

described as “anti-Jewish, anti-Negro and anti-Oriental.” Mizrahi maintained, however, that Endara himself “harbors no anti-Semitism.”

Total losses to the Panamanian economy may exceed \$2 billion. But, despite promises by Bush that he will help to rebuild the economy, so far the only money made available is a small portion of the Panamanian funds the U.S. held in escrow as part of its sanctions against Noriega. In fact, while Panamanian economists say the U.S. owes Panama at least \$700 million, Washington only acknowledges a debt of \$370 million. The administration says the U.S. alone will not pay for the cost of rebuilding Panama, and says that help should be provided by Japan, Europe, and financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund. But those institutions will not lend any money “until Panama pays \$400 million in back loans, and adopts structural reforms,” reported Mexico’s *El Financiero* Jan. 1.

There have been some cracks in this conspiracy of silence, at least regarding the drug connections of the puppet government. On Dec. 31 *Jornal do Brasil*, Brazil’s largest daily, ran a front-page article on the “special vulnerability of Guillermo Endara,” because of his connections to Carlos Elea, “accused in the United States of laundering money and trafficking in 600 kilos of cocaine.” Vice President Arias Calderón’s brother Jaime is tied to the First Interamericas Bank, whose owner, Gilberto Rodríguez Orejuela, was accused in 1985 of overseeing the transfer of \$46 million in drug proceeds to the Banco Cafetero Panama in New York, the paper reported. As for Billy Ford, he is implicated with politicians Carlos Rodríguez (Endara’s ambassador to Washington) and Bobby Eisenmann in the laundering of drug funds through the Dadeland National Bank in Miami.

The *Miami Herald* reported Jan. 5 on the ties between Medellín Cartel money launderer Ramon Milian Rodríguez and Henry Ford, brother of Panama’s second vice president, Guillermo Ford. Milian Rodríguez “laundered millions of dollars in drug money in the early 1980s through a Panamanian company in which Ford’s brother Henry was an officer.”

The same day, the *Oakland Tribune* came out with an editorial stating: “It is significant that Noriega’s political foes, who now enjoy power, opposed a rollback in the country’s bank secrecy law that passed the legislature in December 1986.”

One of those mentioned by the *Oakland Tribune* is Rogelio Cruz, installed by the U.S. occupation forces as Panama’s new Attorney General. Cruz was a member of the board of directors of First Interamericas bank, which was closed down by the Panamanian government in 1985, after a joint operation with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration revealed that the bank was engaged in money laundering and that its principal shareholder was Gilberto Rodríguez Orejuela, kingpin of the Cali cocaine cartel.

## Backlash against U.S. invasion begins

by Gretchen Small

Bush administration officials appear as confident that Ibero-America will soon accept U.S. occupation of Panama as a *fait accompli*, as they were that the Panama Defense Forces would lay down their arms without a fight. So confident is President Bush, in fact, that he sent Henry Kissinger down to Caracas Dec. 29 to meet with Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez and his shady business sidekick Gustavo Cisneros, to work out how to quickly “mop up” continental resistance to U.S. plans to eliminate Panama as a nation. Upon leaving their pleasant luncheon, Kissinger assured the press that “Panama is an incident” which will soon blow over.

Indeed, the United States has deployed unprecedented diplomatic and military pressure to silence Ibero-American resistance as quickly as possible. Every U.S. asset in the region has been activated in support of the invasion, while wire services pump out a steady stream of propaganda that all resistance throughout the region has collapsed.

Despite the pressure, however, the U.S.-imposed Guillermo Endara government in Panama has thus far been recognized by only four countries: the United States, Great Britain, Luxembourg, and Dominica. From the standpoint of Ibero-American patriots, a battle as during the 1982 Malvinas War is again taking shape, to defend the continent’s right to sovereign development against the attempt to subjugate it to Anglo-American rule.

### ‘You’re with us, or we’re against you’

The veiled ultimatum issued to the Argentine government by Bush’s ambassador to Argentina Terence Todman, exemplified Washington’s message. “We regret that those who, for years, have expressed their support for hemispheric efforts to liberate Panama from the Noriega regime, now do not deem it appropriate to support the United States in the necessary measures which we have carried out,” Todman stated in a Dec. 21 communiqué. “The decision of President Bush to act with firmness and legitimacy in self-defense and in the name of the conscience and democratic norms, deserves not opprobrium, but the full support of all sister democracies.”

Within 24 hours of Todman’s communiqué, Argentine Army officials announced that retired Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín—who issued a Dec. 22 appeal for all American patriots to support Panama against the “aggression against the principle of national sovereignty”—had been placed un-

der 20-day house arrest.

Seineldín, whose patriotic leadership in the past five years has made him increasingly looked to by civilian and soldier alike as the savior of the Argentine nation as crisis loomed, replied that it was “an honor to be sanctioned for defending the sovereignty of a Latin American nation which, in its moment, offered solidarity to our Malvinas cause.”

U. S. pressure also succeeded in having Colombia’s Foreign Minister Julio Londoño sent on a sudden “leave of absence” to attend to “personal matters,” shortly after he had drafted a harsh condemnation of the U.S. invasion which he proposed be submitted to the foreign ministers of the “Group of Eight Minus One” (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, and Uruguay—the “one” being Panama). The Colombian press reported how the State Department had contacted Colombia’s ambassador to the United States, and pressured him in turn to contact U. S.-favored Colombian ex-President Julio Turbay.

The invading U. S. military command was deployed politically against the Mexican government. On Dec. 27, Gen. Maxwell Thurman refused landing rights for a plane sent by the Mexican government to remove Mexican nationals from the scene of fighting, until the Mexican government contacted the Endara puppets as the real “authorities” on the ground. After their plane had circled Panama City for as long as it could, Mexican authorities decided to contact the Endara group, but specified that contact did not constitute the diplomatic recognition of the Endara government that the United States was seeking.

But if some governments have been intimidated, the populations and legislatures of the region have not been. The day after the invasion, the Mexican Congress unanimously condemned the invasion. “For us Mexicans, this is the equivalent of the French invasion of 1861, in which the same pretexts were given about the government then—that of President Benito Juárez—not being able to guarantee the security of the lives of [foreign] citizens as are being given about Panama today,” one deputy said during the debate.

Outrage against the U.S. occupation came from across the political spectrum in Mexico. The popular opposition leader Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, widely believed to have been the real winner of the 1989 presidential elections, sent an open letter to Bush demanding the immediate withdrawal of all U. S. troops, because the U. S. invasion “has no justification, neither in law, nor in reason, nor in truth.” Jesús González Schmall, foreign policy secretary of Mexico’s National Action Party (PAN), wrote in an official statement Jan. 3 that “the [U.S.] attempt to take his [Noriega’s] life is a certainty . . . that was the primary motivation for the occupation of Panamanian territory by U. S. military forces.”

A similar resolution was endorsed the same day by the Argentine House, and the Bolivian Congress approved a resolution calling on all Latin American governments not to recognize the puppet government in Panama.

---

## Documentation

---

# Voices of outrage from Ibero-America

### Brazil

*Jornal do Brasil, the New York Times of Brazil, has run a near-daily series of exposés on the fraudulent nature of the Endara government established by the U.S. military forces. The first in the series, published Dec. 31, 1989, under the headline “Dangerous Relations with Drug Trafficking,” reviewed how Guillermo Endara and his two vice presidents are linked to drug trafficking. Most of those links were reported in EIR, Jan. 5, 1990 (“Bush names drug mob capos to rule Panama”). We provide selections of other articles here.*

*Jornal do Brasil, Dec. 31: “Guillermo Endara, a Miserable Peon in the Americans’ Game”:*

Endara is called “Nhonho” by his political colleagues—the name of a stupid fatso boy who wears a hat and short pants in a Mexican television series—while ordinary folk call him *Pan Dulce* (“Sweetbreads”), fat and soft, *Jornal* reports.

He is a member of one of the poorer of the white oligarchical families which have alternated power with the military since 1904, the article reports. He “began his political life as an obscure commercial lawyer in Panama City, in the law firm of Galileo Soliz, foreign minister in one of the Arnulfo Arias governments. . . . Through Soliz, Endara fell into the good graces of Arias, who made him his legal counselor.

“‘But “Nhonho” never gave Arias a juridical opinion. He was nothing more than the chief’s briefcase porter, always ready to shower him with praise and rapid in opening doors for the leader,’ said a Panamanian politician. . . . When Arias went into exile again, in 1980 . . . Endara was chosen his spokesman in Panama. ‘The choice was more than logical,’ recalls a National Assembly deputy. ‘Endara never had his own ideas; he was as faithful as a puppy and adored repeating what Arias said. . . .’

“The recent history of Panama is marked by disputes between the aristocracy and the military, a split which the Americans always take advantage of to play one off against the other and keep their dominion over the country.”

*Jornal do Brasil, Jan. 2, front page, “Panama’s Sovereignty Only Survives on Paper”:*

“The finest flower of Panamanian society was represented at the New Year’s party in one of the Punta Paitilla mansions. There were the Solizes, the Ariases, the Galindos, the Endaras—families of the country’s white aristocracy which, with the American invasion of the 20th, renewed their hopes of freeing themselves of mixed-blood up-and-coming types like Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega. . .

“When a group of foreign journalists asked if the Panamanian government would be able to firm itself up without the presence of the gringos, the aristocrats responded with rage, in impeccable English. ‘This is our country. We are not going to keep licking the gringos’ boots,’ said one of them. . . .

“The sons of the traditional Panamanian families did not differ in their bravado from the unfortunate Noriega. Only there is something ever more pathetic in their proclamations of independence. . . . Panama’s sovereignty was always a fiction. The only exceptions to the tradition of governments obedient to Washington were, for different reasons, Arnulfo Arias’s, Omar Torrijos’s, and Noriega’s.”

*Jornal do Brasil*, Jan. 2:

“‘Endara only exists today thanks to the Americans,’ a presidential adviser admits. It’s true. In the recent episode of the invasion of the Nicaraguan embassy, for example, the ambassador from that country, Antenor Ferrey, did not seek anyone from the country’s government.” He went straight to U.S. ambassador Arthur Davis.

“Julio Linares, Panama’s own foreign relations minister, sought out the U.S. embassy to learn how his government should behave during that same Nicaraguan embassy crisis. A top U.S. diplomat, asked if it should have been the reverse—i.e., that, at least for protocol, someone from his embassy should have gone to the minister’s office—tried to give an explanation but ended up muddying up things even more. ‘In fact, Linares did not have to come here. We installed offices for our diplomats in rooms in the Panamanian foreign ministry. All he had to do was walk into one of them,’ he said candidly. . . .

“By overthrowing Noriega, the Americans returned power to an aristocracy which always has exercised power based on two untouchable pillars: nepotism and shameless favoritism to allies. . . . ‘The invasion pulled Noriega’s soldiers from power. But in their place, put other soldiers,’ the Panamanian deputy said ironically.”

The new police “are closely watched by American troops, who have absolute control. . . . Based on anonymous tips—from Panamanians or American intelligence itself—Mad Max’s troops could enter any house and seize any person, without needing a judicial warrant—something impossible in their home country.”

## **Mexico**

*Mexican press and politicians also refuted U.S. administration lies about the invasion and occupation.*

*Excelsior*, Dec. 27:

“The horrifying lack of solidarity by all the Latin American governments and citizenries with the Panamanian cause, cannot but auger awful consequences for all. Amidst generalized apathy, one Latin American country is about to disappear in the most violent attack on international law, and few stop to think that there is nothing stopping the process from continuing into other latitudes of the continent. It is lamentable but predictable that U.S. presence in Panama will be long-lasting. . . .

“Panama’s requiem [is] the dirty diplomatic inauguration in Latin America of President Bush and those who applaud him. In the midst of just a few months of 1989, which were prodigious in shining achievements for democracy in the world, the U.S. behaved ominously, grotesquely. This augers a lugubrious decade, which, God help us, will last only ten years.”

*Excelsior*, by Luis Suárez, Dec. 28:

“The true goal was to destroy the PDF and its Commander Manuel Antonio Noriega. . . . It is clear that the 25,000 or 30,000 soldiers did not go to Panama for the head of ‘drug trafficker’ Noriega, but for the chief of the Defense Forces who offered resistance to its plans for the Canal and also for the whole military institution, educated in his nationalist spirit.”

*Excelsior*, Dec. 27:

“The invasion demonstrated the urgency of uniting that part of the continent. . . . Agreements around an immediate end to the military occupation of Panama and restoration of its independence and sovereignty must be made. It should be clear that the imposition of a government presided by Guillermo Endara could not possibly mean a return to constitutional legality, broken by U.S. interventionism four months ago. . . .

“There will not be a legitimate national government in Panama without immediate troop withdrawal and new elections. During the next few days, news which is militarily controlled and generously induced with abundant dollars, will try to give the world the image of a nice guy and popular Endara, although his only support comes from the U.S. troops.”

*Excelsior*, by Raúl Moreno Wonchee, Jan. 3:

“Not only are the sovereignty and security of every country at risk, but the United States seeks to annihilate a Latin American nation. The absorption of Puerto Rico is next on the imperialist agenda.”

*Excelsior*, José Luis Mejías, Jan. 3:

“Latin America has been left with no remedy other than defending, by itself, its sovereignty, its dignity, its culture and even its race.”

## International press attacks invasion

### West Germany

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, editorial, Jan. 3:

Attacking the Panama intervention is no “cheap anti-Americanism” but justified. The Americans exceeded a mere “surgical” military operation. The violation of diplomatic immunity of the Nicaraguan ambassadorial residence, the acoustic war of nerves against the Nunciature of the Vatican, and “more grave even, the big number of deaths among the civilian population,” have alarmed the world public.

### Italy

*Corriere della Sera*, editorial, Dec. 30:

“The Nunciature is no colony. It is not admissible, from the standpoint of international law, that a state invade another one, just because its head of state is accused, rightly or wrongly, of grave faults. . . . To this, one must add the arrogance used against the Apostolic Nunciature in Panama, arrogance that has not yet elicited adequate indignation. . . .”

*Il Secolo XIX*, editorial, Dec. 30:

“The U.S.A. does not give up their imperial rights. No international treaty grants the U.S.A. this right to invade. . . . It is incredible that a crime defined in the internal law of a state implies the right to occupy another state. . . . De facto the U.S.A. adopted the Brezhnev Doctrine. . . . The toughness of the Holy See is clear: Today it is called upon to defend human rights and international law in the face of the U.S.A.”

### East Asia

*Philippine Newsday*, Francisco S. Tadad, Dec. 22:

“When one thinks that Mr. Bush came to power promising a kinder and gentler America, we can only thank our lucky stars that he is not committed to making America the most dangerous nation in the world. . . . It seems to us—and so should it seem to our officials in Congress—that if there is anything that concerns us here, it is America’s invasion of its puny little neighbor, not the political quarrel between Noriega and Endara.”

*Daily Malaya*, editorial, Dec. 22:

The U.S. “has no compunction about riding roughshod over the sovereignty of another country if its vital interests so require. Today, Panama.

### Pakistan

*Muslim*, editorial, Dec. 22:

“If it were to be accepted that a country has the right to invade another country in retaliation for the killing or wounding of some of its citizens, then what would be there to prevent any country that has the capacity from doing the same? This is a dangerous argument which if accepted would sanction any state interfering where ever it pleased. . . . The real issue is no country has the right to decide what sort of government another country should have. Neither the Panama Canal Treaty, nor the United Nations Charter, nor the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS) gives the U.S. that right, though all of these were cited by Secretary of State James Baker in justifying the U.S. action.”

### Great Britain

*Independent*, letter to the editor by Austen Ivereigh of Oxford, Dec. 28:

“Will the U.S. invade Britain to save Britons from ‘Mad Thatcher’? The shocking aspect has been the U.S. response. To the obvious argument that America has acted illegally by all standards of international law, the response of senators on Newsnight was to say that Noriega is insane. Mrs. Thatcher, in recent months, has also been going mad, but would we appreciate an American invasion to clean things up?”

*Guardian*, Dec. 28 editorial:

“George Bush went hunting and fishing for a very long week-end yesterday, which is probably the best place for him. Whilst the earthquakes of freedom grow ever more thunderous across Eastern Europe, all the President of the United States has to occupy his time is a tedious and embarrassing wrangle with the Pope about the fate of General Noriega. And, so far, the Pope commands the high ground. . . . In spite of the U.S. troops who ring the refuge, in spite of much White House bluster, there is no reason for him to change in mind; indeed, just sitting tight seems the best immediate policy.” Insisting that Noriega has no chance of getting a fair trial in the U.S. and that Endara is acting like a perfect

best course would be to keep Noriega for several months, waiting to see if a legitimate Panamanian government ever actually develops. “Handing him over in any other circumstance would be a mockery of justice.”

*Daily Telegraph*, Dec. 30:

Accuses U.S. forces of mimicking the tactics of the “Chinese during the Cultural Revolution” in its use of rock-music psychological warfare against the Nuncio’s office. “It is sad- dening that the Americans, whose forcible deposition of General Noriega we supported as warmly as Mrs. Thatcher, should now diminish their cause by resorting to such crude and absurd tactics as playing heavy metal music through loudspeakers. Aural warfare, practiced notably by the Chinese during the Cultural Revolution, is an undignified way of conducting diplomacy.”