

ever-closer relationship on fighting drugs, monitoring the common border, and military cooperation." It is that cooperation which Human Rights Watch, and its kissing cousin from London, Amnesty International, are determined to sabotage.

A leading figure in the campaign to target Mexico's military is Jesuit priest David Fernández, head of the Agustín Pro Human Rights Center. Fernández, who is regularly cited in the British and U.S. media as an expert on Mexican human rights issues, has taken up the case of Brigadier General Gallardo (see the section of this report on the Inter-American Dialogue) as a battering-ram against the Mexican Armed Forces. Fernández has also deployed against co-thinkers of the LaRouche movement inside Mexico, who are advocates of U.S.-Mexican cooperation against narco-terrorism, by falsely accusing them of issuing death threats against him.

On Nov. 19, 1996, Human Rights Watch invited Fernández to Washington to receive an award for his work. In statements to the Mexican magazine *Proceso*, Fernández said that the HRW award provided an "umbrella of protection" for himself and his colleagues. He added that the HRW awards ceremony was also intended to prepare an attack against the "militarization" of Mexico: "Virtually all public security of the country is in the hands of the military; this is a threat to civil rule and democracy. . . . There has been a deliberate confusion between public security and national security, to legitimize the presence of the military in the public security agencies."

Not surprisingly, the London *Guardian* of Jan. 13 quotes Father Fernández on Mexico's growing "authoritarianism," in an article on the Gallardo story which warns that Mexico's military is being "unleashed" by President Zedillo to commit human rights horrors against the country's "opposition." The *Guardian* says that human rights groups like Fernández's are "particularly worried about the Armed Forces' immunity from punishment," precisely HRW's lament.

The Soros/drug connection

HRW's leading financier is George Soros, the global speculator whose latest philanthropic exercise has been to sink millions into drug legalization initiatives in various states of the United States. Soros also sits on the board of the HRW's oldest projects: HRW/Helsinki (which targets Russia, Poland and the former Czechoslovakia) and HRW/Americas. The current president of Soros's Open Society Fund, Aryeh Neier, previously served as executive director of HRW/Americas.

Most recently, HRW has created a new department, dedicating to hampering anti-drug programs around the world by claiming "human rights abuses." Says HRW, because "national and international counter-narcotics programs . . . by and large have escaped close human rights scrutiny, in early 1995, HRW began a multi-year effort to document and challenge human rights violations caused or exacerbated by efforts to curtail drug trafficking internationally as well as in the United States."



George Soros, the money-bags for Human Rights Watch, extends his largesse worldwide, to destroy nations.

HRW has closely collaborated for years with the Andean Commission of Jurists, which has a long history of defending the "human rights" of the region's narcotics industry. With offices in six countries, its main headquarters are in Peru, where it essentially functions as a branch of HRW. Diego García-Sayán, the head of the Andean Commission Jurists and a member of the Inter-American Dialogue, is currently collaborating with another of George Soros's operations, the Lindesmith Center, to win the legalization of the coca leaf by the United Nations, which would be an important step in the drive for global drug legalization.

Neo-con malthusians say, 'Shut the border'

by Valerie Rush

The ultimate fate of Mexico, according to the British gameplan, is to be "downsized" through genocidal population warfare. A central element of this is the proposal to shut down the U.S.-Mexican border, so that all flows of Mexican immigrants—legal and illegal—are forcibly cut off. A variant on



The neo-cons want to close the U.S.-Mexico border and “watch them scream.” Here, a section of the wall erected along the border.

this would feature militarizing the border, including cross-border hot pursuit by U.S. authorities of drug-runners and other trouble-makers, into Mexico’s sovereign territory.

The most brazen presentation of this Malthusian approach is still that of Rockefeller Foundation agronomist William Paddock, who in a series of 1975 interviews, insisted that Mexico’s population must be cut in half. “Shut the border and watch them scream,” he said. How would this reduce the population? “The usual means—famine, war, and pestilence,” he answered.

In 1979, Paddock formed the Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR), which played a role in the formulation of the Carter administration’s neo-Malthusian *Global 2000 Report*. That two-volume “Report to the President” painted a picture of world overpopulation, resource shortages, and environmental hazards, and represented a statement of *policy intent* by such British influences on the U.S. government as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, to rid the world of up to 2 billion “excess” people, through restricting technology transfer to the developing sector, restricting food and nuclear energy production, and so forth.

In the current Mexico crisis, voices are rising to once again promote this genocidal British policy. For example, there is the novel *The Next War*, by Sir Caspar Weinberger, which proposes a scenario featuring U.S. troops being deployed across the border to Mexico to impose order there.

And in the recent Congressional debate on the certification of Mexico, Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.) told a hearing of the House Government Reform Committee on Feb. 27 that, “if it’s necessary and a policy of the United States, we should close down and tighten that border.” Mica, curiously, was one of nine U.S. Congressmen who sent President Clinton a letter in February, urging that Colombia’s narco-government be certified.

A similar argument was presented by Pat Buchanan in the March 5 *Washington Times*: “Mexico is a virtual narco-democracy,” out of control, Buchanan proclaimed. “Americans can try to help, but we are not going to save this regime by pretending these realities do not exist. Mexico is on the way to becoming the gravest U.S. foreign policy crisis of the new century. Our first priority should be to marshal whatever force is required to re-establish, protect, and police the U.S.-Mexican border.”

Similarly, on Feb. 27, neo-conservative mouthpiece Georgie Anne Geyer penned a column for the *Washington Times* which demanded drastic U.S. action against Mexico: “It is time for the White House to stop dancing around the borders of this behemothian problem and to move to confront its core. That will, unfortunately but inevitably, require a confrontation with Mexico, almost surely closing the border to take back power and to deny it to them where it hurts. Our border, after all, is their cynical ‘escape valve’ for that massive overpopulation they have no intention of curbing at home.”