

The U.S. certification procedure, which the Dialogue has repeatedly demanded be abandoned in favor of “collective” criteria, and which the Dialogue-influenced media tried to ignite into a full-blown confrontation between the United States and Mexico, in fact scarcely figured in the discussions between the two heads of state.

On the issue of the *armed forces*, too, the anti-military lobbyists at the Dialogue were iced out. Despite a furious campaign by the British press and their media cohorts in the United States to smear the Mexican Armed Forces as corrupt and as human-rights abusers, the Clinton administration not only expressed an appreciation of Mexico’s defense forces as a bulwark against the drug cartels, but President Clinton personally praised that institution. During a visit to Mexico’s Niños Héroes monument, the first by a U.S. President in 50 years, Clinton paid homage to “the patriotism and the integrity of the people who have served this country.”

On the question of Mexican *political reform*, the watchword for dismantling the ruling PRI party as an institution vital to Mexican stability, the Dialogue went unsatisfied as well. Although President Clinton praised the Zedillo government’s commitment to “democratizing” Mexico’s political environment, and met briefly with representatives of the National Action Party (PAN) and Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) opposition, the net effect of the visit was to strengthen, rather than weaken, Mexico’s governing institutions.

Jorge Castañeda, an outspoken opposition figure linked to disgraced former Mexican President Carlos Salinas, and who travels in Dialogue circles and has most vocally publicized the demand that Clinton help sink the Mexican political system, complained after the visit that Clinton’s policy toward Mexico “is absolutely clear, decisive, unequivocal: to try at all cost to keep the system in power. . . . The timing of his visit was planned with clear electoral purposes. It’s obvious that they could have waited another three months. . . . Zedillo and the PRI will be the obvious winners.”

On *human rights*, the Dialogue was also left high and dry. Mexican Dialogue member Mariclaire Acosta, who is also president of Mexico’s Commission for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights, met with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and presented her with a document demanding that the United States and all Ibero-American countries submit to the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States in matters pertaining to human rights. This call for placing supranational agencies above the laws of sovereign nations has been a long-standing demand of the British one-worldists, and of the Inter-American Dialogue. Acosta complained that Clinton is not moving on this agenda item either.

President Clinton has not freed himself, however, from the Dialogue’s grip on the crucial issue of economic policy, although he is not implementing their directives at the speed the British would like. In remarks to Mexican businessmen on May 7, Clinton praised the Bush-initiated North American

Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as a success story, and stated that he was hoping to incorporate “more nations in our partnership” by seeking fast-track negotiating authority from the U.S. Congress.

The *Financial Times* of London complained on May 14, that Clinton’s “credibility” in Ibero-America “depends on Congress granting ‘fast-track’ authority . . . an issue on which there has been little progress to date.”

Clinton’s encounter with Mexican history

by Carlos Cota Meza

President Bill Clinton’s state visit to Mexico May 5-7, and his meetings with President Ernesto Zedillo, held out a promise of the type of relations which could exist between sovereign nations, within the framework of a new and just international economic order.

To properly locate the Clinton-Zedillo meetings, recall the serious tensions which existed between the two countries in February and March of this year, as a result of highly provocative behavior by the U.S. Congress in opposing the administration’s certification of Mexico as a drug-fighting ally. At that time, President Clinton proceeded to certify Mexico in the face of opposition from practically every Congressional Republican, along with some Democrats. After the President’s decision, it was this same opposition group which demanded the imposition of an arbitrary time frame on Mexico, within which it would have to implement certain anti-drug policies, or otherwise be labeled an unreliable ally.

In reviewing the key elements of this conflict, Lyndon LaRouche stated that those in the United States who attacked Mexico’s certification, know virtually nothing about the Mexican political system or the history it embodies, including the history of U.S.-Mexican relations. Current relations between the two nations, LaRouche said, are similar to those of the 1861-65 period (see *EIR*, March 28, 1997, “The Certification of Mexico”).

It was precisely this positive environment which characterized the personal meetings between the two heads of state, and was a theme expressed in their speeches and in major events. It should also be said that this same 1861-65 period, highlights historical mistakes which the two Presidents must overcome between now and the year 2000, when both their terms in office end.

Monument to the ‘Child Heroes’

President Clinton’s first official act in Mexico on May 6, has been characterized as “of historic proportions.” He paid



President Ernesto Zedillo (left) chose the itinerary of President Clinton's visit. Here, sightseeing at the "Sun Pyramid," in Teotihuacán.

homage to the famous "Niños Héroes" monument in Mexico City, the first American President to do so since May 3, 1947, when Truman joined an honor guard in front of what was known as the Altar of the Fatherland.

The "Niños Héroes" monument commemorates six teenage military cadets who were killed while resisting the Sept. 13, 1847 capture of Mexico City by the U.S. Army, commanded by Gen. Winfield Scott, in the war against Mexico declared by President James K. Polk. The conflict was resolved by the Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaties, in which Mexico accepted the Río Bravo (known by Americans as the Rio Grande) as its northern border, thus losing an extensive territory which today forms part of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

Part history, part legend, the fact remains that this is something that Americans don't like to remember, and that Mexicans don't want to forget, even though it would be absurd for Mexico to claim these territories today. It is a polemical matter for both neighboring countries, since that event defined not only the current territorial boundaries of Mexico, but many of its current government institutions as well. In effect, the war of 1846-48 is considered today as the event that forced the creation of a national army to professionally defend territorial integrity and national sovereignty. The "Niños Héroes" are the seed of today's Mexican Army.

Responding to this polemic, President Clinton stated: "I'm going there as a gesture of respect — not only respect for their lives, but respect for the patriotism and the integrity of the people who have served this country. . . . I do not believe

the President of the United States should decline to go, because of what happened between our two countries a long time ago. . . . It is imperative for us to respect our friends and neighbors especially, in countries around the world, and honor their symbols of national honor."

President Zedillo returned to the theme of Mexico's long and important history at another official event later that day. During a state dinner with the Clintons at the National Palace, in the historic center of Mexico City, the Mexican head of state offered an unusual toast, reminding his guests: "Just down the street, we have the first printing press, the first mint, the first university, and the first Academy of Art in the Americas." Although the University of Santo Domingo, in the Caribbean nation of the Dominican Republic, was founded in 1538, the University of Mexico was the first one founded on the mainland of the American continent, in 1551.

"Also from here," Zedillo continued, "a great Mexican President, Benito Juárez, established a relationship of mutual respect and appreciation with a great United States President, Abraham Lincoln. We Mexicans hold Lincoln in high regard, because, in his relations with Mexico, he always knew how to reconcile defending the legitimate interests of his country with respect for the sovereignty of our nation and the dignity of Mexicans. . . . These are the sentiments President Clinton has demonstrated during this visit."

Thus, in a single day, both heads of state referred to the most turbulent and most significant periods of the nineteenth-century history of Mexico and the United States. As is recognized by universal history, Lincoln's republican victory against the slave-holding Confederates of the South was the second U.S. war of independence from the British Empire, a singular event that changed the course of history for all of humanity.

Journey to Tlaxcala

President Zedillo has acknowledged that it was he who chose the itinerary of Clinton's visit, which was approved by Clinton himself, and thus what transpired during the course of the trip was their joint responsibility.

Because they bore no great significance in defining a new strategic relationship between the two nations, we do not detail Clinton's May 5 visit to the Anthropology Museum, nor the naive concepts Clinton expressed about pre-Hispanic culture, nor the visit to the Teotihuacán pyramids, with which he concluded his trip.

What was striking was Clinton's surprise May 7 visit to the historic city of Tlaxcala, and the celebration held there. The joyous acclaim with which the city's residents greeted the Clintons brought smiles of delight to the visitors' faces. In this simple way, it was demonstrated that it is possible to have friendships between different peoples.

But even more important is the epic history of Tlaxcala revealed during the visit, which demonstrated to a surprised Bill Clinton that it is possible to create a civilization from the bottom up. Tlaxcala is the first city on mainland America

from which the conquest, evangelization, and colonization of the New World was begun.

The festivities were held outside the San Francisco convent, the first constructed on the American mainland; a construction decided upon in 1519, the same year that Hernán Cortés arrived on these shores. The Presidents, their wives, and entourage toured the hall through which Cortés and his men had also passed.

President and Mrs. Clinton, along with a reduced entourage, accepted the invitation of the three parish priests of the Tlaxcala Cathedral to sign the book of distinguished visitors, and tour the cathedral. Clinton inquired about the details of the sacred art he was viewing, including the most minute description of each of the paintings that adorned the church walls. The cathedral was constructed in 1537, and its roof was designed to resemble a ship's hull, in commemoration of Cortés's order to burn his ships upon arriving in the Americas. Even the baptismal font where Cortés acted as godfather to hundreds of newly baptized Indians was preserved, as well as the very first pulpit of the American mainland.

The history presented by the paintings concluded with an oil painting re-creating the baptism of the four Tlaxcalteca chiefs, who chose the names Lorenzo, Vicente, Gonzalo, and Bartolomé. These are the same Indian leaders who sealed a military alliance with Cortés, to defeat the cannibalistic tyranny of the Aztecs.

We don't know what the priests told the visitors in private, but there is no other way to explain Tlaxcala's history except as a key element in the creation of the New World. The priests offered to bless the Clintons, and their blessing was accepted.

'Dialogue' says, smash the nation-state now!

by Cynthia Rush and Gretchen Small

EIR has repeatedly warned that the main policy agenda of the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD), the Wall Street-linked think-tank, was to smash the sovereign nation-states of Ibero-America, and replace them with supranational entities capable of enforcing the dictates of a British-led international financial oligarchy. In the Dialogue's many reports, this agenda has always been dressed in the insane language of globaloney: "redefining sovereignty," "multilateralism," "strengthening democracy," and "regional governance."

In two new reports issued in April, *The Americas in 1997: Making Cooperation Work*, and *The Inter-American Agenda and Multilateral Governance: the Organization of American States*, the Dialogue has thrown caution to the wind, and issued a blueprint for the transformation of the OAS into a regional government, empowered to impose economic, mili-

tary, and political policies upon the region—and it demands immediate implementation of this agenda. Both reports in fact express great frustration over the lack of progress made since 1991 in forcing Ibero-America to accept their nation-wrecking plans.

There are two matters which explain the Dialogue's exasperation. One, is that its influence in Washington, particularly inside the Clinton administration, has diminished, evidence of which was seen in President Clinton's very successful state visit to Mexico on May 5-7, and the close, personal working relationship he established with Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo. This type of government-to-government cooperation flies in the face of the United Nations-enforced supranationalism that the Dialogue says must govern all hemispheric relations.

This explains why the IAD is so intent on destroying the Mexican political system and the ruling PRI party, a goal not stated explicitly in its reports, but one which is central to its overall policy agenda. The IAD openly demands that U.S. policy be "redirected" away from any unilateral initiatives, such as those Clinton has taken in the anti-drug war, and which the Dialogue sees as obstacles to its drive for regional government and multilateralism. "The opportunity to build strong and productive hemispheric partnerships must be grasped soon," *The Americas in 1997* report warns, "or it will fade."

The IAD's other problem is the resistance to its agenda within Ibero-America itself. The April 22 commando raid ordered by Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori, which rescued 72 hostages held by the MRTA at the Japanese ambassador's residence in Lima, was the Dialogue's worst nightmare: Not only did an Ibero-American President act unflinchingly in defense of the nation-state, but his actions reverberated throughout the continent, provoking an outpouring of optimism and pride in Peru's victory over the narco-terrorist enemy—the MRTA, which the Dialogue supports. In an April 23 press conference in Washington to present *The Americas in 1997* report, IAD staff member Carlos Iván Degregori, a Peruvian, solemnly voiced the Dialogue's fear: "Yesterday, when I saw President Fujimori addressing the military and singing the anthem—I'm deeply concerned that this military victory, the methodology, can be translated to the political arena." Degregori speaks of sovereignty as if it were some dread disease which must be stamped out before it spreads.

Hence, the report's renewed emphasis on crushing the continent's armed forces, in the guise of eliminating "impunity" for human rights abuses, doing away with "special economic and political prerogatives," and creating new multilateral security bodies whose decisions would override any national security concerns of individual nations. Peru's military, not surprisingly, is singled out as a special target for destruction.

A new Maastricht?

Underlying every agenda item discussed in the two reports, and in the April 23 press conference, is the demand that national sovereignty, and the nation-state, be replaced by