

The UN invades Mexico with civilian 'Blue Helmets' . . . for now

by Carlos Cota Meza

During Nov. 23-28, United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights Mary Robinson conducted an official visit to Mexico, for the ostensible purpose of getting Mexico to comply with international human rights agreements. As anticipated, her visit set off a furious political tug-of-war. On the one hand, the federal government and senators from the ruling Revolutionary Institutional Party (PRI) were trying to keep the visit—and the visitor—within institutional bounds. On the other, opposition congressmen—primarily from the Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD), but also some from the National Action Party (PAN)—plus a myriad of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), tried to turn Robinson's four days of activities into a lynching of national institutions, on behalf of the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) and its secessionist plans in the southeastern state of Chiapas.

Perhaps most shameless of all was PAN Presidential candidate Vicente Fox, who took advantage of the environment created by Robinson's visit to invite the EZLN's "Sub-Commander Marcos" to hold "a good chat," to solve the armed conflict in Chiapas. Fox pledged that, as President, "I would ask the Army to open up space for dialogue and negotiation. I believe that it is viable to withdraw the Army [from Chiapas], so that it is not pressuring the indigenous communities." This is precisely the strategy embraced by Colombian President Andrés Pastrana with the FARC narco-terrorists, through which he has delivered nearly half the country over to the international drug cartels.

Mexico's sovereign institutions were the real victims of Robinson's visit. The imposition of the UN's supranational dictates will, sooner rather than later, drag the country into an internal conflict that will "force" an intervention by UN "Blue Helmet" troops, as has already occurred in several African countries, as well as in Kosovo and East Timor.

Who is Mary Robinson?

Mary Robinson's official *curriculum vitae* says that she has been the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights since 1997. She was President of Ireland (1990-97), and a senator (1969-89). She was a member of the International Commission of Jurists (1987-90), and has been a member of the En-

glish Association of Lawyers since 1973. In an interview with the Mexican daily *La Jornada*, Robinson explained her views on Mexico.

According to the daily, Robinson likes to tell two stories related to her trip to Mexico. The first explains the "similarities" between Mexico and Ireland, because "Ireland has suffered colonialism, hunger and poverty, mass emigrations, political and religious divisions, is neighbor to a powerful country, and is negotiating a peace process." The second, is that Irish troops fought alongside Mexican soldiers against the British.

As the outcome of her visit makes clear, Robinson not only makes a mechanistic historical comparison; she also rearranges the facts and the protagonists. As we will see, for her, the Zapatistas and the NGOs represent a new Mexican Sinn Fein. The former bishop of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Samuel Ruiz, becomes a Mexican version of Gerry Adams, while the Mexican federal government represents the British Empire. In her second story, the EZLN becomes a modern-day "Saint Patrick's Battalion," fighting against the "colonialism" of the federal government.

The climax of Robinson's visit occurred in her last-minute meeting with Samuel Ruiz, who is now president of the Fray Bartolomé de las Casas Human Rights Center, and operates openly as "commander" of the EZLN. On Nov. 27, after intense negotiations with the government, Robinson met with Ruiz, who had returned from Rome that same day. Ruiz had travelled to Vatican City with Auxiliary Bishop Raúl Vera, to argue for the latter's appointment as his successor in the San Cristóbal diocese.

In a 20-page document prepared for the High Commissioner, Ruiz stated: "We suggest exploring the possibility of offering UN technical assistance in [preparing] legislation on the rights of indigenous peoples, which could help to unblock negotiations" between the federal government and the EZLN. "We," said Ruiz in the name of the EZLN, "propose to the UN that it demand [government] compliance with the San Andrés Larrainzar Agreements, and that it encourage the requisite national and state legislation for indigenous rights."

Ruiz presented the EZLN as a regular army, and accused

the federal government of having broken the truce between the two opposing armies. "On at least two occasions, the government has unilaterally and unjustifiably violated the ceasefire," he said. He added that "coinciding with the establishment of Army camps, paramilitary groups flourished, [and were] allowed [to operate with] impunity by Chiapas authorities."

Synchronizing perfectly with the apostate retired bishop, Robinson declared on Nov. 26 from the Chiapas capital of Tuxtla Gutiérrez, that it is necessary to reduce the presence of the national Army in Chiapas state: "Its mere presence undermines the sense of security of the indigenous communities. . . . They see the Army's presence as a threat, they see that it is not protecting their safety, providing them security, and in some cases it is violating their human rights."

After her meeting with Chiapas Gov. Roberto Albores Guillén, Robinson declared, "I hope that my visit helps bring about actions to resolve the conflict, affirm human rights, reduce the role of the military, have a better administration, and eliminate impunity." She offered "technical cooperation" to the state government, so that problems can be resolved "through political will."

Sovereign institutionality shattered

At the institutional level, in the Armed Forces and in the Defense Ministry, there is no doubt about the purpose of Robinson's trip. Gen. Rafael Macedo de la Concha, the Military Justice Prosecutor, who participated in the Nov. 27 eighth annual National Conference of Attorneys, responded explicitly to Robinson: "The Armed Forces carry out very specific functions: first, compliance with the constitutional mandate; second, application of the Federal Firearms Law; and third, aid and support of the civilian population in social work activities. I totally reject [the idea] that [the army presence] generates possible acts of violence in the state of Chiapas."

From the little made public on Robinson's meeting with Defense Secretary Gen. Enrique Cervantes Aguirre on Nov. 25, it was learned that when she proposed the creation of a civilian "ombudsman" to guard against "impunity in the armed forces," General Cervantes responded: "Look, allow me to explain to you how military legal jurisdiction works and the breadth of our legislation which, as it now exists, anticipates these cases, which, although not generalized, are investigated and, if proven true, are punished." According to sources quoted by the media, Robinson said that, as of that point, the meeting with the military had been "the least fruitful."

Inside the PRI bloc of the Mexican Senate, there were also adverse reactions to the UN High Commissioner's subversion of the constitutional order. On Nov. 24, in the meeting between Robinson and a Senate committee, Sen. Fernando Solana Morales reminded her of several things. Solana Morales indicated that "Mexico has provided individual guarantees since its Constitution was established in 1917, after an

armed revolution." The Senator recalled the amnesty decreed by the federal government which had gone so far as to provide a "legal basis" for the existence of a "semi-armed" group, which in 1994 announced its intent to overthrow the government. "I believe that there are very few countries in the world—I can't recall any—that have done that," he concluded, in clear allusion to current events in Northern Ireland.

But all this effort was in vain. Within two days of her arrival, Robinson had already succeeded in weakening the country's sovereign institutions. On her first day, she met with the Inter-Secretarial Commission for Attention to Mexico's International Commitments in the Matter of Human Rights. There, Robinson made her "first recommendations": Mexico should "accept the guarantees contained in various international instruments"; should "make declarations" in accordance with Articles 21 and 22 of the Convention Against Torture, so that this committee "can examine the statements of other states and individuals regarding events in Mexico"; it should "define the crime of torture in accordance with the International Pact of Civil and Political Rights"; and it should "bring Mexican legislation into conformity with the Convention Against All Forms of Racial Discrimination," among other points.

The next day, in her meeting with President Ernesto Zedillo, they signed the "Memorandum of Intent between the Ministry of Foreign Relations and the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, for the Development and Applications of Programs of Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights."

According to the report from the UN Information Office in Mexico, the only point Mexico doesn't subscribe to is that concerning the International Court, which could receive individual complaints against Mexico. However, Mexico has already accepted the "obligatory jurisdiction" of the Inter-American Human Rights Court, and that the use of advisory and technical cooperation services offered by the UN High Commissioner's Office "will be based on the National Program of Human Rights and on priorities expressed by the Mexican government."

President Zedillo also surrendered. On Nov. 24, the President had already acknowledged that "there are deficiencies in the matter of respect for human rights, which are the result of many years of violations of the law, with impunity, by some; of discretionary enforcement by legal agencies, and of erroneous attitudes that fail to respect the rights and dignity of persons." With a Jesuitical smile, Robinson responded: "This is the key point, having recognized that problems exist which must become priorities."

Mexico's strategic failure

An event closely related to the High Commissioner's visit was the signing of the Economic Association and Political Cooperation Agreement, a supposed "free-trade treaty," with the 15 countries that make up the European Union (EU), an-

nounced the day after Mexico signed the “Memorandum of Intent.” From the very beginning of its negotiation, the EU had conditioned its signing on “respect for human rights” in Mexico.

The serious failure here is in not understanding the unmissable relationship between the dismantling of Mexico’s sovereign institutions, which are replaced by supranational dictates, and the application of globalist and free-trade economic policies.

Timed to coincide with Robinson’s visit and the signing of the “Memorandum of Intent,” plus the “political agreement” with the EU, a delegation of 41 observers from ten European countries from the Commission of the International Civil Committee for the Observation of Human Rights, an NGO, finally concluded their lengthy visit to Mexico.

In a preliminary report submitted to the High Commissioner on Mexican soil, the International Civil Committee insisted that “impunity persists, as does the presence of the Army and the restriction to free transit of individuals.” The report goes on, “The paramilitaries continue to act with total impunity, in connivance in some cases with elements of Public Security and the Army. . . . Concern stemming from the monitoring of this issue not only exists in Chiapas, but extends throughout the country.” The report states that, since “more than 400 foreigners expelled during the period of the conflict” reveal restrictions by the Mexican government, it proposes reform of Article 33 of the Constitution, which regulates the travel of foreigners through the country.

According to the recent agreement signed between Mexico and the EU, Mexico should adopt norms whereby Europeans could freely travel throughout the country, just as they now do among EU member-nations. Incredibly, the Government Ministry committed itself to “not invoking” Article 33 of its own Constitution during the remainder of the Zedillo Presidency.

Converts to ‘one-worldism’

The acceptance of the UN’s supranational dictates, and of the transformation of national institutions to which Mexico has been committed “by obligatory jurisdiction,” in the Foreign Relations Ministry, is now called “Contemporary Diplomacy.” This is the title of a book written by career diplomat and current Foreign Relations Undersecretary Carlos de Icaza, in which the UN’s proposed reforms are accepted as positive.

The new foreign policy of the Zedillo government is full acceptance of the UN doctrine, consolidated at the last UN General Assembly in September. There, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan proclaimed the international community’s right to intervene into sovereign nations, on the pretext of defending human rights. Annan underscored that military interventions could not be ruled out, and offered the intervention in East Timor as an example.

As Mexican foreign policy synchronizes itself with the

UN’s new—gunboat—diplomacy, a multitude of government officials have become converts to globalism. For example, Emilio Rabaza Gamoza, coordinator of Dialogue and Negotiation in Chiapas, finds the preliminary results of the UN High Commissioner’s visit to be “relevant.” Humberto Lira Mora, Undersecretary for Religious Affairs in the Government Ministry, announced that his agency would ask the High Commissioner for “technical assistance in training and sensitivity in religious matters.” And to top it off, the new president of the National Commission of Human Rights, José Luis Sobranes, declared that he has “no problem” bringing soldiers alleged to be implicated in human rights violations to trial before civilian courts.

For their part, the more than 50 NGOs which welcomed the High Commissioner, did not hide their delight over what they see as a coup.

Michael Chamberlin, head of the National Network’s “All Rights for All,” created at the request of the EZLN’s self-dubbed “Sub-Commander Marcos,” stated that “the government can no longer hide what is going on, no matter how they try to reduce the impact of this visit.” Marielaire Acosta, president of the PRD-allied Commission for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights, declared: “We understand this visit as part of a process of collaboration between the NGOs and the United Nations, and we hope also with the government.”

The Jesuits’ Miguel Agustín Pro Center for Human Rights played a major role in coordinating the NGOs’ contacts with the High Commissioner, which is not surprising, given that Robinson is one of their own.

In aligning itself with the UN’s supranationalism, which appears to be the latest fashion for the Zedillo government, it wouldn’t be at all surprising to hear its officials speaking with great feeling of the “morning dew,” the “aroma of the flowers,” or the “adorned colors” of nature, just as “Sub-Commander Marcos” does in his nauseating papers published in *La Jornada*. Or, will the Government Ministry itself ask the “Blue Helmets” to intervene to protect the “emerald tapestry” of the Lacandón jungle—where the Zapatistas have their bases?

Six years after its appearance, it should be clear that the story that the EZLN “rose up in arms” against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), is a thoroughgoing lie. On the contrary, when free-trade globalism decides to destroy a national economy, it uses sentimentality and romanticism as part of its arsenal.

The globalist multinational cartels and the supranational agencies are the ones that have been financing Samuel Ruiz and his EZLN through the NGOs. Isn’t the pastoral life more picturesque, or the naked savage armed with bow and arrow more romantic, than to have to fight for a sovereign nation, even if the enemy outnumbers us in size and strength? Watch out: In this, the last year of the Zedillo government, globalist one-worldism will try to stage a coup in Mexico.