
Commentary

'Ibero-America's corrupt democracies are politically in question'

The following editorial is taken from the introduction to a recently published special issue of Resúmen Ejecutivo, the Spanish-language edition of EIR, which is dedicated to the subject of George Bush's "new world order" and its proposal to dismantle the armed forces of Ibero-America as part of a broader scheme to impose the supranational concept of "limited sovereignty" on the nations of the world.

The United States, with the complicity of the other major powers, is seeking to dismantle Ibero-America's armed forces. The premises upon which this effort is being undertaken are essentially four:

1) that the East-West conflict is over and, with it, Soviet-inspired armed subversion.

2) that the war doctrines of the region's armed forces are essentially outmoded, because they anticipate possible conflicts with bordering nations or invasion from extraregional powers. The primary concern now is with the "collective defense of democracy."

3) that, for these reasons, Ibero-America's armed forces have no need for advanced weaponry nor, in general, for modern military technology (be it for combat, logistics, communications, intelligence, etc.).

4) that, therefore, Ibero-America's armed forces can and should be subject to the same budgetary constraints that have been imposed on other areas of public expenditure. This means, for example, drastic cutbacks in personnel, reduction of troop wages, elimination of various military corps and, even, of entire military institutions.

From these premises stem, explicitly or implicitly, all the statements and proposals that are being made against the region's military forces.

• The Trilateral Commission proposes the creation of a sort of NATO of the Americas, which would turn all of the region's military forces into mere appendages of the United States. Armed Forces, dedicated to the "collective defense of local democracies," and "to protect their citizens from criminal violence," along with units of a "permanent regional police" dedicated to such tasks as George Bush's mythical

"war" on drugs.

• A May 20 article in the *Christian Science Monitor* demanded a "regional security alliance" on the NATO model, so that the nations of the continent could "share the burden of military costs" and thus "free up funds for social welfare and economic development." The article quotes a recent paper by former U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara which, according to the *Monitor*, "reveals the extent to which sumptuous military budgets extract tribute from their societies."

• Former Central Intelligence Agency director William Colby declared that "Mexico doesn't need an army," but rather "some kind of police force." For Colby, according to an interview he gave to the Mexican daily *El Financiero* of May 9, Ibero-America's armies "are necessary as symbols, to display them on parade," but "they absorb money that could be used in education and social programs."

The Ibero-American puppets of the great powers have the same line. Argentine ambassador to Brazil José Manuel de la Sota has proposed that Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay sign a pact to "defend democracy in the Southern Cone." Should any of these four countries suffer an attempted military coup, the others would respond with sanctions, a trade blockade, and even with "the deployment of troops to defend the legitimate government."

Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez has been similarly proposing a reform of the Organization of American States which would convert it into a supranational police agency in charge of intervening "in defense of democracy." During a recent trip to Colombia, Pérez repeatedly called for a "modification" of the concept of national sovereignty, both to "more efficiently battle the drug traffickers" and "so that the rights today being established as supranational, and which gave rise to the United Nations' ordered intervention to restore territorial sovereignty to the state of Kuwait, exist in full force." Pérez has also urged the creation of an "international police" force for the region.

Even a superficial review of the region's strategic situation discredits the false premises behind this grand scheme.

Armed subversion a continuing threat

Putting aside for the moment the subversion promoted by the Soviet Union, and even pretending that the communist regime of Fidel Castro has disappeared, the fact remains that in Nicaragua, the Sandinistas remain firmly entrenched in the command of the Armed Forces there—in large part, thanks to the intervention of Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez.

In El Salvador, the communist guerrillas have not been defeated, and in fact appear on the verge of being awarded half the country with the blessings of these same defenders of “democracy.” In Guatemala, despite years of war, the guerrillas have not been eradicated.

In Colombia, narco-terrorists are on the verge of capturing power; they have already created a dual-power situation, turning the spurious National Constituent Assembly into something even worse: a *soviet* under the direction of M-19 narco-terrorist Antonio Navarro Wolf. Something like this has not happened since the 1971 creation of a *soviet* in Bolivia, or the attempt by Salvador Allende to abolish the Chilean Congress in 1973.

In Peru, Shining Path and the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) control one-third of national territory.

In Argentina, the 1989 assault on the La Tablada barracks revealed that terrorist organizations still exist there, prepared to launch a new power bid at the first opportune moment.

In Brazil, extremists tied to subversion exist in at least one of the country’s most important political parties.

And in Venezuela, the so-called *Caracazo* riots of February 1989 proved that the conditions of misery and deprivation caused by the International Monetary Fund’s austerity prescriptions create a breeding ground for social violence, in which subversive projects can more easily thrive.

It is thus absurd to maintain that the supposed end of the East-West conflict has eliminated the threat of armed subversion. It is true that border conflicts between neighbors should be avoided, but it is equally true that triggering these conflicts is a deliberate part of the superpowers’ strategy. Regarding the issue of threats from outside the region, one need only refer to the ongoing assault against Ibero-American sovereignty—for example, under the pretext of “protecting the Amazon ecology”—to fully justify the determination of the armed forces of nations like Brazil to defend themselves.

Denying Third World technology

And such defense demands access to advanced military technology. It could not be clearer that Washington’s opposition to the possession of modern weaponry by Ibero-America’s armed forces is a central aspect of the policy of technological apartheid which characterizes George Bush’s much-touted “new world order.” For this same reason, Washington would prohibit Ibero-America from exploiting nuclear ener-

gy or developing aerospace programs. The gentlemen of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council have already declared themselves to be the exclusive owners of 21st-century technology.

The claim that military budgets consume resources necessary for education and social welfare is similarly fraudulent. Payment of tribute to foreign usury is what is sucking the nations of the region dry. In 1980, Ibero-America’s total foreign debt was \$242.535 billion. Between then and 1989, the region has paid \$337.499 billion in interest payments alone. And yet, today, it owes \$438.636 billion, most of that due to rising interest rates, debt “refinancings,” and similar frauds. Ibero-America’s foreign debt has already been paid. All the rest is sheer usury.

What makes this picture even worse, is the corruption of those “democratic” politicians who serve usury, the same politicians who grow rich through the looting of their nations, who cooperate with these campaigns against the armed forces and who want a “permanent regional police force” to come defend them if they should get in trouble. Examples abound: the lover of one South American President who has a \$5 million apartment in New York; the children of another politician who adorn themselves with the profits of Israeli weapons trafficking; an Argentine President who emerges from one scandal only to become mired in another. Not to mention the finance ministers who serve on the payroll of the international banks.

Encyclical denounces corrupt democracies

The corruption of the “democracies” is so scandalous that Pope John Paul II had harsh words for them in his most recent encyclical. He said that “the Church appreciates the democratic system,” but that “an authentic democracy is only possible in a state of law and on the basis of a dignified concept of the human person.” If democracy is to be taken seriously, it must respect fundamental rights, starting with the right to life. Even “in those countries where democratic forms of government rule, these rights are not always totally respected,” he added.

John Paul II asserts that in today’s democracies, “the questions posed to society are often not examined according to the criteria of justice and morality, but rather in accordance with the electoral or financial strength of the groups which sustain them.”

From the standpoint of objective reality, there can be no doubt that sovereign nations need modern, well-equipped, well-trained, and well-paid armed forces, a patriotic model for the entire population. Further, what is morally and politically in question are the corrupt democracies which betray their nations through their servility to what the papal encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI called “the noxious and detestable internationalism of capital, that is, international imperialism in financial affairs, which holds that where a man’s fortune is, there is his country.”