

# Salvadorans charge Inter-American Dialogue serves communist interests

by Gretchen Small

"Internationalist usurers" and "devotees of convergence with socialism" infiltrated into positions in Washington, D.C., have imposed a losing strategy upon El Salvador's military, because they *seek* to hand this country over to the communists, leading Salvadoran geopolitical strategist, Edgar Chacón, charged at year's end. Chacón named Sol Linowitz's Inter-American Dialogue as a center of this conspiracy, and warned that the Dialogue is running similar operations against other Ibero-American militaries, on behalf of "internationalist usury."

Chacón is president of El Salvador's International Relations Institute, an institute linked to the ARENA party. His charges, reported in two separate articles appearing in San Salvador's daily, *El Diario de Hoy*, in late December are not merely his own, however, but reflect the view of a broader grouping within El Salvador's military and political elite.

That grouping has concluded that only if El Salvador breaks with the policies coming out of Washington, do they have any hope of stopping the terrorist insurgency there from seizing power in the next year or, maximum, two.

They have also concluded that the policy is not an accident. The "Low Intensity Conflict" strategy for fighting the insurgency which the United States has imposed upon the Salvadoran military, "was designed by U.S. conspirators (Fabian socialists infiltrated in Washington), who seek to complement the Prolonged Popular War strategy of the communists," *El Diario* reports.

Low intensity conflict strategy is no counter to the communists' people's war strategy, "but rather both are destroying the country; each with its own methods, at its own pace, is bringing us to the same point: that is, El Salvador's fall to communism," Chacón explained.

El Salvador is not the only country which will lose if the Fabian usurers' policy continues to dominate in Washington; the United States will also lose.

Already, the Establishment press has put out the word that "El Salvador could be Vice President Bush's first foreign policy crisis," the formulation of Morton Kondracke's *American Interests* television program on Dec. 31. That program posed the question raised by every article on El Salvador which has appeared in the major U.S. newspapers since Dec. 23: "Civil war, economic woes, and urban terrorism—elements that could push El Salvador to the brink, and the Bush

administration to the edge of crisis. . . . Can El Salvador be saved?"

## A broader battlefield

The alarm bells are not based on any sudden surge in the strength of the terrorists' army, the Farabundo Marti Liberation Front (FMLN), however. The immediate danger to El Salvador stems, rather, from the global deal which the United States has struck with the Soviet Union.

The FMLN has launched a two-pronged military and political offensive, to seize the advantage during the conjuncture created by the combination of a new administration coming into Washington (they believe committed to that U.S.-U.S.S.R. deal), and the national elections being held in El Salvador for March 1989.

Militarily, the FMLN has adopted the tactics of Peru's Shining Path terrorists, targeting local authorities who provide leadership to their towns and villages. Mayors in territory claimed by the FMLN have been ordered to collaborate with the terrorists, or quit.

In the last two months, the FMLN has murdered eight mayors who refused to submit. By early January, 33 mayors had quit out of terror, on top of the 51 of the 262 mayors elected to office last March who never took up their posts "because their towns are usually under rebel control," Reuters wire service reported on Jan. 5.

The FMLN has also stepped up attacks on the country's economic infrastructure. Electrical blackouts now occur almost nightly in the capital, San Salvador, because of FMLN bombings of the nation's electricity grid. Since the majority of the capital's water supply is electrically run, the abrupt changes in water pressure caused by the black-outs have produced ruptures in the pipes, which in turn, has cut off the water supply for some sections of the city. Bombings and kidnappings in the capital have escalated dramatically.

Meanwhile, on the terrorists' "legal" front, the social democratic Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR) has announced it will participate in the March elections, as candidates of the "Democratic Convergence" election coalition.

This retooling has won the FMLN more advocates abroad than in El Salvador. The U.S. State Department hailed the FDR's election announcement as a "dramatic departure . . . [from] the past eight years of armed conflict," in a November

1988 Public Information Series bulletin. This, despite the fact that in the same Bulletin, they quote FMLN documents captured by the military in February 1988, which state:

“Dialogue is not an end. It is a means. . . . Whatever form a negotiated political solution takes does not mean that we cease the struggle. . . . In the most likely event, it would mean the continuation of the struggle in all its forms—political and military—but now from a position of legitimate and recognized power at the national, and to a good extent, international level.”

Given such benefit of the doubt in Washington, the guerrilla commanders themselves have joined in the campaign to gain international legitimacy. Top FMLN commander Joaquín Villalobos personally visited several Ibero-American capitals in December 1988, to request that other countries pressure the Salvadoran government to open negotiations with the terrorists.

His trip appears to have been best received in the United States, where the *Wall Street Journal* went so far as to paint the Villalobos trip as a signal that the Soviet Union had cut off the FMLN, thus “forcing” them to opt for negotiations.

## Power-sharing

Since Dec. 23, articles have appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and the *Los Angeles Times*, calling for Washington to accept the fact that the Salvadoran FMLN is too strong to be beaten on the battlefield. If the Salvadoran military refuses to go along, the U.S. Congress must cut off U.S. aid to the country until the military accepts, several papers argued.

The media blitz is nothing but public packaging for the sell-out policy outlined in the Council on Foreign Affairs’ *Foreign Affairs* quarterly this winter, (see *EIR*, Vol. 16, No. 2).

To defeat the FMLN army, requires the implementation of a full-scale economic development program for all of Central America, centered around infrastructure construction, a debt moratorium, and a crackdown on the drug trade. Fixated on cutting the budget and striking a global deal with Moscow, the U.S. Liberal Establishment has no intention of spending that kind of money.

The *Los Angeles Times* Dec. 27 editorial spelled out the budgetary rationale for defeat: “While there are links between the Salvadoran guerrillas . . . and their ideological kin in Havana and Managua, the FMLN forces have proved that they are capable of waging their own war quite effectively without help from Fidel Castro or the Sandinistas. The same claim cannot be made by the Salvadoran security forces. Despite almost \$3 billion in U.S. aid that the Salvadoran government has received since 1980, military analysts still question the battlefield effectiveness of the Salvadoran army,” they wrote.

Therefore, they argued, El Salvador must capitulate: “The incoming American administration must reassess its policy

toward El Salvador, giving up Reagan’s wish-dream that the insurgency can somehow be defeated.” Negotiations must quickly be convened between the government and the FMLN, and a cease-fire arranged as a prelude to the “more realistic, if difficult option . . . [of] a power sharing arrangement,” the *Times* wrote.

This is the kind of thinking which has forced nationalists within El Salvador’s elite into rebellion against U.S. orders. If the Bush administration attempts to implement the Establishment’s sell-out of El Salvador, they may find the resistance in El Salvador’s military and civilian policy tougher than they expected. As former Army Colonel Sigifredo Ochoa (now the vice president of the National Assembly) told the *Associated Press* on December 28, “we [may] resort to nationalist guerrilla warfare. . . . A frustrated people could do just that.”

## Chacón’s charges

El *Diario de Hoy* ran the following article on Dec. 27, 1988, under the headline, “International Organization Plans to ‘Domesticate’ Militaries”:

A political program to achieve the “domestication” of the Ibero-American militaries to the benefit of a regime of party rule which answers to the dictates of international political organizations, includes El Salvador, a political analyst charges.

The president of the International Relations Institute (IRI) Mr. Edgar Chacón points out that last May, the Inter-American Dialogue issued its fourth report. . . . “The model of the Inter-American Dialogue can be summarized,” the political analyst emphasizes, “as the re-education of the Ibero-American militaries, to transform them into gendarmes of party rule. Their success or failure will depend on the annulment of national values which still exist in the Ibero-American countries, paving the way for internationalism.”

. . . Chacón points out that for these devotees of convergence with socialism, the problems left unresolved by their new democracies stimulate tendencies for coups in the militaries. . . .

The successes of this inter-American group on behalf of internationalist usury are indisputable, he adds. “That is how Mexico and Brazil, with incredible natural and human resources with which to excel as true powers, have been reduced to the category of mortgaged nations, with more than \$100 billion in debt apiece.”

The political analyst notes that the Inter-American Dialogue proposes “a concerted effort to redefine relations between democratic governments and the armed forces,” in order to confront the military challenge. According to the report, this redefinition includes the authority of civilian governments to “establish the precepts which rule the armed forces and their relations with the rest of the state and society. . . .”