

ently share the same telephone number in Miami, and EIR has reason to suspect they are coordinating their activities. Since the Cubans United rag-tag flotilla of boats also managed to pass through the U.S. Coast Guard's normally tight blockade undetected, it is likely that word came from higher up to let the boats through.

On Aug. 20 Radio Moscow charged that the exile group's plans to land on Guantanamo—plans that finally never materialized—were a provocation planned as part of the Ocean '81 maneuvers that were taking place in the vicinity of Cuba.

Kirkpatrick and Haig's collusion with convicted criminals is not the most important aspect of the Cuban policy now under discussion. According to a spokesman for Freedom House, an adjunct of Social Democrats U.S.A. that works closely with Kirkpatrick, the real core of the policy that the Reagan administration is expected to adopt this month will be to force Cuba to "negotiate" with the United States using the island's worsening economic crisis as a major bargaining chip.

Cuba can be softened up, the line goes, through a combination of measures that include outright sabotage of its economy—the U.S. Department of Commerce is currently preparing a detailed profile of the Cuban economy requested by the administration—and an intensified campaign of domestic subversion and destabilization through vehicles such as a new "Radio Free Cuba" program. "The greatest threat that Castro faces right now is a domestic one," a Freedom House representative reported, "not one of foreign imperialism." Presuming that the Soviet Union is passive while all this occurs, the social-democratic policymakers in Haig and Kirkpatrick's circles predict that if Cuba resists negotiating with the United States for aid and trade concessions, additional "penalties" can be applied.

What is Cuba to gain from such negotiations? If it is lucky, say Jeane Kirkpatrick's friends at Freedom House, it can follow the lead of former British possessions Jamaica, Barbados, and Trinidad in becoming model Hong Kongs and Singapores: that is, labor-intensive "free-enterprise zones" whose economies are intimately linked to the international drug trade. This scheme, also known as "Hong Kong West," is enthusiastically endorsed by Haig and by Ronald Reagan's National Security Adviser Richard Allen.

The Freedom House crowd feels that when Trinidad, Barbados, and Jamaica become "showcases for development" and "leaders" in the Caribbean, they will be able to integrate Cuba into the system, or at least curb its expansionist tendencies. The Commerce analyst currently studying Cuba's economy adds that "Cuba has no choice but to adopt the Singapore/ Hong Kong model. . . . Its labor force is growing too rapidly, and can't be employed. They will need labor-intensive industries to employ people, and export the goods produced."

Documentation

From EIR's briefing on Central America

On Aug. 26, 1981, EIR's Latin American intelligence director Dennis Small addressed a select audience of business executives, government officials, and diplomats in the latest of EIR's ongoing seminar series in Mexico City. His topic: Central America. What he had to say was the next morning's front page news. The coverage in El Sol, the largest nationwide chain of papers in Mexico, highlighted the following paragraphs:

"Small emphasized that there is a fall scenario prepared by the Socialist International and the U.S. Secretary of State Haig, to have violence break out in the Central American region before Oct. 22. 'They intend,' he said, 'to throw the left against the right in the six countries of the area. From here to October there will be leftist insurrections and preventive coups from the right. Haig's purpose is not to install governments friendly to the U.S. but to depopulate the region.'"

Following are excerpts from Small's presentation in Mexico City. Transcripts of the groundbreaking March 26 EIR conference in Washington, D.C., "The U.S., Mexico, and Central America: Conflict or Cooperation?" are available for \$100 each from EIR, Department M-3, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th floor, New York, N.Y. 10019.

My intent today is neither to catalogue all of Central America's problems nor to list the various and sundry guerrilla operations in El Salvador. These are well known. What I do want to analyze is who is behind all this and why they are doing it. Who? and Why?: two questions generally given either tremendously naive or simply deceitful answers.

I'll be precise: U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig is a liar. He is lying right now about responsibility for the Central American problem. Since late 1980 and again in the State Department's White Paper, Haig has told us that the Cubans and Russians cause the Central American problem. . . .

I'm not saying that the Cubans aren't in there; they are obviously there making trouble in Central America. They are following policies inimical to the economic and political development of the Central American peoples. Nor do I deny that there is some direct Soviet presence or influence. I would be quite surprised and we would be

quite naive to think that the KGB or other Soviet intelligence forces were not involved in Central America and all over the world.

But Alexander Haig lies in saying that that is all that is going on there, that the communists are responsible for the Central American problem.

Who?

The fact is that two other forces are primarily responsible for the Central American mess. One is the Socialist International presided over by Willy Brandt of the West German Social Democracy. The other is the Society of Jesus, that anti-Christian faction inside the Catholic Church which is organizing insurrections all over the Third World. The networks deployed by the Socialist International and by the Jesuits are the networks which have caused most of today's unrest in Central America. Running the whole business from above, controlling the Socialist International *and* controlling the Jesuits are the huge oligarchic financial interests based in the European oligarchy. I'm talking about the old noble families of Italy, Germany, and France, such as the Pallavicinis, Savoyes, Hapsburgs—well remembered in Mexico—and the financial institutions which this oligarchic group controls. I'm speaking of the Wall Street banks, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and so on. This apparatus is what is controlling from above *both the left and the right* in Central America. Our problem is that there are many honest people caught up on both sides of the conflict, honest but manipulated people. . . .

Mexico and Central America have recently received extremely important visits from people with capabilities of activating left-wing networks to promote insurrection. One of the tours was by the new French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson, who went to Mexico for the foreign ministers' meeting at Cancún and then traveled through Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica before returning to Mexico. He spoke with the Central American leaders of the Socialist International, bringing them the orientation which had been worked out by the Socialist International in their quite public, quite open, December 1980 conference in Washington, D.C. . . .

Willy Brandt, whose well-known habits would name him "Willy Brandy," appeared on U.S. television one Sunday morning and said to the nation, "Sure, the Socialist International is financing guerrillas in Central America—why not? If there's an unjust situation there, why not admit that Socialist International funds go for that?" That is what Brandt said on television. So, we aren't talking about some secret or hidden conspiracy. We are dealing with publicly declared policies.

At the same time, Haig and U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick have taken care of activating the right-wing side of the imbroglio. It is worth emphasizing that Haig

and Kirkpatrick are both social democrats. Mrs. Kirkpatrick is a right-wing social democrat; she belongs to the same international organization as Willy Brandt, but on the rightist side. Alexander Haig is also tied to the same social-democratic circles. . . .

Why?

We can analyze the why in terms of short- and medium-term objectives. The short-term target is the Cancún summit this October. The medium-term objective is to consolidate such drastic depopulation policies in the region that I give them the scientific name of *genocide*, which is the scientific term to describe what is going to happen in Central America should these gentlemen have their way. What the forces deployed by the international financial oligarchy are seeking so far as Cancún is concerned is to strengthen the hand of the International Monetary Fund. . . .

The medium-term goal of the people who are planning the explosion of Central America should give you a good idea of how crazy they actually are. It is the *depopulation* strategy. The oligarchic financiers put forth the following argument: given that there are not sufficient resources to support the growing world population, if population continues growing at its present rate or even a little slower, we are not going to have the raw materials and natural resources needed to keep all these people alive. Therefore, our problem is that population growth—and even absolute size of the population—must be reduced.

These people are saying word for word the same thing as the IMF. They want to wipe out billions of human beings as a matter of economic policy, *not* because of any resource shortage. Jacques de Larosière, the IMF director, declared a week ago that the biggest problem that the developing countries have is that they haven't succeeded in reducing their populations. He said that one of the conditionalities the IMF puts on its loans is that the countries getting them have to cut their population growth rate. . . .

The program of the Socialist International, the program of the State Department, and the program of the International Monetary Fund are identical. . . . This is the bestial, antihuman genocidal mentality of the men who are today controlling Central American destabilization. They do not support communism; they do not support authoritarian military regimes; they don't care whether something is socialism, communism, fascism, rightism; they could care less. What they really want is to manipulate both right and left to provoke civil war and chaos in which they can implement their only true policy—creating the requisite conditions for repeating the 14th-century depopulation of Europe in which half of the population was eliminated because the ravaged economy could support no more people.

Commentary on the French-Mexican move

The following are excerpts from the communiqué issued by the governments of France and Mexico on Aug. 28, 1981 recognizing the Farabundo Martí Liberation Front and the Revolutionary Democratic Front of El Salvador as "representative political forces."

The Mexican foreign minister, Mr. Jorge Castañeda, and the French foreign minister, Mr. Claude Cheysson, exchanged opinions on the existing situation in Central America.

Both ministers expressed their governments' grave concern for the suffering of the Salvadoran people in the current situation, and [stated] that this is a source of potential danger for the peace and stability of the entire region. . . .

We hereby make the following declaration:

Convinced that it is the sole responsibility of the people of El Salvador to seek a just and lasting solution to the country's profound crisis. . . .

Conscious of our responsibility as members of the international community and inspired by the principles and purposes expressed in the United Nations Charter;

Taking into account the extreme gravity of the current situation in El Salvador and the need for fundamental change in that country's economic, political, and social structures, we recognize that the alliance of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front and the Revolutionary Democratic Front is a representative political force willing to assume the obligations and exercise the rights derived therefrom. It is therefore fitting that the alliance participate in the creation of the mechanisms of rapprochement and negotiation required for a political solution to the crisis.

We acknowledge that it is the task of the Salvadoran people to begin the process of a global political solution in which a new internal order will be established, the armed forces will be restructured, and the necessary conditions will be created to [guarantee] respect for the popular will expressed through truly free elections and other mechanisms characteristic of a democratic system.

We call on the international community so that, particularly in the framework of the United Nations, it will ensure the protection of the civilian population in accordance with applicable international norms, and facilitate rapprochement between the representatives of the battling Salvadoran political forces to re-establish peace in the country and avoid all interference in El Salvador's internal affairs.

Below are excerpts of U.S. State Department responses to the Mexican-French communiqué, made on Aug. 28 1981:

The French-Mexican letter is unhelpful . . . but it is not a complete disaster. We praise the document's expression of concern for the Salvadoran people, and [El Salvador's] right to self-determination.

And on Aug. 31, 1981: We continue to hope that all groups willing to renounce violence will choose to participate in elections.

We would regard it as regrettable if the declaration had the effect of encouraging the left not to participate in elections. As for those who refuse to lay down their arms, we are on record in our view that violence of any kind is a major obstacle to the development of the political process and the quest for social justice in El Salvador.

José Napoleon Duarte, president of the Salvadoran junta, told Associated Press on Aug. 29, 1981:

The Mexico-French declaration constitutes nothing more than interference in the internal affairs of our country. We categorically reject and energetically protest it. . . . This type of attitude contributes to sharpening our conflict by increasing the level of foreign interference. . . . This has been the work of Castro.

Venezuelan President Luis Herrera Campins responded to the Mexican-French communiqué on Sept. 1:

The decision taken by the governments of these friendly nations strikes us as very grave, and we are sincerely worried. . . . This came as a surprise and we have called in the Mexican and French ambassadors in Caracas to ask for an explanation on the scope of their governments' declaration which appears [to us] to be intervention. . . .

Since we are opposed to any intervention by the United States in El Salvador, we also oppose any hemispheric or extrahemispheric [intervention]. . . . I hope that the Latin American nations express their feeling that the serious conflict can be resolved by the Salvadoran people. . . . Venezuela's policy is characterized by independence, multilateralism, and respect for the self-determination of peoples.

Fidel Castro, president of Cuba, told the Nicaraguan magazine Barricada on Aug. 31:

I consider the recognition by Mexico and France of the Salvadoran revolutionary movement as one that is capable of assuming responsibilities, to be very positive, good and just. . . . It is an action that ennobles Mexico and France.