

of a mutual fund, perhaps under the auspices of the World Bank or IDB [Inter-American Development Bank], to attract flight capital and other funds for reinvestment in Latin American countries." Some \$1 to \$2 billion might return a year to Ibero-America, the Dialogue suggests, of the "more than \$100 billion" Latin Americans hold "in assets outside the region."

"Conditions will, and should, be placed on Latin American countries in exchange for new financing," the Dialogue states, and governments should join a "standing group" of bankers and international financiers, to work out a regional "consensus" of the pragmatists accepting the International Monetary Fund rule.

The next task of the Dialogue, they report, will be to set up a special task force to discuss weakening the military institutions of Ibero-America, with Central America's militaries targeted in particular. The task force, to include military and civilian leaders, will issue "detailed recommendations" on how to "institutionalize civilian control of the armed

forces."

The Dialogue speaks of coordinating a "network" of parties, trade unions, women's groups, students, etc., into a sort of Democratic International, which can counter both "communists and the military establishments." Also praised is the U.S. State Department's Project Democracy, financed through the National Endowment for Democracy.

Who does the Dialogue work for? Says the Dialogue, the Soviet Union's right to interfere in Western Hemisphere matters must be institutionalized, and the U.S.-Soviet "talks" on regional matters, first held in 1985, regularized. "We welcome the initiative of the current U.S. administration to discuss issues of regional security with leaders of the Soviet Union," the Dialogue states, because it can "help to prevent superpower competition from intensifying." They suggest, "It is worth exploring whether discussions between the United States and Cuba might advance the cause of peace." Believes the Linowitz Commission, "Neither country stands to gain from escalating conflict in the region."

## LaRouche: Prosecute advocates of legalization

*At a March 1985 seminar in Mexico City, EIR first presented a 15-point war plan against narcotics for the Western Hemisphere, drawn up by Lyndon LaRouche. Excerpts of the war plan relevant to the signers of the Inter-American Dialogue follow.*

1) What we are fighting, is not only the effects of the use of these drugs on their victims. The international drug-traffic has become an evil and powerful government in its own right. It represents today a financial, political, and military power greater than that of entire nations within the Americas. It is a government which is making war against civilized nations, a government upon which we must declare war, a war which we must fight with the weapons of war, and a war which we must win in the same spirit the United States fought for the unconditional defeat of Nazism between 1941 and 1945. . . .

2) Law-enforcement methods must support the military side of the War on Drugs. The mandate given to law-enforcement forces deployed in support of this war, must be the principle that collaboration with the drug-traffic, or with the financier or political forces of the international drug-traffickers, is treason in time of war. . . .

2)b) Any person . . . advocating the legalization of traffic in such substances, or advocating leniency in anti-drug military or law-enforcement policy toward the pro-

duction or trafficking in drugs, is guilty of the crime of giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war. . . .

11) The primary objective of the War on Drugs, is military in nature: to destroy the enemy quasi-state, the international drug-trafficking interest, by destroying or confiscating that quasi-state's economic and financial resources, by disbanding business and political associations associated with the drug-trafficking interest, by confiscating the wealth accumulated through complicity with the drug-traffickers' operations, and by detaining, as "prisoners of war" or as traitors or spies, all persons aiding the drug-trafficking interest. . . .

14) One of the worst problems we continue to face in combatting drug-trafficking, especially since political developments of the 1977-81 period, is the increasing corruption of governmental agencies and personnel, as well as influential political factions, by politically powerful financial interests associated with either the drug-trafficking as such, or powerful financial and business interests associated with conducting the revenues of the drug-trafficking. . . . In addition to corruption of governmental agencies, the drug-traffickers are protected by the growth of powerful groups which advocate either legalization of the drug-traffic, or which campaign more or less efficiently to prevent effective forms of enforcement of laws against which the usage and trafficking of drugs. Investigation has shown that the associations engaged in such advocacy are political arms of the financial interests associated with the conducting of revenues from the drug traffic, and that they are therefore to be treated in the manner Nazi-sympathizer operations were treated in the United States during World War II.