
STATE DEPARTMENT STRATEGY

Kirkpatrick pushes Latin America toward military and economic disaster

by Cynthia Rush

Jeane Kirkpatrick, the United States ambassador to the United Nations, toured South America last week in a brazen attempt to line up the continent behind the doctrine of strategic confrontation now dominating U.S. foreign policy. Kirkpatrick, a right-wing social democrat whose close collaborators include Jesuit solidarist Michael Novak and U.N. aide Carl Gerschman from Social Democrats U.S.A., made two explicit policy recommendations during her stop-overs in Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Ecuador.

First she invited the armies of South America's southern cone to join the United States in militarily combating "Soviet and Cuban expansionism" in Central America. Though this proposal is not new—emissaries for Kirkpatrick and Alexander Haig have traveled to South America over recent months to quietly promote the plan—Kirkpatrick's rabid statements on its behalf during her trip are a signal that the Reagan administration intends to pursue it as official policy.

Second, Kirkpatrick also publicly endorsed Milton Friedman's Chilean "economic miracle" which has ravaged that country's once-productive human and economic resources. Chile's economic recovery "has been an enormous success," she stated in Chile's capital, Santiago, "and the whole world knows it or should know it . . . I see no symptoms of a recession here."

The sole purpose of Kirkpatrick's trip was to create the necessary conditions for implementation of these proposals. The nature of the Central American conflict makes this point emphatically. Kirkpatrick is really asking the southern cone armies to fight an insurgency which her close political allies in the international social democracy have intentionally created. The purpose of pulling in the southern cone armies is not to "win" anything but to create a unified military apparatus—a virtual extension of NATO—that can be deployed on behalf of administration policy anywhere on the continent, or even the world.

The success of the U.N. ambassador's trip was ironically sealed in Brazil, a country she *did not* visit, but where the ouster of Presidential Minister Golbery do Couta e Silva paved the way for lining up the continent behind this confrontationist policy. The Aug. 11 an-

nouncement by the Colombian government that it will send troops to participate in the Sinai peacekeeping force—something Kirkpatrick and Haig have been trying to force Argentina to do—is also an immediate result of Kirkpatrick's trip.

In every one of her stops in Latin America, Kirkpatrick shrilly reiterated that the Soviet Union and Cuba were threatening "hemispheric security."

After meeting with Chile's Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Ernest Videla on Aug. 7, she announced to the press that "the Soviet Union first conquered Cuba and has now moved its beachhead to Central America, threatening important food and energy centers." She urged southern cone nations to band together, "despite your cultural differences," to halt Soviet subversion in Central America. In Peru on Aug. 11, the U.N. ambassador vowed that the United States would be willing to aid "any nation" threatened by Soviet and Cuban expansionism, and proceeded to list all the countries of Central America plus Colombia as targets of Cuba and the Soviet Union.

Minister Videla delightedly reported that the United States and Chile "coincide absolutely" on the need to combat communism in Central America—a fact underscored by the presence in Honduras of Chile's foreign minister to arrange military aid for that country. To cement its newfound alliance with the United States—one that reversed the last eight years of U.S. policy toward Chile—the Pinochet government announced that Mrs. Pinochet will soon travel to Washington to inaugurate an art exhibit. In return, U.S. Vice-President George Bush will make an official visit to Chile at the end of this year.

This alliance will consist of more than polite visits, however. The Chilean "economic miracle" is to become the basis of U.S. economic policy toward Latin America. Two months ago, Kirkpatrick colleague J. W. Mendenhoff, U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States, told a group of Miami businessmen that the United States must promote adoption of the Chilean and Jamaican "free-enterprise" models in the rest of Latin America. And just before Kirkpatrick left on tour, her cothinker David Rockefeller announced that he would

use his new creation—the Americas Society—to extend Friedmanite economic policy throughout the continent.

Removing obstacles

Not all the countries of Latin America responded with the same enthusiasm as the Chileans, however. As far back as February of this year, when Haig sent envoy Vernon Walters to Latin America to drum up support for his “Soviets are taking over Central America” thesis, the Brazilian government pointedly rebuffed Walters and stated that it would prefer to rely on its own embassies in Central America as sources of information on the region. Itamaraty, Brazil’s foreign ministry, stated at that time that the government would adhere to a policy of strict “nonintervention in the internal affairs of other countries.”

The political coup that took place last week against the chief architect of Brazil’s noninterventionist policy, Presidential Minister Golbery, was an obvious attempt to alter that country’s strategic alignment (see p. 34).

The more immediate question that arises is how the Golbery removal will affect the strategic alignment of

other Latin American nations, most notably Argentina. Argentine President Roberto Viola and Foreign Minister Oscar Camilión publicly oppose Argentina’s military involvement in Central America. But extreme right-wing military factions that *do* favor participation in Central America as an extension of the proposed South Atlantic Treaty Organization—SATO—could feel sufficiently strengthened by Brazilian developments to force the government to line up behind Washington.

Last week’s Bolivian coup may also be a plus for the advocates of strategic confrontation, although the smoke still hasn’t cleared after the ouster of Gen. Luis García Meza. Rather than pursuing any serious policy changes, the coup appears primarily to have been a face-lifting operation to remove the stigma of drug-trafficking from the junta. To date, the junta’s overt involvement in cocaine-trafficking has prevented its official recognition by the Reagan administration.

A “clean” Bolivian government, finally made respectable by U.S. diplomatic recognition, could be an additional asset for Ambassador Kirkpatrick and Secretary Haig.

Who is Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick?

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick is a prime example of “right-wing” Socialist International penetration of the Reagan administration. She and her husband Evron are close to Social Democrats U.S.A., a branch of the Socialist International, and Ambassador Kirkpatrick is listed on the advisory board of another Socialist International organization, the League for Industrial Democracy, housing both “right-wing” and “left-wing” socialist agents. Before she entered the Reagan administration, with help from National Security Adviser Richard Allen, Kirkpatrick worked with Senators Daniel Moynihan and Henry Jackson and leaders of the AFL-CIO in the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, a grouping disingenuously billed as a conservative Democratic alternative to George McGovern’s left-wing takeover of the party.

Kirkpatrick’s appointment was reportedly based on an article she wrote for the November 1979 issue of *Commentary* magazine. Entitled “Dictators and Double Standards,” the article drew the distinction between “moderately repressive regimes” such as Anas-

tasio Somoza’s in Nicaragua, and “totalitarian” ones such as the Soviet Union, and urged the United States to make common cause with the former against communism and consider the Soviet Union its primary adversary. Beneath the anticommunist rhetoric, Kirkpatrick’s writings defend a more insidious premise: that the vast majority of the world’s nations can have neither democratic governments nor significant economic development, and that the United States should abandon its concern for both objectives.

Kirkpatrick’s outlook stems from her admiration for Viennese logical positivist Sir Karl Popper, the successor to “New Dark Age” advocate Bertrand Russell as head of Britain’s Aristotle Society. Popper is best known for his ideological tracts equating Platonism with “totalitarianism,” and for his defense of Aristotle’s bestial pragmatism. He is also a founder of the Mont Pelerin Society, the organization created for high-level operations by the international “black nobility.”

Kirkpatrick’s allegiance to Popper was demonstrated in her recent participation in founding the Committee for the Free World. The committee claims Popper as its ideological godfather and intends to use its anticommunist cover to continue his battle against Neoplatonic science. Addressing the group’s first meeting in February 1981, Kirkpatrick vowed to use her U.N. ambassadorship to “pursue a parallel political course.”