

'Bush Manual' plot to dismantle military ripped by Ibero-Americans

by Gretchen Small

Bush administration officials stationed in Ibero-America were busy in December denying accusations that the United States has a strategy to dismantle the national armed forces of Ibero-America, and that any "Bush Manual" elaborating this strategy exists. Their protestations, however, did little to calm civilian or military leaders in the region, who have begun to rebel against the assault on every aspect of national sovereignty, including the military, which the U.S. government and the international financial institutions are carrying out.

The sharpest public confrontation occurred in Bolivia, where press revelations at the beginning of December of the existence of such a "Bush Manual" created such an uproar, crossing all normal ideological dividing lines, that the debate was reported from Mexico to Peru.

"Bolivia was born through the armed forces. As long as Bolivia exists, the Bolivian Armed Forces will continue to exist," the president of the Revolutionary Left Movement Party, Oscar Eid Franco, told the La Paz Radio Fides Network on Dec. 4. Senate President Guillermo Fortún Suárez agreed, stating that U.S. reports that the Bolivian government will allow the dismantling of the armed forces are not true.

"The armed forces have emphatically rejected the possibility of their abolishment. This is a project considered by the Bush plan, under which the armed forces of Latin American countries will be gradually reduced. This report has created reaction in all circles of our country," Televisión Boliviana reported the next day. The station interviewed Armed Forces Commander Gen. Alejandro Camponovo, who affirmed that this "study by some analysts or politicians" has been "emphatically rejected" by the majority of the Bolivian people. "We know that our armed forces were born with the country on Aug. 6, 1835. We are part of the people. . . . We wear a uniform but we are Bolivian citizens fulfilling our obligations," the general stated.

Acting President Luis Ossio Sanjines added that abolishing, or even reducing, the armed forces would be as absurd as abolishing "any other basic institutions of the country, such as the Catholic Church, the National Labor Federation, or the universities"; the military has an "essential" role to play in ensuring national integration, development, and sov-

ereignty, he said.

La República newspaper reported Dec. 12 that only time limitations kept the Parliament from approving a resolution, introduced by Deputy Filomeno Escobar on Dec. 10, which defended the armed forces as a part of "the very life of the republic." Escobar, who reported that U.S. plans were directed against the armed forces of other Ibero-American countries as well, told the Parliament that they must "defend our armed forces against the intentions of the government of the United States."

The U.S. Embassy in La Paz rushed to deny that any "Bush Manual" proposing the substitution of the armed forces by national gendarmes existed. "If the Bolivians wish to discuss the future of their armed forces, that is a sovereign right," an official note from the Embassy stated patronizingly. "But to involve the U.S. government and the Bush administration in this debate is dishonest and unjust."

In other countries, U.S. officials have attempted to squelch the debate over the anti-military strategy by dismissing all reports of such a strategy as having been invented by this magazine. *EIR*, those officials have insisted when questioned about Bush military policy, ought to have been adequately "discredited" when its founder, Lyndon H. LaRouche, was rushed off to jail at the beginning of the Bush administration.

The growing hostility U.S. officials face in the region is not of *EIR*'s making, however, but is a result of the genocidal anti-sovereignty policies which the U.S. government continues to pursue.

The U.S. government-financed project to transform the Ibero-American militaries into small, U.S.-directed national gendarmes, for example, is promoted in the book *The Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*. A review of that book, published in *EIR*'s Spanish-language edition, *Resumen Ejecutivo*, under the title, "Bush Manual to Eliminate the Armed Forces of Ibero-America," has circulated widely.

Because people have corroborated *EIR*'s report by reading the original book, lying U.S. Embassy denials that any such "Bush manual" exists, only angered people more.

The policy of eliminating national militaries in favor of

supranational forces under the control of a U.S.-dominated United Nations, is, after all, no secret. Former Costa Rican President Oscar Arias, a favorite of Washington, went so far as to announce on Dec. 7, after a meeting of 18 Nobel Peace Prize winners in Norway, that not only was Panama scrapping its armed forces, but that "we have reason to believe that other Latin American states could also disarm themselves in the near future." Arias urged the newly freed nations of east-European Europe to dismantle their armed forces as well.

These are the realities which have turned the special issue of *Resumen Ejecutivo* on "Bush's New Order: Eliminate Sovereignty and the Armed Forces of the Ibero-American Nations," published in June 1991, and a more recent videotape produced by *Resumen* on the same subject, into hot items in many countries of the region.

Backlash spreading

Bolivia is not the only point where the anti-military strategy has been denounced.

In Venezuela, Defense Minister Gen. Fernando Ochoa Antich blasted U.S. pressures to dismantle the armed forces, in a speech given Dec. 13 at a seminar on "The New International Order, Peace, and Security," organized by the Defense Ministry's National Defense Institute for Advanced Studies. His speech was a direct answer to one given the day before by U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela Michael Skol. Skol had urged that the role of the armed forces should be "reformulated," to take on a more limited mission of fighting drugs.

The Venezuelan defense minister retorted: "The armed forces of our countries, and many political spokesmen, refuse to assume police roles, which weaken our strategic function as guarantors of the national interest, in the international arena. . . . A kind of supranationality is being created outside of the framework of international organizations, through which the powers seek to become the overseers of their respective areas of influence, disregarding the traditional concepts of sovereignty and self-determination which has regulated international relations up until the present time."

In Mexico, the daily *La Jornada* on Dec. 13 pointed to the U.S. invasion of Panama and imposition of a puppet government there, under the pretext of fighting drugs, as an example of U.S. strategy toward the region. "It is a fact that the existence of [Ibero-America's] own armed forces constitutes one of the characteristics that determines the existence of national, sovereign states. To suppress them and replace them with foreign police and military forces can only lead to control by the United States," *La Jornada* wrote.

And in Brazil, the daily *O Estado de São Paulo*, which generally speaks for monetarist banking circles, warned on Dec. 17 that the debate over whether or not Brazil needs an army, was turning "acrimonious," and could lead to "perverse results" for the Brazilian state. A Dec. 23 editorial proffered that discussion of any such policy should be carefully limited to the need for "restructuring" the military.

Documentation

Will usury be allowed to bury Ibero-America?

The following article was published in a special supplement issued by EIR's Spanish-language edition, Resumen Ejecutivo, in January 1992, dedicated to the national-military crisis in Ibero-America.

As 1992 opens, Ibero-America faces a crisis more profound than any it has confronted since the evangelization of the region began five centuries ago. Despite all the chatter from President George Bush and the Presidents of Ibero-America, the decisive battle facing the continent is *not* that of "democracy" vs. "dictatorship." Rather, Ibero-America must choose between genocide and development.

The policies imposed by Anglo-American finance have brought genocide to Ibero-America, through starvation, epidemics, and the rampages of narco-terrorist armies in Central America and the Andes. The economies of every country are being Africanized, as their governments dutifully pay their debts through the brutal methods prescribed by the International Monetary Fund. As a result, the social order in many nations is also collapsing. And on top of this, the Anglo-American establishment has launched a violent assault on the fundamental institutions which are the last support of the nation-state in the region, in particular the military and the Catholic Church. To do this, the U.S. government is actively promoting governments made of communists and narco-terrorists in Ibero-America—all in the name of "democracy."

The very existence of the nation-state itself is now called into question.

Some say we exaggerate? In Peru, the Catholic Church is being driven underground by the narco-terrorist Shining Path. A prominent bishop reported in December that Shining Path had promised to kill the priests in his diocese, if he did not leave his post—and that therefore for two months he had not appeared in public. "We are halfway to the Church of the Catacombs," a Catholic missionary told the *New York Times* of Dec. 10.

Or take the case of Colombia, where the military, ordered to stop its war against the drug cartel, is now deployed to *protect* the cartel chieftains in the luxury "jail-plantations" which the government constructed for them! "From soldiers, thanks to the weakness of a few, we have become prison guards. The soldiers of the 4th Brigade—always proud of their successes against the FARC and ELN guerrillas, against the [M-19's] Popular Militias, against the cartel hitmen and common criminals, we

'men of iron,' symbols of the Army's dignity," were stripped of our role as defenders of the nation, and turned "from persecutor to bodyguard, by the force of circumstances, and because of a sick obsession for a peace that we did not deserve," wrote Col. Augusto Bahamón Dussán (ret.), former second in command of the 4th Brigade based in Medellín, in his just-published book, *My War in Medellín*.

It is no exaggeration to say that either this genocide will be stopped, or future historians may write that 1992 was the year in which the great Ibero-American civilizing project which began in 1492, was buried.

To aid that battle against genocide, *Resumen Ejecutivo* is issuing this supplement, reprinting two crucial reports from 1991.

No illusions about the enemy

The first is *Resumen Ejecutivo's* report on the defense presented in an Argentine courtroom in August by the leading officers of Col. Mohammed Seineldín's *carapintada* movement [the "painted faces"—a reference to the camouflage paint worn by soldiers—ed]. There the officers, including Colonel Seineldín, explained why they chose to act, rather than sit back and watch Argentina disintegrate under George Bush's new world order. Colonel Seineldín himself warned that the Bush government intends to dismantle the military throughout Ibero-America.

What is unique in Ibero-America, thus far, about Colonel Seineldín and his movement, is their recognition that Argentina, and the region as a whole, faces imminent total destruction at the hands of a foreign enemy—the Anglo-American financial empire—which seeks nothing less than to eradicate their nation, by destroying the institutions and the very culture which gave it birth. They have refused to accommodate to the demands of the enemy, instead laying their careers and their lives on the line to rally the Army and the nation against that threat.

At present, the officers are jailed with lengthy sentences, with Colonel Seineldín condemned to life imprisonment. Far from being crushed, however, their example is giving courage to others to act. Thus, they are better situated to defend their nation, even from jail, than those who still have illusions that there might be some deal which could be arranged with the United States under current policies of the Anglo-American financial establishment, or illusions that half-way measures can defend their nation, without confronting the Anglo-American empire.

Economics as a weapon of war

The second report is the *Resumen Ejecutivo* study which demonstrates that, not only did Ibero-America pay *more* in interest payments in the decade of the 1980s than the total foreign debt owed in 1980, but that when capital flight is added in, the total wealth looted from the region over the decade rises to an astounding half-trillion dollars! That is

straight usury, whose effects can be counted in lives. Had only a portion of that capital been invested in sanitation and water purification facilities, for example, there would be no cholera epidemic in the region today.

Since 1981-82, when the debt crisis first broke, most governments and leaders of Ibero-America have repeated the litany that the foreign debt must be paid, no matter what the cost in human lives. Instead of listening to Pope John Paul II's warning that "the debt cannot be paid with the hunger of

It is Bush administration policy today to bring into power communists and narco-terrorists in the Americas, as an efficient means to impose IMF policies and to eradicate finally the nationalist institutions and culture which defend these nations.

the people," they have religiously applied the programs of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which channeled all national resources toward payment of the foreign debt, and in that way propped up the bankrupt banks of Wall Street and the City of London.

Now, 10 years later, we are told that "modernization" requires even more drastic application of those policies and programs, if Ibero-America is to be permitted entry into the almost mythical "global marketplace." One of the new conditionalities demanded by the IMF and the creditor banks is that Ibero-America's military budgets be slashed, so that the money thus "saved" can be used to bail out the Anglo-American financial system. Former World Bank president Robert McNamara demanded this explicitly in April 1991. And at its 1991 annual conference, IMF director Michel Camdessus announced that he agreed with this idea.

The Presidents of Ibero-America insist—as did Mexico's Carlos Salinas de Gortari during his December visit to Washington—that there is no alternative to these policies, because "to live on the sidelines of the currents of change is, in addition to being unuseful, a grave risk for the very existence of nations."

But nothing so threatens "the very existence of nations" as the insistence on paying that usurious debt through IMF policies! In 1982, when the debt crisis first broke, Lyndon LaRouche, the leading opponent in the United States of the Anglo-American establishment and its policies, outlined a strategy for Ibero-America to defend itself from this usury, and to develop. To survive as sovereign nations, Ibero-America must form a Debtors Club and jointly drop the "debt bomb" by declaring a debt moratorium, LaRouche argued in his *Op-*

eración Juárez proposal. He specified the measures necessary to form an Ibero-American Common Market under such emergency conditions, arguing that in this way, the region would be able to mobilize sufficient resources to survive retaliatory economic warfare from the creditor countries. Only when faced by such decisive defense of sovereignty, will the industrialized nations accept more sane and more moral international monetary arrangements, LaRouche argued.

Ten years later, LaRouche's strategy still stands as the only viable alternative to watching one's nation die. Its author, Lyndon LaRouche, is today a political prisoner of the Bush administration, serving a 15-year sentence.

U.S. allies with the narco-communists

The Anglo-Americans have demonstrated that unless they are stopped, there is no limit to how far they will go to crush opposition to their policy. Look at their reaction to the collapse of the Soviet empire. Instead of welcoming it, the British and American governments went into public mourning over Mikhail Gorbachov's sudden loss of employment. Bush insists that no country should recognize Croatia and Slovenia, because it is U.S. and British policy to *support* the Serbian communists in their slaughter in Croatia.

These actions make clear that the Anglo-Americans are not concerned with either freedom or democracy, but seek instead to ensure that the collapse of their condominium partner in Moscow does not also bury the policies upon which that condominium was based.

The same picture has emerged in the Americas. Even as the hammer and sickle are removed from the Russian flag, the Bush administration is doing everything in its power to have that symbol of oppression imposed upon the flags of Ibero-America. That policy is being sold under the argument that because communism has collapsed in the Soviet Union, "peace" can now be reached with the communists in the Americas.

Let there be no mistake: *It is Bush administration policy today to bring into power communists and narco-terrorists in the Americas, as an efficient means to impose IMF policies and to eradicate finally the nationalist institutions and culture which defend these nations.*

Take the case of Haiti. The Bush administration has imposed an economic embargo upon the poorest country in the western hemisphere, and seeks to force Ibero-American nations to join a "multinational" force to invade the island. Why? In order to reinstate as President, the ultra-leftist liberation theologian, self-avowed follower of China's Cultural Revolution, "Papa" Jean Bertrand Aristide, whom the Haitian military overthrew, in coordination with the majority of the Parliament. The military had acted because Aristide was ruling through unconstitutional means, including creating a parallel private army and encouraging his Jacobin supporters to "necklace"—burn alive—their opponents in the streets.

But George Bush calls that horror "democracy." Aristide,

remember, had signed a deal with the International Monetary Fund, and promised to pay Haiti's debts through their policies. The Anglo-Americans prefer liberation theologians and followers of Pol Pot who will pay the debt, to military nationalists who want development. Such is the "anti-communism" of the U.S. State Department today.

Few voices of protest have been raised against Bush's campaign for the Haitian Pol Pot. As with the U.S. offensive against Panama before, Haiti's crisis is often dismissed as "a special case." In the same way, many Ibero-American military officers tolerate the anti-military propaganda coming out of Washington, arguing that "excesses" were committed by the military in other countries, but since "their" military is different, it will not come under attack.

But Haiti is not an "isolated case." In El Salvador, the Bush administration has demanded that the United Nations force through a "peace" agreement before the end of 1991—an agreement in which the military is to be reduced and purged according to the narco-terrorist wishes, and control of the National Police handed over to the Farabundo Martí Liberation Front. The FMLN, their top spokesmen argue, now advocates "free trade" instead of "Marxism."

In Peru, as Shining Path and the MRTA kill at will, the Bush administration cut off its aid for the military, because of alleged "human rights" violations. Who benefits?

In Colombia, the M-19 holds cabinet posts, while the Attorney General's office seeks to sanction General Arias Cabrales, the officer who directed the operation to recapture the Justice Palace from those same M-19 killers in 1985. The negotiations with the M-19, their participation in the Colombian government, and the M-19's all-out assault on the morals of the country, have all occurred with the prodding and the insistence of the U.S. State Department and Embassy in Bogotá—which now insist that the FARC and ELN be included also. All of this, they explain, is good for "democracy."

Moment of opportunity

Yet the current success of these imperial policies is due, not to the strength of the enemy, but to the lack of political will of those who might oppose them. The Anglo-American empire is collapsing from within under its own policies. The U.S. and British economies are in a deepening depression, their banks increasingly insolvent. The Anglo-Americans' communist ally in the East has been buried, while many leaders of the newly freed nations seek partners that can help rebuild their economies after decades of communism. The time has come to deal a decisive blow to Anglo-American power, before no capability is left standing to do so.

Thus there is one question before Ibero-America in 1992: Who will say "enough" of this genocide carried out in the name of "democracy"? Who will stop the payment of the debt, and ally with those internationally who also seek to reestablish an international order based on justice, sovereignty, and development?