

Brzezinski pushes 'limited sovereignty' in Nicaraguan crisis

Two weeks of the brutal extermination campaign by Nicaragua's National Guard and mercenary forces to suppress the armed uprising of the population against the oppressive Somozan regime have left an estimated toll of 5,000 dead, and 30,000 homeless refugees in camps in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Honduras. Despite U.S. press reports that the situation is "quiet," Nicaraguan National Guardsmen under the prevailing martial law continue to execute any young men suspected of being Sandinista guerrillas.

While Latin American countries are condemning the brutality of the Somoza regime, the United States, under National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, is cynically attempting to maneuver the Nicaraguan situation toward some form of unilateral "outside intervention," to establish a clear precedent for Brzezinski's doctrine of "limited sovereignty."

Cuban Foreign Minister Isidore Malmierca denounced the Somozan regime as an outlaw nation before the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 26, calling on that body to condemn the Somozan government, reject the credentials of its delegation to the UN, and cut off all economic and military aid to the regime in response to the mercenary-backed "genocide" now taking place in that nation.

Malmierca's charges of "genocide" were echoed by Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez and Mexican Foreign Minister Santiago Roel in statements issued last week. Latin American press sources have reported that the Venezuelan government is now considering bringing the Nicaraguan crisis before the UN Security Council, in response to the failure of the Organization of American States (OAS), Latin America's U.S.-dominated body, to take even a formally strong stand against the genocide.

Panamanian Vice Foreign Minister Carlos Ozores Typaldos foreshadowed a new dimension to the Nicaraguan crisis in an address to the UN General Assembly Sept. 27. Typaldos reported that his government has received "reliable information" that "international arms traffickers" are deliberately reactivating the Honduras-El Salvador conflict in order to distract public attention from the "deplorable" Nicaraguan crisis — a clear, if undefined reference to Israel. Israel's role in upsetting the military balance between these two hostile nations

throughout the 1970s had been so blatant that even the Rand Corporation took note of it in a 1977 report profiling the Latin American military and arms sales to the area.

Denunciations of the Israeli role as the major weapons supplier to the Somozan war machine continued to be issued in Mexico last week, including a statement by the official representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to Mexico. The pressure resulting from extensive documentation published in Mexico on the Israeli interventionist role throughout Latin America forced the Israeli ambassador to Mexico, Saul Rosolio, to acknowledge last week Israel's weapons sales to the outlaw Somozan government. Rosolio, however, told the Mexican daily



Uno Mas Uno that he did not understand what "all the noise" was about; "a few machine guns" will not determine the battle!

U.S. intervention precedent set

In contrast to the growing condemnations against genocide, U.S. policy toward the region stands clearly on record now as a cynical effort to ensure the continuation of the Somozan machinery, with or without Anastasio himself, in order to deliberately prolong the conflict in the area. National Security Council advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's strategy, on which present U.S. foreign policy is based, is to allow the Nicaraguan crisis to continue until Latin America bends to strict adherence to the principles of nonintervention, and capitulates to U.S. demands to impose a "regional" solution.

Brzezinski himself, quoted in the *Washington Post* Sept. 22, affirmed that the goal of U.S. policy in the Nicaragua crisis was to achieve "mediation" by Nicaragua's "friends and neighbors." Brzezinski indicated his support for "Somozismo" — if not Somoza himself — when he defined mediation as "some process of political accommodation to create resolution of the differences that led to the dispute."

The result, from Brzezinski's British-oriented standpoint, will be the establishment of the dangerous precedent of limited sovereignty, and the imposition of *supranational* solutions to any future regional crisis.

In practical terms, establishing such a precedent would provide Brzezinski with the ability to manipulate or trigger "crises" — even regional war — at will. This would create the pretext for outside intervention to effect changes in the internal policies of governments of any nation or group of nations targeted. South America — particularly the southern cone region — is a potential tinderbox of long-standing border and territorial disputes which, as detailed in the 1975 Rand Corporation scenario for a second "War of the Pacific" conflict, if triggered could produce a chain reaction leading to regional war.

The U.S. proposal to last week's OAS Special Meeting of Consultations, convened to consider the Nicaraguan crisis, explicitly called for regional "mediation" into the conflict. U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, speaking for the U.S. at the meeting, began by stating that the "reports" of "mass arrests and detentions, torture and even indiscriminate killing of civilians" should be "investigated fully." His recommendation came after Mexican Foreign Minister Roel had already characterized the Nicaraguan situation as perhaps the worst case of "filicide" ever in the region. Christopher then called for the "good offices of concerned governments" to be offered the chance to mediate between the "government of Nicaragua and the opposition groups within Nicaraguan society to help find an enduring and democratic solution."

A happy *Washington Post* immediately noted in a Sept. 27 editorial the implied foot-in-the-door for limited sovereignty. "With the U.S. quietly leading the way," the *Washington Post* commented, "the OAS is trying to manage the process of Nicaraguan political change."

Despite the *Washington Post's* eagerness, U.S. intervention proposals have thus far been roundly rejected by most Latin American nations, and particularly bluntly by Brazil and Mexico. The resolution supporting mediation was voted down by the Organization of American States. In fact, the only official acceptance of the U.S. proposal at this time has come from General Somoza himself, who gladly offered to have a "dialogue" with some of the opposition, providing that the "good offices" utilized are not those of Mexico or Venezuela — but only Argentina, Chile, Bolivia or the U.S.!

The U.S. policy is a prescription for continuing crisis — with all the regional and continental consequences. Somoza's extermination campaign has not pacified the country — and cannot. Representatives of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, constituting the armed leadership of the majority of popular forces, have announced that their forces are still intact, despite the two week National Guard campaign, and their present retreat is merely tactical, to be followed soon by a second offensive.

The saner forces in the U.S. should note the prescription of the Mexican proposal to the OAS: "Winning the peace" in Nicaragua will require the "feeding and development of the peoples" — not the "trafficking with war."

Latin Americans denounce interventionism

Despite pressure from the United States, leading Latin American nations have firmly rejected any approach to the Nicaraguan crisis which would tend to legitimize the Brzezinskian doctrine of "limited sovereignty." Key statements by Latin American leaders follow.

Mexico

Mexican Foreign Minister Santiago Roel, addressing the Sept. 21-22 Organization of American States meeting in Washington:

... The existing situation in the Republic of Nicaragua ... has endangered the peace of the region and gravely disturbed the tranquility of the border zone between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. ...

In the last days, reliable reports from diverse sources have called attention to indiscriminate attacks on the civilian population, producing a holocaust in which women, youths and children have been victims, bordering on filicide without precedent in regional history.