

# Aspen's Ibero-American strategy

*Elsa Ennis describes the institute's latest blueprint for ending national sovereignty and modernization on the continent.*

The Aspen Institute last month released a 100-page report titled "Governance in the Western Hemisphere." The document, now circulating among Latin American governments and ambassadors to the Organization of American States (OAS) in Washington, is one of the most elaborate blueprints ever produced for the destruction of the role that nation-states have played in the continent's industrial development. Latin America, Aspen says, is to be given the "Iran treatment."

It was the September 1975 Aspen Institute "Iran: Past, Present and Future" conference in Persepolis, Iran which approved the plan to oust the Shah and use Muslim Brotherhood cultist Ayatollah Khomeini to reverse the industrialization of that developing nation. Even more than Iran or any other sector of the Third World, Latin America is too modernized and industrial-

ized, Aspen complains; therefore the continent's future will be "marked by population pressures, famine, ethnic and religious conflicts, territorial disputes and irredentist causes," the 21 members of the task force which wrote the study conclude.

The report summarizes two years of deliberations under the chairmanship of Viron Vaky, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs during the Carter administration.

"The clue to building a New International Order that works is to make sure we know why the several national orders are falling down on the job of governance," says Aspen leader Harlan Cleveland in a paper setting policy-guidelines for the study. "The evidence is now overwhelming that every national government is beyond its depth . . . traditional institutions of national government

## Who's who on Aspen's steering committee

The steering committee of the Aspen Institute's "Governance in the Western Hemisphere" workshop includes:

**Viron Vaky**, Chairman. Former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Georgetown University. Member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

**Nicolas Ardito Barletta**. Vice-President of the World Bank for Latin America and the Caribbean.

**Rodrigo Botero Montoya**. Former Minister of Finance of Colombia. Key member of the Brandt Commission in Latin America.

**Antonio Casas**. Director of Petróleos de Venezuela.

**Jorge Domínguez**. Center for International Affairs,

Harvard University.

**Gonzalo Facio**. Former Foreign Minister of Costa Rica. Leader of the Socialist International.

**John Gallagher**. Former Vice-President of Sears Roebuck, a corporation reputed to have played a key role in touching off the 1968 student destabilization of Mexico.

**Augustin S. Hart**. Vice Chairman Emeritus of Quaker Oats Company.

**Felipe Herrera**. President of the core "one-worldist" United Nations think tank, UNITAR. Brandt Commission member. Former President of the Inter-American Development Bank.

**Peter T. Jones**. General Counsel, Levi Strauss and Company. Chairman of the Inter-American Foundation, a funder of environmentalist and terrorist groups in Latin America.

**Joseph John Jova**. President of Meridian House International, a key outpost of British intelligence for Latin America operations. Former U.S. ambassador to Mexico, Honduras, and the OAS. Knight of Malta.

**Neville Linton**. Christian Action for Development

are badly designed for the kind of problems they now face." National governments are too concerned with uplifting their population's standards of living, with modernization and industrial development, Cleveland thinks. Therefore they have to be destroyed to give room to a feudal, zero-growth "New International Order" of powerless, backward regional groups ruled by British-run supranational agencies.

The continent's most industrialized countries, such as Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, are described pointedly as "middle powers willing to act locally to advance national interests." Argentina's resistance to British colonial designs "revealed the persistence and depth of such concepts as nationalism, '*Hispanidad*,' fears of dependency, and competitive feelings between the developed and the developing worlds," the paper says.

### A strategy for destruction

Among the report's "Iranization" formulas are:

- **Engulf the continent in endless disputes over territorial claims.** Aspen calls special attention to such conflicts as the Argentina-Chile fight over the Beagle Islands; the territorial dispute between Peru, Chile, and Bolivia which led to the nineteenth century War of the Pacific; the border fight between El Salvador and Honduras which in 1969 led to what Aspen circles call a "population war" between those two countries. Guatemala's uneasiness over Belize's role in the volatile Central America region is the subject of detailed profil-

ing for similar future provocations.

These disputes, the report says, should not be left to national governments but to a "poll of distinguished statesmen," that is, policy-makers whom Aspen would draw from different countries.

- **Set up supranational institutions to control the "mass migrations" and refugee problems which will emerge from territorial and other wars.** Aspen proposes an "Inter-American Commission on Refugees." This commission would be a regional bridge to the British-controlled United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR), intervening in such cases as the migration of Guatemalan refugees fleeing civil war in their country into Mexico. The government of Mexico has refused to let the UNHCR and similar institutions interfere with its national sovereignty in this matter.

- **Balkanize the continent by promoting resistance among "indigenous" groups to national integration.** Aspen's allies have spent millions of dollars to create synthetic terrorist groups and send them on anti-nationalist rampages (see *EIR*, July 20). Included among the report's task force are members of the board of directors of the Inter-American Foundation, a publicly funded U.S. organization which since 1971 has financed environmentalist groups, would-be Ayatollahs among Indian tribes, and radical priests of the Theology of Liberation current in the Catholic Church.

- **Dismantle the industrial capacity of the continent.** Aspen demands that all countries join the General

in the Caribbean.

**William Moody.** Director of International Programs for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

**Gert Rosenthal.** Former Minister of Planning of Guatemala. Head of the Mexico Office of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America.

**Richard Rubottom.** Former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Southern Methodist University.

**Javier Silva Ruete.** Former Finance Minister of Peru.

**L. Ronald Scheman.** Assistant Secretary for Management in the OAS. President of the Pan-American Foundation.

**Stephen P. Strickland.** Vice-President of the Aspen Institute. Project director of the workshop.

**Sidney Weintraub.** Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Trade-war expert based at the University of Texas.

The workshop was financed by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Owens Foundation of Dallas, the Quaker Oats Company, Sears Roebuck, Levi Strauss,

IBM World Trade Americas/Far East Corporation, the National Bank of Washington, and Marshall B. Coyne.

The policy guidelines for the Aspen workshop were formulated by Harlan Cleveland, former U.S. ambassador to NATO. A member of the U.S. Association for the Club of Rome, the Aspen Institute, and the Atlantic Council, NATO's main ideological arm in the United States, Cleveland teaches at the Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

In a paper "The Governing of International Community," published by the Aspen Institute in March 1981, he wrote: "National government agencies in the main still are not organized to handle problems that 'cut across' disciplines, specialties and bureaucracies, to heighten decision making. . . . There is a place for extranational institutions—with a wider reach and stronger powers than a U.N. style of governments, yet not a world government from which there is no earthly appeal. . . . A pluralistic world order will be made up of regional and functional communities of the concerned. . . ."

Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), the main vehicle for imposition of British "free trade." The idea is to flood the continent with industrial goods produced in the advanced sector and force them to return to an emphasis on raw-materials production.

• **Halt transfers of advanced technologies to the continent.** Under the excuse of controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons, Aspen's policy-makers propose a series of complicated mechanisms and "safeguards" which would make nuclear-energy development in these nations virtually impossible. Under this guise, Cuba, Argentina, and Chile are ordered to join the Tlateloclo Treaty on non-proliferation while Brazil, a signer, is told to comply with it.

• **Stall industrial development through so-called international anti-pollution rules.** On the model of Aspen's deployment of the environmentalist movement to stop nuclear energy development in the United States, the workshop now proposes that inter-American agencies in the OAS undertake legal battles against industrial "pollution" in Latin America. Environmental problems on the U.S.-Mexico border are presented as an example of where this apparatus would intervene.

The anglophilic Aspen strategists welcome the collapse of U.S. influence in the continent after the Malvinas war. They recognize that Ibero-American governments and economic leaders are looking for new workable institutions to defend the continent from outside aggression and to further industrial development. Now Aspen hopes to direct this reorganization process.

Aspen's plots against Latin America had the unrestricted logistical support of the head of the OAS, Alejandro Orfila, as Viron Vaky notes in his introduction to the study. It is through ideological control of Orfila that Aspen hopes to take control of the OAS, the most important representative body for the continent.

With the United States discredited, Aspen proposes to have the British protectorate of Canada playing a greater role in inter-American affairs. Contrary to U.S. obsessions with Soviet expansion in the continent, the report notes, Canada has wisely won sympathies in the continent by befriending both "left" countries like Cuba and "rightist" ones like Haiti.

Using Canada as a channel of British influence in the continent, however, would require some structural changes in the OAS. Since it is not a sovereign nation but a dependency of the British crown, Canada has never been admitted to the OAS, where it only holds the status of "observer." Aspen calls on the OAS to admit all countries in the hemisphere as members. The institute also hopes to deploy the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean, some of which are not currently members of the OAS, against the Ibero-American nations which have traditionally dominated the OAS.

---

## Interview: Spain's Defense Minister

---

# 'We must command our territory'



Spain's precipitous decision last year to enter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—a decision entered into after intense international pressure mainly from Britain and the United States, on the one hand, and internal pressure to appease the coup plotters that still threaten the future of the country, on the other—has now led to predictable complications. Some of the most important of these are discussed in the interview below with Spanish Defense Minister Alberto Oliart.

One of the most acute and potentially disastrous complications revolves around the issue of the NATO command under which Spain would be integrated. Will Spain have a unified command or, as currently looks more likely, will the NATO powers continue to insist on a humiliating division of the country between the English command for the nation's Atlantic side, and a Neapolitan command for the Mediterranean half? This issue has led to a temporary halt in the country's negotiations with the NATO allies.

The question of Gibraltar is thus placed on center stage. As NATO chief Joseph Luns explained in an interview to the Spanish daily *Ya* on June 20, it is the current control of Gibraltar by the British which makes appropriate the integration of Atlantic Spain into the British NATO command at Norfolk. Particularly after the Malvinas affair, the mere proposal that Spanish generals be forced to operate on Spanish territory (Gibraltar) under British command is a provocation of such a high order that it guarantees disorder and possibly worse among the Spanish officer corps.

There is no doubt, therefore, of the correctness of Defense Minister Oliart's statement that Spain must have sole and undivided control over the command of her territory, in which he emphatically includes Gibraltar. What is involved is a fundamental question of national sovereignty, and one of high emotional content at that, which no Spanish government would dare disregard with impunity. The internal pressure, from the military point of view, is compounded by the expected landslide victory of the Spanish Socialists in the early legislative elections