

The Establishment urges alliance with Dope, Inc.

by Mark Sonnenblick

Since 1986, the Inter-American Dialogue has advocated *surrender* in the War on Drugs. Now, this Establishment "consensus" advocates an *alliance* with the international narcotics cartel in the growing portion of the hemisphere it has overrun. The Dialogue, a composite of Trilateral Commission and Socialist International figures from all over the Americas, rushed publication of its "The Americas in 1989: Consensus for Action" report in order to define policy for the Bush administration. Bush's National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, fresh from Kissinger Associates, Inc., welcomed the report as "significant" and urged its "careful study."

Dialogue secretary Abe Lowenthal, another Kissinger protégé, was not far off the mark when he presented the report, Jan. 17, as the "bipartisan consensus which has emerged over the past decade." Its core, led by co-chairman Sol Linowitz, drew up the Carter administration's Latin American policy. Since 1976, the productive economies of Ibero-America have been ravaged by genocidal policies dictated by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The continent has been turned into one big cocaine machine and the Trilateraloids welcomed Jesuit and Soviet involvement in their Central American insurgencies.

The Dialogue's executive committee also includes Robert S. McNamara. Satanist McNamara organized the Vietnam War to maximize "body counts" of dead Vietnamese, to sell out America's allies, and to disorient succeeding generations of American youth by making "patriotism" a dirty word. That demoralization can be thanked for the rock, drug, sex counterculture.

No war on drugs

Now that "U.S. citizens currently spend up to \$100 billion annually on illegal drugs, and a cocaine epidemic is devastating inner cities," the Dialogue's consensus is that

"no quick or easy solutions are currently available." It rejoices that, under George Bush's leadership, "the United States is finally shifting its attention to reducing demand," rather than fighting Dope, Inc. as an alien power at war with the republic. "Experience with anti-tobacco and marijuana campaigns provides some suggestions for reducing demand for cocaine. So do declines in the consumption of alcohol and saturated fats, and the increasing numbers of people engaged in physical exercise."

The ostensible motive for alliance with Dope, Inc. is to better fight communist insurgencies. The Dialogue raves against the well-documented fact of "narco-terrorism" and goes so far as to blame the War on Drugs for alliances between drug traffickers and terrorists.

"The fight against cocaine can threaten democratic governments as seriously as the trafficking itself. Involving the national army in eradication risks both enmeshing it in corruption and diminishing civilian authority by stretching military responsibilities. For countries with guerrilla insurgencies, eradication poses an especially cruel dilemma: destroying drug crops can undercut support for anti-guerrilla operations, pitting the military against local peasants. In Peru, the Sendero Luminoso guerrillas have made deep inroads into the country's coca producing areas.

"Although governments of the Hemisphere have expressed concern about guerrillas and drug traffickers joining forces, such alliances seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Repeated assertions of such a link suggest an effort to find scapegoats to spare governments the harder task of grappling with the domestic roots of both anti-government insurgency and drug trafficking. . . . Unlike guerrillas, they do not seek to overturn social and economic structures. . . .

"Traffickers, in turn, hire their own armies to protect drug operations from the guerrillas. *if they are left alone, traffick-*

ers and growers will often support national police and armies in combating guerrillas [emphasis added].”

The report specifies that in 1984, cocaine dealers and local Peruvian army commanders helped each other in the Huallaga Valley. But the intensive military operations by the Alan García government, with U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration support, against coca plantations and cocaine labs spoiled that. The Dialogue says only extensive aerial spraying of herbicides such as “Spike” could sharply reduce cocaine output, but “such spraying could cause widespread environmental damage and would risk alienating whole areas of the country. In Peru, it would give Sendero Luminoso [Shining Path] the opportunity to expand its influence in coca-producing regions even further.”

The Establishment’s “free market” economics is reflected in the Dialogue’s demand for an end to the “costly” efforts to break up drug production and trafficking. “Neither eradication in Latin America nor interdiction at the border will do much to address the U.S. cocaine problem,” since “the drug business is so profitable that the traffickers can tolerate the seizure of half or more of their shipments.” Therefore, the report urges they be left in peace. “So long as there is demand for illicit drugs, supply will find the way to fill it,” profess the Satanist free marketeers. “To put faith in eradication or seizure to end the drug trade is to pursue a will-o’-the-wisp.”

The traffic is also profitable to the Wall Street banks which finance the Dialogue. These debt collectors comment, “The jobs and foreign exchange from drug trafficking are clearly important to these countries that are wracked by debt and depression.”

The Inter-American Dialogue first called for examining “the selective legalization” of narcotics in its 1986 report (See *EIR*, Vol. 13, No. 18, May 2, 1986, “Trilateral panel talks up legalizing the dope trade”). It acknowledged that legalization could lead to at least 60 million people using

Other key members of the Dialogue include: **Mc-George Bundy**: former National Security Adviser, Ford Foundation head; financed New York City narco-terrorist gangs; helped arrange Vietnam War. **Elliot L. Richardson**: former Secretary of Defense and Attorney General. **Bruce Babbitt**: governor, ex-presidential candidate (Democratic). **Cyrus R. Vance**: Trilateral Commission; ex-Secretary of State; president, New York Federal Reserve. **Theodore Hesburgh**: Trilateral Commission; ex-president, Notre Dame University. **Pedro-Pablo Kuczynski**: First Boston International, indicted in Peru in 1986 for illegal oil dealings. **Augustín Legorreta**: Mexican banker who claims to lead the “300 families” who “decide everything.” **Nicolás Ardito Barletta**: ex-President of Panama who created banking secrecy for money laundering.

cocaine in the United States, a tenfold increase. It now recognizes, “There is little support for legalizing cocaine and other illicit drugs in any country of the Hemisphere, but a few political leaders in both the United States and Latin America have begun advocating this approach.”

Behind the magic of ‘debt reduction’

Except for James Baker III, practically everyone in Washington now admits that the Ibero-American debt crisis is worse now than when it erupted in 1982. There is lots of talk there and by Ibero-American leaders such as Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez about “debt relief.” Would those schemes enable Ibero-America to resume development? No. Would they leave taxpayers with the bill for bailing out the big money-center banks? Yes.

In 1982, Lyndon LaRouche proposed in his *Operation Juárez* study that existing debt be “isolated” and a new international financial system be created to provide massive development credits so that the region could grow its way out of bankruptcy. He was then alone in warning that Baker’s crisis management approach would lead to disaster in Ibero-America and to the bankruptcy of the United States itself. Then, as now, the Establishment sought to silence LaRouche.

No one could dispute the situation report in the Inter-American Dialogue’s “The Americas in 1989: Consensus for Action.” It says, “Latin America has been mired in depression for six years; most Latin Americans are worse off today than they were a decade ago. Having trapped millions in extreme poverty, the depression has begun to feed on itself. Continuing capital flight, low investment, rampant inflation, and declining funding for education and health are destroying the foundations of future productivity, and may keep Latin American economies stagnant for years to come.”

The Dialogue, however, endorses the policies imposed on the region by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which have led to this disaster. The changes it advocates are designed to complete such genocidal “reforms”: “Latin America cannot hope to recover without major structural reforms,” it postulates. “Latin American governments have made significant adjustments in their external sectors. Realistic exchange rates are now in place in most countries and trade deficits have been turned into surpluses—although largely by curtailing imports and real wages, not by improving productivity. More must now be done to liberalize trade policies by reducing tariffs and other import barriers. Few governments have progressed very far in their internal reform efforts. Fiscal deficits remain all too high. . . . These deficits cannot be controlled as long as scarce resources are used to subsidize uncompetitive industries and finance bloated bur-