

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

“collective,” multilateral consensus in all areas of policymaking. The body chosen to enforce what the IAD calls “regional governance,” that is, regional government, is the Organization of American States (OAS).

The *Multilateral Governance* report argues that the OAS is the “logical and principal mechanism which governments can use to engage each other . . . in the management of hemispheric affairs, and that it should be the central ‘hub’ of the region’s multilateral networks. . . . Rather than a project-execution agency, the basic organizing concept of the OAS should be that of an overall, pro-active forum . . . inducing agreements and commitments from governments.” To carry out this role, the IAD baldly states, the OAS must function “under the global network of the United Nations system.” That is, become a regional sub-division of the United Nations, to which the region’s governments agree to hand over sovereign powers on economic and military matters, and domestic and foreign policy.

The scope of the IAD’s proposals are unprecedented, matched perhaps only by the Maastricht Treaty, whose final implementation is intended to subject all of Europe to supranational government. The regional governance project was the product of an IAD study group of 14 “scholars and practitioners”—practitioners of *what*, we might ask—created in May 1995, and whose conclusions were released in April of this year. In effect, it is the continuation of the IAD’s earlier “redefining sovereignty” project, public discussion of which had to be dropped because the topic was too sensitive politically, at least under that name. As IAD member Rodrigo Botero put it in December 1992, “It would be difficult for any government to endorse a statement that national sovereignty has disappeared.”

So the IAD came up with “regional governance,” which is only a slightly dressed-up version of the old plan. Nor is there any subtlety in its demands. Multilateralism is necessary, it argues, because “by acting collectively, the nations of the Americas grant legitimacy . . . to initiatives that no country could justifiably undertake by itself.” That is, it’s all right to violate sovereignty, as long as it’s done collectively! In any case, the *Governance* report opines, “rising nationalism and appeals to sovereignty are . . . a reaction to the driving forces of interdependence, globalization, and technological change. Nationalism and sovereignty have become comforting established symbols [!]—something to cling to against the disturbing forces of change.”

Besides, the report states, all of the problems in today’s world—“institution-building, fighting poverty, and redressing inequities—have multinational dimensions . . . and cannot be adequately managed in isolation.” This does not mean, however, as the Dialogue is careful to point out, that the harsh monetarist economic reforms imposed on most countries by the International Monetary Fund should be abandoned. Nor does it mean any physical economic development ought to occur to raise living standards. Attaching conditions to for-

eign loans requiring that governments take steps to improve the lot of the poor, would be a good idea, *The Americas in 1997* report contends, but it quickly adds that “it would take decades” for there to be any visible improvement in living conditions.

Act now

The Dialogue sets March 1998, when the Presidents of the Americas will meet in Santiago, Chile, as the deadline by which governments must commit themselves to transforming the OAS into the imperial entity the IAD envisions. But, there are difficulties with this timetable, as *The Americas in 1997* admits. “Confidence in the future of hemispheric cooperation has been diminished. . . . Despite the election in 1994 of a highly regarded new secretary general, the OAS has not gained significantly in stature or credibility. Most nations remain opposed to expanding its financing or mandate, or making necessary changes in its structures and operation.”

Nonetheless, the IAD argues that immediate restructuring and strengthening of OAS powers can be undertaken, before agreement is reached on a total overhaul of the OAS. And both reports underscore, where there is still resistance to the drive toward globalism, that resistance must be smashed. As Dialogue President Peter Hakim stated in the April 23 press conference, “It really is time for the countries of the hemisphere, the governments of the hemisphere, to stop tolerating the mediocrity of the OAS, and turn that organization into something that we can all be really proud of.”

To achieve this, the IAD reports identify four areas in which there must be sweeping reform: defending democracy, human rights, security, and economics. Also, if the OAS is to function, the IAD insists that it be run by an “elite professional corps,” preferably drawn from other international organizations such as the UN or the Inter-American Development Bank. This “relatively small, but highly expert, elite cadre of civil servants,” would run a revamped General Secretariat, in which various departments would be “headed by a distinguished, respected regional figure as ‘Assistant Secretary’ or ‘Undersecretary.’”

The Americas in 1997 complains that “Latin American governments . . . have resisted efforts to make the OAS’s Democracy Unit a more forceful instrument for democratic change.” Asserting that the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy is inadequate for the depth of intervention required, the *Governance* report proposes the creation of a “Political Department” which would serve as the Executive Secretariat for the OAS Permanent Council. This would operate several sub-units, to handle such matters as observing/monitoring elections, institution-building, and creating “a culture of democracy.” Again, the report stresses the importance of the OAS maintaining “close consultation with the UN” in cases pertaining to a collective defense of democracy, adding that “the possibility of some coordinated division of labor between the two institutions . . . should be explored.”

Reform in the areas of human rights and security are vital to the success of the governance project. In discussion of “a new national security framework,” the IAD is adamant that the definition of security be limited, so as not to include social or economic matters which might justify military involvement in civilian affairs. A major complaint, however, is that it hasn’t yet been possible to reach a consensus on the principles and concepts of hemispheric security, because of “the reflexive and latent fear among many Latin American officers that multilateral norms and agreements could be manipulated to destroy the Armed Forces as an institution. This fear . . . also gives rise to concern that multilateralism could mean the intrusion by foreign actors into profoundly domestic political issues, such as the formulation of defense policy and strategic doctrine.”

The point of departure for the IAD’s proposals are the institutional changes initiated in the early 1990s, when George Bush was U.S. President, Kissingerian Luigi Einaudi was U.S. ambassador to the OAS, and disgraced former Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez was one of their major allies in ramming through the “collective defense of democracy” embodied in the so-called Santiago Resolution of 1991. At the 1991 General Assembly, a Standing Committee on Hemispheric Security of the Permanent Council was created and mandated to “rethink regional security arrangements and norms in the light of the changed international context.”

To build on these initial changes, the IAD demands the revamping of the Inter-American Defense Board, to put it under the control of the OAS’s political organs, rather than function independently of them, as is now the case. Also proposed is the creation of a Defense Secretariat, empowered to collect, coordinate, and make available relevant security information. These steps would transform the IADB into a virtual multinational military force, prepared to deploy into countries of the region that stray off the path of British globalism.

As an adjunct to this, the *Governance* report calls for tightening coordination among human rights non-governmental organizations, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and the Inter-American Court. The operational principle of this “Inter-American Human Rights System” would be that foreign or supranational law takes precedence over national laws in cases pertaining to human rights abuses. The system would be empowered to intervene to change domestic legislation, shape the political environment, assure an end to “impunity,” and generate cases against opponents. Efforts in the early 1990s to prosecute military officers at the Inter-American Court in Costa Rica, for human rights abuses allegedly committed in anti-terrorist campaigns, *after* they had been amnestied through national legislation, is an example of how this system is intended to work.

It is noteworthy that the IAD feels restrained from formally proposing the creation of an inter-American military or peacekeeping force, noting that “opposition to the use of force and obligatory sanctions [in conflicts] remain a limiting fac-

tor.” However, they then try to sneak the creation of such a force in through the back door, calling for a “tighter, integrated, pro-active regional approach” to the problems of drugs and terrorism, despite continuing opposition to the creation of an OAS-led multilateral drug-enforcement capability.

U.S. sovereignty also a target

The Americas in 1997 makes one point with an urgency not seen in earlier reports. It demands that U.S. policy, that is, Clinton administration policy, be “redirected” to ensure that the regional governance project moves forward. The report begins with a pointed reminder that the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the proposed Western Hemisphere Free Trade Agreement, emerged from the “new framework for U.S.-Latin American economic relations” launched by George Bush as his Enterprise for the Americas Initiative of 1990.

“We call on the United States to play a more vigorous role in building cooperation,” the introduction to the report states. Later, the report says that “U.S. policy has not been fully conducive to building long-term cooperation in the hemisphere,” and attacks the Clinton administration for failing to obtain fast-track authority from Congress which would allow it to negotiate broader trade agreements. The Dialogue views the fast track as the *sine qua non* for the advancement of its regional government agenda. “It would be a disaster,” Hakim said in the April 23 press conference, if the United States doesn’t have fast track by the March 1998 Santiago summit.

The Dialogue demands that the United States also change its policy toward Cuba, and in the war on drugs. Why? Because “they raised concerns in Latin America and the Caribbean about Washington’s commitment to cooperation in hemispheric relations.” Rather than the unilateral policy of certifying nations as drug-fighting allies, the Dialogue wants the United States to join “with other nations of the Americas to develop a common, multilateral strategy to confront the trade in illicit narcotics. . . . This approach would require, first of all, that the United States stop judging the anti-narcotics efforts of other countries and ‘decertifying’ and penalizing those that are not performing satisfactorily according to Washington’s standards.”

Thus, the IAD, which backs drug legalization, would have the Cali Cartel’s wholly-owned narco-President, Ernesto Samper of Colombia, help devise the continent’s, and the United States’, anti-drug policies! Keep in mind, too, that it was OAS Secretary General César Gaviria who, as President of Colombia, rammed through the 1991 constitution which was bought and paid for with Cali Cartel money, and which made it possible for Samper’s narco-government to come into being. Like his erstwhile Venezuelan ally Carlos Andrés Pérez, Gaviria is tied to the Cali drug cartel. This is the man whose proposals and documents provided the chief inspiration for the IAD study group which produced the regional governance project.