caracas conference of the Sociedad Interamericana de la Prensa (SIP) in September. Eudocio Ravines of the Miami-based *Diario de las Americas* began a regular column of outrageous stories at that time. Peru's head of state Velasco publicly denounced Ravines' material as nothing but provocations; since the SIP conference there has been a steady flow of war rumors in SIP-affiliated newspapers.

A review of the actual events used as "facts" in this warmongering indicates clearly that both Peru and Chile are being set up. In July Peru moved its tank training school to the southern part of the country — a move seen by Ravines et al. as a mobilization along the border, in spite of the fact that the school's new location hundreds of miles from the frontier and the school consists of a few

World War II vehicles ill suited for combat. Also depicted as "border maneuvers" were routine reserve call-ups by both Chile and Peru at about the same time. The maneuvers were nowhere near the border.

In Paita, near Ecuador, the Soviets are building a fishing port for Peru, and it is well known that Polish and Soviet fishing vessels have contracts to fish in Peruvian waters. Ravines and others portrayed the port as a Soviet base and the fishing fleet as nothing less than the Red Navy! Knowing that Velasco could not resist new hardware for his army, and knowing that the Soviets could not resist giving military aid to such an "anti-U.S." regime, Peru was manipulated by hard U.S. terms into acquiring 250 new Russian tanks, adding even more fuel to the hysteria of the continent's rightwing.

At this point, Ravines "discovered" that Peru had an agreement with the Soviet airline Aeroflot that, in the event of an outbreak of war, Peru would nationalize the Russian airline's equipment. Since Aeroflot flies into Lima only once a week, its "equipment" amounts to a neon sign and a couple of baggage carts. While Ravines portrayed this as aid from the Soviet air force, the junta pointed out that this is a standard formality between all airlines and the Peruvian government.

As the tension mounted, the Bolivian government grew increasingly worried. Having lost their outlet to the sea as a consequence of the first War of the Pacific almost 100 years ago, the Bolivians are afraid of being pulled into another catastrophe. On Oct. 16 the Centro de Estudios Nacionales (CEN), the Bolivian military's think tank, published a report warning President Hugo Banzer of the "inevitable" war between Peru and Chile and the danger that the war would be fought on Bolivian soil. The report called for rapid rearmament "at any cost," accelerated economic development of basic industries, and strengthening of the political system. Clearly this report was taken very serious; less than three weeks later the military forced Banzer, through a coup and counter-coup, to disband his civilian cabinet and staff the executive with military personnel. Moreover, Bolivia is now embarked on a program of acquiring massive armaments. Not only is Bolivia now embarked on a program of rapidly acquiring arms, but the entire population has been militarized by making the everyone subject to conscription, with the alternative option of "civil service." The Peruvians quickly followed with a similar conscription law of their own.

By mid-November rumors of war were appearing in the press almost daily. Richard Gott, in the British daily *Manchester Guardian*, reported on the arms build-up and publicized the fact that the Bolivian coup was a direct consequence of these developments. He wrote that a Chilean pre-emptive strike is a possibility. At the same time, Argentina's largest newsweekly, *Panorama*, printed a major feature on the now infamous war, drawing the parallel with the situation in the Middle East and suggesting the possibility of U.S. intervention. A week later both Chile and Peru announced the purchase of submarines from Europe while Pinochet publicly claimed that the Soviet Union has military intentions against Chile. During the week of Nov. 26 top officials of the

Peruvian military visited Cuba, increasing Chile's anti-Soviet paranoia and prompting rumors that Raul Castro was urging Peru to invade Chile.

On Nov. 29 a major incident occurred with Mexico's breaking off relations with Pinochet's junta. Immediately before this Chile had gone through the agony of the OAS conference in Quito, in which its political isolation from the rest of Latin America was made very clear. Simultaneously, they were nearly expelled from the Andean Pact for not taking a sufficiently "anti-imperialist" stance against foreign investors. This was coupled with an intense propaganda campaign against the outmoded police-state style of the Chilean junta, a campaign still being conducted by CIA press agents like Seymour Hersh of the *New York Times* and Laurence Birns of David Rockefeller's Center for Inter-American Relations. Mexico's President Echeverria, in order to maximize psychological impact, waited until the precise moment that Chilean finance minister Leniz was in Mexico City for official talks to announce the breaking of diplomatic relations. According to the Mexican government, this was not due to any disagreements or "hostilities"; there was simply nothing more to say to the Pinochet regime, now that Mexico had secured safe-conduct for the remaining political refugees in its embassy in Santiago. Mexican Foreign Minister Rabasa simply noted that relations with Chile had "died a natural death" at which point the Chilean minister left in humiliation. Chile's generals were in a frenzy, realizing that Mexico's political leadership in Latin America could well cause a chain reaction completely cutting them off.

By the time Chile's diplomatic mission had returned to Santiago, a major piece in Brazil's *o Estado de Sao Paulo* by Mario Busch had appeared stating that "Russian imperialism" behind the Peruvians was the cause of all the tensions building up against Chile, adding to their fears that they were about to be amputated from the continent. Busch's sensationalistic, war-mongering article relied heavily and explicitly on material from Theberge's book. In Lima there occurred near-riots by "leftists" demonstrating against the expected visit of Pinochet. Chile was being provoked to lash out in blind fear against the Soviet "military menace."

The entire region was heating up. Bolivia papers warned about letting "frontiers languish in abandonment" at the same time that it was reported that Bolivia had purchased several troop and cargo planes. Ecuadorian President General Rodriguez Lara suddenly announced that he would also refuse to attend the Ayacucho conference because of "historic" border disputes with Peru — referring to territory lost in a war more than 30 years ago. The British weekly *Latin America* reported that Peru's new Minister of Agriculture, General Gallegos, is in fact a top U.S.-trained expert on bombing and air transport, and quoted him as referring to Chile as a tube which uses Peru as an escape valve when internal pressure is too great. As of the end of last week, hundreds of students were rounded up in Lima to try to prevent further anti-Pinochet demonstrations.

Thus the Ayacucho crisis must be viewed as the culmination of carefully orchestrated provocations

and psychological warfare. The news of Raul Roa's attendance at the Lima celebrations was simply the coup de grace for Pinochet.

It is critical to note that Peruvian behavior is being manipulated and programmed to the same degree as that of the other countries involved in this setup. The current resistance by the old bourgeoisie in Peru to modern fascist economic programs is being played up as a foreign rightwing conspiracy with connections to the Chilean oligarchy and, ultimately, to Pinochet. The CIA-controlled Maoist gangs behind the anti-Pinochet riots are making sure this connection is not lost on the public. The heaviest blow against Chile, however, was last week's "rightwing" assassination attempt against two of Peru's allegedly "pro-Soviet" generals — including Mercado Jarrin himself — the first terrorist actions against the Peruvian government in six years. This has seriously agitated anti-"rightwing" sentiments among the generals, the nationalist petit bourgeoisie, and peasant layers which, as Theberge suggests, could be turned against Chile.

Who Wants War?

Not only is it strikingly obvious that a war between Chile and Peru, with the likely involvement of Bolivia and Ecuador, would mean political and economic disaster for all participants, but the very actions of the Peruvians and Chileans indicate that they have made extraordinary efforts to avoid it. Official statements by both governments try to neutralize the onslaught of rumors by saying that relations between them are "very good," denying reports of war, and giving the impression that they are not worried. Representatives from both sides have told IPS that the campaign is being fomented by "external forces," and unofficially have indicated that they are extremely worried.

The lengths to which the two governments have gone to minimize apparent friction is exemplified by Peru's highly significant absence from the UN General Assembly in September at the precise moment that a vote was taken on a motion to censure Chile for torturing political prisoners. This absence was ostensibly because Peru believes in "nonintervention." Further, Peru was one of the few countries in Western Europe and Latin America that did not allow pro-Allende demonstrations to take place in observance of the anniversary of the September 1973 coup, nor has the Peruvian regime permitted figures from the defunct Allende government to stay in Peru and organize. Likewise, the government of Chile was avoided labeling Peru a haven for its enemies and has put pressure on its own national press to refrain from anti-Peruvian comments.

Throughout October and November military officials from both nations exchanged visits and cordialities. The Peruvian and Chilean chiefs of staff met at the border towns of Tacna and Arica Nov. 11 as a friendly gesture. A week later the Chilean ambassador to Lima stated it is "ridiculous" to speak of war, citing "family ties" between the two countries. November 26 Pinochet and Velasco met at the frontier and embraced like

old friends. A few days later Velasco intervened albeit unsuccessfully, to keep a major Peruvian political figure out of an ILO (International Labour Organization), inquiry into Chilean labor conditions. When the demonstrations broke out against Pinochet in Lima last week, Velasco ordered arrest and closed down the universities until January, while Peruvian General Victor Odisio impotently blamed "arms merchants" for fomenting friction. In early December Pinochet stated publicly that he would go to Lima, and a few days later Peru's air force chief General Gilardi went to Santiago to personally invite the head of the Chilean junta to Ayacucho.

The obvious conclusion is that the growing trend towards war has nothing to do with the specific politics of Peru and Chile and, furthermore, they are thus far impotent to stop the "external forces" that are fomenting hostilities.

The Peru-Chile dichotomy is an expression of the contrast of "hardline" and "softline" forces throughout Latin America, with Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Ecuador lining up with Chile, and Mexico, Venezuela, and Argentina with "radical" Peru. What is generally over-looked, however, is that the "anti-imperialist" Peruvian junta was trained in the United States and conceived from studies by the Rand Corporation and David Rockefeller's Center for Inter-American Relations (CIR). Peru has long been the CIR's exclusive laboratory, as indicated in studies of Peruvian "revolutionary nationalism" and "corporatism." For example, Luigi Einaudi is the top Rand Latin Americanist and is presently on the U.S. State Department Policy Planning Staff, which is part of — to use the words of another member of the staff — "the loose structure" of the National Security Council/CIA. According to a State Department biographical sketch, "Einaudi was guest lecturer at Peruvian National War College in 1971 and received Rockefeller Grant to study Marxism in Latin America in 1966." Thus Rockefeller makes sure Peru is capable of "meeting its foreign obligations."

Not only was Velasco himself trained at the CIA counterinsurgency school in the Panama Canal Zone, but top Rockefeller agents have been sent to Peru since the early 1960s to set up a model "radical" corporatist state. John Rawlings Rees, the founder of modern psychological warfare at Rockefeller's London-based Tavistock Institute, was a consultant to the military-patronized government on "educational reform" in 1962, the year of the growing peasant ferment led by Hugo Blanco. From 1962-64, William Foot Whyte, a top "labor relations advisor to (among others) the U.S. Labor Department," conducted "comparative behavior" studies on Peruvian workers, eventually setting up the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, which was funded by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, as well as the Pentagon. (See Appendix 3.)

The real difference between a regime like that of Velasco or Echeverria and the Pinochet junta is not a question of ideology, but rather of viability in the eyes of the Rockefeller interests. Chilean recognition of this fact was demonstrated by the Dec. 4 editorial of *El Mercurio* in response to Mexico's breaking of relations: "For all his

maneuverings during the years of his presidency, he (Echeverria) has not been able to erase his torturous political line. Before he became president, he was responsible for the death of a number of students which has still not been clarified, ordering that a crowd of unarmed youth in the Plaza of Three Cultures be fired upon (in 1968), repression he used again as Chief of State in the locality of Casco de Santo Tomas (1971)." The old oligarchy of Peru, fearing that it too may no longer be of service to Rockefeller forces, has likewise raised doubts as to Velasco's supposed "anti-imperialism" as a result of the recent trade deals with Japan. Another War of the Pacific would thus engage not "revolutionaries" versus "reactionaries," nor "pro-Soviets" against "pro-Americans," but rather those forces the Rockefellers see as viable in maintaining their interests in Latin America opposed to those deemed outmoded.

The political effects a war would have on the entire region indicate clearly the Rockefellers' total control of the situation and what they intend to accomplish. Military experts agree that northern Chile would quickly be overrun by the Peruvian army. Such a humiliating defeat would force the immediate ouster of Pinochet, and his probable replacement by a Christian Democrat coalition. The Brazilian military — which at this point is the only possible major source of arms for Chile — would be blamed domestically for an embarrassing "adventure," perhaps providing for an spark for ushering in a new softline government headed by the Movimento Democratico Brasileiro. The Ecuadorian generals would also get burned for allying themselves with Chile, and an anti-hardline change in government would almost certainly follow. The Bolivians are purging themselves even before the war starts. In contrast, Velasco would use the opportunity to solve his domestic troubles, emerging with an iron grip on Peruvian politics. The "Peruvianist" Anaya or Cargagno faction of the Argentine military would also be strengthened, a necessary precondition for replacing the conservative Lopez Rega-Isabelita duo. In short, virtually the entire Southern Cone of the continent would be politically remodelled in favor of modern, "softline," "anti-imperialist," corporatist regimes. As the counterinsurgent columnist Tristao de Athayde wrote in *Jornal do Brasil*, noting the political shakeups that follow in the wake of wars: "There are evils which may result in good. One of these is war....Portugal and Greece are models to emulate."

But all this is secondary to Rockefeller's long-awaited dream of a hemispheric security force to replace the woefully inadequate OAS. Not only would it protect the family's La Plata "development" projects, but with a police force like this, it doesn't matter how "progressive" a regime may become.

IV. Defusing Rockefeller's Time-Bomb

If the secret threats, rumors, promises, and deals by Rockefeller operatives are made public, the controlled and hostile environment on which the war scenario depends will evaporate. To undercut the entire hard/soft set-up all that is necessary is to expose the common Rockefeller control of both

sides — much as we have done in this brief. With sufficiently broad dissemination of that knowledge, the Rockefellers' entire game-plan would become exposed — *and therefore inoperative in that form.*

Such an exposure campaign immediately raises the question of the total Rockefeller strategy of which the Pacific War is merely a tactic. To do more than merely postpone such a war contingency, the countries of Latin America must launch a counteroffensive. The Trilateral World plan which calls for a new war is based on the Rockefeller cabal's determination to reduce the cost of worldwide production through the fascist "solution" or reducing by at least one billion the number of people world production must support, and of reducing drastically the standard of living of those who do not fall immediately into the category of "useless eaters." The Rockefeller Family's current stranglehold on the world food production, through near-total control of fertilizer and agricultural credit is the fundamental controlled aversive environment throughout the globe. This control can — and must — be broken through broad support for an alternate program for the immediate expansion of food production on a world scale to prevent genocide on a scale any more massive than the world has already suffered. The International Caucus of Labor Committees has formulated such a program and is now discussing it with embassies, food and other organizations of countries around the world. It is in those countries' immediate interests, it is in the immediate interest of the vast majority of the world's population, to rid themselves of the Rockefeller threat to their existence — a threat as ready to starve millions of human beings in the Fourth World as it is to trigger a bloody confrontation on the Latin American subcontinent.

Appendix A: Background of Top Rockefeller Latin American Strategists

Richard J. Bloomfield, Director of the Office of Policy Planning and Coordination of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. Softliner. MPA Harvard 1960. USCG 1945-46, USAF 1950-51. Class I career Foreign Service Officer. Previous assignments: La Paz 1952; Salzburg; 1954; Monterrey 1957; Montevideo 1960; Washington 1962-64; Deputy Director, Office of Regional Economic Policy, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs 1965; Country Director for Ecuador-Peru 1967 (immediately preceding the Peruvian coup); Rio de Janeiro, Economic Counselor and Associate Director AID 1968. Advanced economic studies, Harvard 1959 and 1971-72. Staff Director, National Security Council Interdepartmental Group for Inter-American Affairs. This is part of what Frank (below) terms the "loose" NSC/CIA structure.

Nathaniel Davis, Hardliner. He was a candidate for the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, but, despite backing from Kissinger, he lost to softliner Rogers (below). Best known as ambassador to Chile 1971-73 and field marshal of the overthrow of Allende. His Cold War training began in the infamous Russian Language and Area Studies Department of Columbia, currently headed by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Chairman of the Rockefellers' Trilateral Commission. His first as-

signments were on the Cold War front: Prague 1947-49, Florence 1949-52, Rome 1952-53; Moscow 1954-56; Soviet desk at State Department 1956-60. First post in Latin America was Caracas 1960-62; Peace Corps director in Chile 1962; special assistant to director of Peace Corps 1962-63; deputy associate director Peace Corps 1963-65. Back to the front, Bulgaria 1965-66. Senior staff member National Security Council 1966-68. Ambassador to Guatemala 1968-71. Other activities include chairman Inner City Childrens' and Youth Program of the National Capital Area Council of Churches 1958-59; member of Rockefellers' Council on Foreign Relations and Center for Inter-American Relations (below).

Luigi Einaudi, Top Latin American consultant to the Policy Planning Staff from the Rand Corporation. A founder of the modern counterinsurgent softline. Not only is he responsible for Kissinger's "new dialogue," but he was a crucial member on the Linowitz commission, whose report recommended "radical" departures from past U.S. policy. Joined Rand in 1962. Went to Peru in 1964 to "observe" the effects of the military's "civil action" programs on the peasants organized by Hugo Blanco. Einaudi was "guest lecturer" at the Peruvian war college in 1971, and he still maintains close ties with many military figures there, including Victor Villanueva — a Peruvian "radical" whom Einaudi refers to as a "Trotskyist." Einaudi should know, having received a Rockefeller Grant to study Marxism in Latin America in 1966. Villanueva is also known to have been sympathetic to Hugo Blanco.

Charles R. Frank, Jr. Policy Planning Staff member. Softliner; identifies with Linowitz-Einaudi line. Went on the recent tour as a development economics specialist. Ph.D. Princeton. Former consultant to Rockefeller-controlled World Bank. Professor at Princeton and Yale in economic development. From 1972-74 was Senior Fellow at Rockefeller's Brookings Institute. He has done "work on economic integration in Central America."

Sol M. Linowitz, Consultant. Major figure of soft-line faction. Chairman on Commission of U.S./Latin American Relations, which published report which called for ending sanctions against Cuba, halting U.S. military supply grants and military advisor missions, stopping "coersive measures" against countries that nationalize U.S. companies, and moving to normalize relations with Cuba, among other such "progressive" proposals. The Commission was sponsored by the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Linowitz was consultant to Office of Price Administration 1942-44; ambassador to OAS 1966-69; chairman of State Department Advisory Committee on International Organs 1963-66; head of the National Urban Coalition 1970. His activities include Chairman of Xerox Corporation, director of Time Inc., chairman of National Council of Foreign Policy Assn. He is a member of National Planning Assn., Council on Foreign Relations, and the Rockefeller-created Commission on Critical Choices. Trustee of Hamilton, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins universities. On board of directors of the CIR (below).

William D. Rogers. Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Softliner; member of the Linowitz commission. Graduate of Princeton and Yale. Special counsel and U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress 1962-63; deputy assistant administrator AID 1963-65; first president of the Center for Inter-American Relations; fellow of the

CIA "think tank" Hudson Institute; member of Council on Foreign Relations. Latin American advisor to George McGovern in 1972; advocated restructuring the OAS to include Cuba and not the U.S.

James D. Theberge, Hardliner. Director of Georgetown University's cold war Institute of Strategic and International Studies. Most recent book is *Soviet Presence in Latin America*, in which he builds up the threat of Soviet military intentions. In 1972, while Rogers was "advising" McGovern, Theberge published an attack on McGovern for his position on defense cuts. Yet both Theberge and Rogers are prominent members of David Rockefeller's CIR. Theberge is also the head of Latin American operations on the Commission on Critical Choices.

*Appendix B;
The Center for Inter-American
Relations*

Besides those listed in the text, listed below are a few of the members of the CIR:

Laurence Birns. Professor of sociology at New York's New School. Presently waging a campaign against Chile, supported by Seymour Hersh of the *New York Times*.

McGeorge Bundy. Major planner of the Vietnam war, top researcher for the Ford Foundation, and close associate of Allen Dulles, former director of the CIA.

John C. Campbell. Senior researcher on Council on Foreign Relations and advisor to the Trilateral Commission, the top Rockefeller international planning body.

Gardner Cowles. Head of Cowles Communications; former Domestic Director, Office of War Information.

Douglas Dillon. Former U.S. Treasurer; Chairman Rockefeller Roundation; Chairman, Brookings Institute.

George Franklin, Jr. North American Secretary of Trilateral Commission, Exec. Director of Council on Foreign Relations, former assistant to Nelson Rockefeller.

Lincoln Gordon. Ambassador to Brazil during 1964 coup.

J. Peter Grace, Jr. Head of AIFLD, the CIA's labor operation.

Katherine Graham. Publisher of the Washington Post, and observer on Trilateral Commission.

Francis Grimes. Vice President of Chase Manhattan; former special agent for the FBI.

Andrew Heiskell. Chairman of Time, Inc., his chief editor, Hedley Donovan, is a Trilateral Commission member.

Herman Kahn. Founder of the Hudson Institute think tank.

Edgar R. Kraiser. Head of Kaiser Steel, Kaiser Aluminum, Willys-Overland to Brasil, Industries Kaiser de Argentina; member of President's Missile Sites Labor Commission; Trilateral Commission member.

Charles A. Meyer. Known CIA operative; coordinator of Argentine and Brazilian coups.

Teodoro Moscoso. Author of "Operation Bootstrap" in Puerto Rico.

William S. Paley. Head of CBS; Columbia University trustee; former special agent with the OSS Psychological Warfare Department.

James A. Perkins. President of Cornell; Rand trustee; trustee of the Institute for Defense Analysis.

David Rockefeller

John D. Rockefeller III

Rodman Rockefeller

*Appendix C;
Background: Creation of the
Peruvian Regime*

John Rawlings Rees, founder of the Tavistock Institute of London, was in Peru in 1962 as a consultant on "education reform." Intelligence research and ground-breaking psychological warfare led to Tavistock's creation of MI-5 (British Intelligence) and the Office of Strategic Services, predecessor to the CIA. Tavistock was funded by the Rockefellers in the 1930s and after the Second World War it was bought outright by the Rockefeller family. Rees then created the World Institute for Mental Health, which he headed until his death in 1968. The *Campaigner*, theoretical journal of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, has extensively documented the brainwashing and psychological profiling activities of Rees and the WIMH.

William Foot Whyte was in Peru from 1962-64 conducting "comparative behavior" studies on Peruvian workers, with Peruvian government authority. He tested workers' "reactions to supervision" to see if he could obtain "positive impulses" from them when they were given psychological means of identifying with their work. Whyte concluded that Peruvian workers need "understanding supervision" through co-participation. To this end he set up the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, which was funded by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, as well as the Pentagon. Whyte is director of Cornell's Department of Organizational Behavior, as well as a veteran of Kurt Lewin's National Training Laboratories. He owes his corporatist views to Lewin, as he admits. Whyte is also a consultant to the U.S. Department of Labor.