

Mexico gets the Panama treatment from lunatic U.S. Senate

by D.E. Pettingell

After months of complaining about the lack of “action” in the War on Drugs, the U.S. Senate decided to get tough and demand that Mexico surrender its sovereignty if she wishes to be “certified” by these new self-appointed world judges. The Senate overwhelmingly passed a resolution April 14 to punish Mexico with economic sanctions, supposedly for Mexico’s lack of cooperation in the war on drugs. By a vote of 63 to 27, the Senate withdrew the “certification” of Mexico by President Reagan as a nation “fully cooperating” with U.S. efforts against drugs.

If the House of Representatives votes to “decertify” Mexico, as it is expected to do in the following days, Mexico will become the first nation to be slapped in the face with the aggressive law since it was enacted in 1986. Known as the Anti-Drug Act, the legislation demands the slashing of 50% of foreign aid to any country that the President does not “certify” by March 1, as “fully cooperating” in the anti-drug efforts. U.S. representatives to international financial organizations are also obliged to vote against new loans to those countries. Congress, in turn, has 45 legislative days to revoke the “certification” if it wishes to.

But the Senate vote has nothing to do with Mexico’s “bad” performance on the drug fight. In fact, Mexico has 25,000 military troops and about a thousand policemen devoted to the war on drugs, day and night.

Political analysts in Mexico are correctly predicting that the Senate vote is the prelude to an aggressive offensive to give Mexico the “Panama treatment.” The same group of “Project Democracy” senators who instigated the war on Panama have now launched the “get Mexico” campaign.

The beginning of the “Panamization” of Mexico confirms that Washington’s foreign policy has gone insane. The administration’s so-called War on Drugs is having no effect on saving the United States from drowning in drugs, but it

has turned into a weapon to force nation after nation, from Panama and Mexico to Colombia and Peru, to give up their sovereignty, their national institutions, and their own judicial system, if they wish to be “certified.”

In the summer of 1986, *EIR* warned that after Panama, the secret government’s Project Democracy—thus far mainly identified with selling arms to Khomeini—would target Mexico. We said that Project Democracy’s plans would be to try to discredit Mexico’s institutions in the eyes of the world as infested by drug-related “endemic” corruption . . . as they did with Panama. This would give the green light to the Washington-run “opposition” forces and narco-terrorists, namely the National Action Party of Mexico, to create chaos within Mexico, . . . as happened in Panama. The United States would then have an excuse to intervene militarily, and seal the border to “prevent violence from spilling over.” The militarization of the 2,000-mile U.S.-Mexican border, with American troops pulled out from Western Europe, is part of the New Yalta scenario agreed upon by Moscow and the Eastern Establishment (see article, page 46).

Sovereignty, the issue

“No one wants to take away Mexican sovereignty,” Sen. Alfonse D’Amato lied during the lengthy debate. But we do want Mexico to “allow our Air Force, our Navy, or our Coast Guard, to pursue those drug smugglers inside Mexican air space” the corrupt Republican senator from New York went on.

Allowing U.S. aircraft in Mexican territory in “hot pursuit” of drug planes is one of the concessions the Senate wants Mexico to make. “The Mexican government has turned down a U.S. request for unrestricted access to Mexican airspace,” said Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Calif.), the author of the resolution, to point out Mexico’s alleged “lack of cooperation.”

The other demand by the United States is to allow U.S. law enforcement officials to take over the probe of the 1985 murder in Mexico of Drug Enforcement Administration special agent Enrique Camarena. And finally, the United States wants her officials to be allowed to go inside Mexico and "verify" eradication statistics. "We do not know whether what they are spraying is, in fact, the kind of chemical that is supposed to achieve the killing of marijuana plants or whether it is simply water," Wilson viciously claimed.

But Mexico has rejected all three demands for what they are: pretexts for intervention. Mexico has provided the United States with a full and comprehensive report on the results of Mexico's war on drugs.

Mexico has told the United States that one-fourth of Mexico's 100,000 troops have conducted 22 permanent eradication and interdiction operations since 1982. The most successful is "Operation Condor" in Mexico's Golden Triangle, the drug area of Chihuahua, Durango, and Sinaloa. Mexico's Defense Minister, Gen. Juan Arevalo Gardoqui, recently stated that in the past five years his troops have destroyed 38,352 hectares of poppies and 39,176 of marijuana. Over 5,000 kilos of cocaine have been confiscated at clandestine airstrips. He reminded the United States that 499 Mexican lives have been lost in the war.

The above statistics do not include the achievements by Mexico's attorney general's office, the agency in charge of the national anti-drug program. The attorney general's office figures show that in 1987, there was a dramatic increase of eradication and confiscation efforts. Cocaine seizures were up by 75%, over 9,000 kilos of cocaine were confiscated; opium-derivative seizures increased by 12%, marijuana eradication by 26%, that is, 3,750 hectares were destroyed. In 1987, Mexico increased its fleet of spray helicopters by 50% over 1984, while \$18 million of the attorney general's annual budget, close to 60%, was spent in the effort.

The figures for the first four months of 1988 are even more dramatic: 11,942 poppy plants have been destroyed over a surface of 1,069 hectares and 4,557 marijuana plants over 544 hectares. Mexico's Federal Police confiscated a total of 641 vehicles—including trucks, vans, and cars; 12 airplanes and 9 boats, the latter confiscated by the Mexican Navy. Over 1,000 firearms have been confiscated and four cocaine laboratories dismantled in the first months of 1988.

Drug kingpins Rafael Caro Quintero, Ernesto Fonseca Carrillo, Miguel Felix Gallardo Parra, and others have been in jail since 1985 and are currently awaiting trial for the Camarena murder, among other drug-related crimes. In 1987 alone, Mexico arrested and indicted 9,798 individuals on drug charges, according to a press release by the Mexican embassy.

Among this large group of soldiers and police officers there may indeed be some cases of corruption, a Mexican official publication admits, but individual cases cannot cancel out the merit of work which, if let undone, would have

allowed a great many more drugs to enter the United States, the largest drug market in the world.

Mexico counterattacks

No wonder the Senate action provoked anger in Mexico. Attorney General Sergio García Ramírez expressed "profound shock and great displeasure" at the Senate actions. He accused the United States of "ignoring the great efforts of the Mexican people to combat a problem whose causes are certainly not attributable to Mexico," and demanded to know why the United States does not do more to prosecute money-laundering bankers, who are the key power of the international drug empire.

The Mexican Foreign Ministry responded by reminding the United States that "no power can claim for itself the right to certify the conduct of other societies or governments. No one has the right to impose from abroad conduct, ideas, political or economic systems on other peoples." The denunciation was well understood in Panama where the government's dailies gave broad coverage to both the Senate move and Mexico's response.

Leonardo Ffrench, the spokesman for the Mexican embassy in Washington, stated that despite the Senate vote, Mexico "is firmly committed to keep doing its best efforts to fight drugs in order to protect its own population." Mexico fight drugs, Ffrench added, "as a matter of common sense, for international solidarity with the rest of the world, because it is a State issue and because it is necessary to protect her own national security." The Mexican diplomat then asked, "What is the United States doing, within its own territory, to fight drugs?"

Senators opposing the resolution pointed out that out of frustration in the fight on drugs, Washington is seeking to put the blame on others. "To illustrate how ludicrous this resolution is, I wonder if perhaps we should not penalize states until we are sure that they are fully cooperating in this war on drugs," Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), said during the floor debate April 14, targeting his colleagues Wilson and D'Aмато. "As to my friend from New York, who spent a great deal of time in such compelling and emotional rhetoric about the evils of Mexico, I would like to point out that it is not safe on the streets of his city," he added. "My friend and colleague from California comes from a state that, in the estimate of many, illegally cultivates vast quantities of marijuana."

A plea or green light?

In a last-minute plea, Reagan warned the Senate that it would have a "political impact" on U.S.-Mexican relations. "It would adversely effect every aspect of our relationship with Mexico." He even said that anti-Americanism would make it more difficult for the incoming President (Mexico has presidential elections this year) to have a more "constructive" relationship with the White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater, warned that the President was committed to veto

the decertification on "national security grounds."

But Reagan's plea, rather than discouraging the Senate, had an opposite effect. During the three-hour debate, Wilson conceded that neither he, nor any of the other senators, would fight a Reagan veto and that that was all the more reason to pass the resolution since it was rather "academic." By decertifying Mexico, "we would be sending a message to Mexico," Wilson argued.

Reagan's letter gave the wrong perception that there are political differences between the White House and Congress on how to best deal with Mexico. Nothing is further from the truth. Both branches are committed to the secret government's "Panamization" scenario for Mexico.

What there might be is a division of labor. Reagan's certification of Mexico was preceded by a bitter interagency squabble with Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams and DEA Director Jack Lawn arguing for sending Mexico a strong warning by denying her certification. Reagan's advisers recommended against it. The consensus reached was to grant Mexico full cooperation status and let Congress carry out the diplomatic confrontation; thus, the Executive Branch could wash its hands. They now believe that the purpose of sending a "strong message" to Mexico has been achieved. But the message heard in Mexico is that Washington's foreign policy is "unstable, inconsistent, and zig-zagging," as a Mexican editorial put it.

Documentation

Arturo R. Blancas, columnist for the daily El Diario de México, wrote April 18 on the threatened "Philippinization" of Mexico.

There are two organizations which are working in tandem training cadre to promote and lead the post-electoral destabilization of the country, with an eye to mounting a "filipinazo" [Philippines-style coup]. . . .

One of them, the PAN's civil resistance movement, already has a corps of 700 experts in non-violent destabilization and pressure tactics, according to its national coordinator, Edmundo Gómez. Those 700 graduated from 36 seminars held expressly to instruct them . . . in the tactics and timing of battle. . . .

Parallel to the PAN's civil resistance movement is another movement working toward the same end, an organization without a name and without visible leaders, that is, which shields itself in anonymity, which is providing training on "active violence," based on the experiences of the Philippine

AKKAPKA group. . . . This parallel movement is encouraged by the Chihuahua clergy and sponsored by certain business groups.

Regarding the AKKAPKA group, it is said that it sent a mission to our country at the end of 1987, headed by a Philippine priest of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Manila, and by two non-clerics, Teresa and Rafael, who provided training in fighting through non-violence.

That mission must have fully met its purpose, for after its stay in Mexico, several members of the leadership of various parties and civic groups, as well as business associations, went to the Philippines "to observe the Philippine experience in defense of democracy by peaceful means."

At the same time, the Philippine mission left behind, to reinforce the instruction it gave, printed and audio-visual pilot material, which was reproduced and is being distributed around the country. National and state civic associations have systematized the showing of a video-cassette brought by that mission, "which explains how the Philippine people acted toward the overthrow of Ferdinand Marcos."

The two organizations . . . have instruction manuals which present the experiences of similar movements in other parts of the world. They also contain the political and philosophical arguments upon which they seek to morally and juridically base their fight. . . . Here are a few:

- The sources of power of the ruler intimately depend on the obedience and cooperation of the population;
- The loss of authority initiates the disintegration of the power of the ruler. His power diminishes to the extent his authority is denied.
- The degree of success of the ruler in the exercise of power depends upon the degree of obedience and cooperation he garners.

● . . . Obedience is definitively based on the consent of the person, but this consent can be withdrawn.

And in the manual are established the steps or phases for withdrawing obedience and cooperation from a government. . . .

In the same instructions, derived from the work of Gene Sharp, "The Politics of Non-Violent Action," it is stressed that the secret to this kind of fight lies in how to sustain and carry out disobedience, "even in the face of repression," and to establish three basic modes of non-violent action—protests and persuasion, non-cooperation, and intervention.

Similarly, the actions of protest and non-violent persuasion are enumerated, among which are . . . satiric cartoons, pickets, parallel elections, use of "noisy symbols" . . . suspension of religious services . . . student or teacher strikes, asylum in embassies or churches, withholding rents, boycotts by workers, producers, distributors, or providers, withdrawal of bank deposits, black lists against merchants, refusal to pay quotas, debts, or interest, unannounced protest strikes by peasants, prisoners, business and professional associations, slow-downs, hunger strikes, sit-ins, transport shut-

downs, creating parallel black markets, overburdening administrative systems, creating double sovereignties or parallel governments, etc.

The following are excerpts from the column "Pulso Político" in El Universal of April 18, 1988, written by Francisco Cárdenas Cruz.

The United States initiated what it hopes will be the "Panamanization" of our country, even going so far as to declare the upcoming federal elections "illegitimate," in an open and brazen intervention that harms our sovereignty, and which neither the government nor we Mexicans should permit. . . . What has happened in recent days in the American capital [the Senate vote to de-certify Mexico—ed.], seems to be a repetition of events which nowadays are keeping Panama submerged in serious conflict. . . .

Once Panama was accused of not acting with decision and energy in the fight against the drug trade, and given the immediate Panamanian rejection of such imputations, Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega, chief of the Defense Forces, was pointed to as an "accomplice" of drug traffickers' activities and an offensive from Washington was mounted to overthrow him. . . . Today, the "Panamanization" of Mexico, conceived, planned, and encouraged from Washington, has been launched in terms similar to those of the brother country of Central America: "To certify" that Mexico is not collaborating in the fight against drugs and to accuse members of the government of President de la Madrid of being complicit or involved with the international drug mafia. . . .

What follows is easy to predict: interference in next July's electoral process, taking up the protests and complaints of the opposition party on the illegality of the elections . . . and proclaiming that the next President of the Republic was not legitimately elected, for which reason his arrival at the post should not take place. Between that and immediate U.S. intervention in our country, there would not be much distance.

The "Panamization" of Mexico that Washington has under way, like that of the "Philippinization" to which a presidential candidate like the PAN's Manuel J. Clouthier appeals, should keep us alert and demanding that the government act with energy, decision, and urgency to prevent our territory from being turned into an internal battlefield, sponsored from without and prompted from within by Mexicans who, like Clouthier, are inciting the lighting of a fuse that neither he nor anyone else can afterwards extinguish. . . .

U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of Mexico is simply inadmissible. . . . The anti-drug fight is, now, the anticipated pretext that Washington has found to try to turn itself into the great judge of the July electoral process and, with the complicity of a handful, to "certify" illegality to back up its intervention in our country. . . . We Mexicans must all be well aware of this and very attentive to that which will occur between now and then.

Italy under Ciriaco Will it bow to 'New

by Leonardo Servadio

Italy's new government, under Christian Democrat Ciriaco De Mita, faces a war for survival on the strategic and economic fronts, against an effort to force Italy into the Soviet sphere of influence in a "New Yalta" superpower deal. The assassination of top De Mita adviser Roberto Ruffilli on April 16 was an ugly warning to the new premier, should he balk at granting the Italian Communist Party all it demands in the expected accord.

On one front, the De Mita government has already hoisted the white flag: The first act of the government was to block work on the Montalto di Castro nuclear plant. This decision means 1) increasing dependency on foreign sources for energy, at precisely the time that the Soviets are taking control of the Middle East oil route; and 2) bringing the country to the brink of internal economic disaster, making it all the easier to turn Italian institutions into a transmission belt for "crisis management," on the path to fascism.

Let us look at the two "fronts" of the war being waged on Italy, strategic and economic.

Irregular warfare

On April 14, forty-eight hours after the new government was installed, a car-bomb went off in Naples in front of the United Services Organization (USO). The explosion killed four Italian citizens and one U.S. soldier. The act was quickly attributed to Okudaira Junzo, a Japanese Red Army mercenary working for Islamic Jihad. Junzo was already wanted in connection with an attack on the U.S. embassy in Rome in 1987.

In a communiqué given to the Italian press agency ANSA in Beirut, Islamic Jihad said, "We warn Italy and its government not to continue supporting imperialism. We are determined to strike all the allies and collaborators of the imperialist countries." The press in Italy stressed that this is a specifically anti-U.S. attack and lists similar strikes which occurred between 1984 and 1987 in West Germany, Greece, and Spain against American targets. *La Stampa* of Turin on April 15 included the April 7, 1986 bombing of the offices of the Parti Ouvrier Européen (European Labor Party) in Paris. That bombing, carried out by a group linked to Direct Action,