

“Nicaraguan connection,” as already mentioned in *EIR*'s *Special Report*.

Sources point to Lenín Cerna—inspector general of the Nicaraguan Army, former chief of the Sandinistas political police, and head of the São Paulo Forum's continental narco-terrorist apparatus run by Cuba—as the link in the training of the EZLN in Nicaragua. The Sandinista daily *Barricada* confirmed, in a Feb. 10 article, that “Subcommander Marcos” lived in Nicaragua during the 1980s, where he was involved in military training and in organizing peasants in the rural areas of northern Nicaragua. Interviewed on this by the Mexican press, Lenín Cerna refused to comment, while Tomás Borge (Carlos Salinas de Gortari's official biographer) and Nicaraguan former President Daniel Ortega rushed to deny any links.

Nonetheless, Edén Pastora, Nicaragua's famous “Commander Cero,” told the Mexican magazine *Siempre!* that “Marcos” reminded him of “El Mexicano,” or Marcos Rojas, a Mexican guerrilla in the town of Ocotol who participated in the Sandinista army, then “took his leave and said he was going to fight on his own.”

8) The Spanish daily *El País* reported on Feb. 10 that “the Spanish government is aware that the separatist Basque organization ETA gave money to the Chiapas guerrillas.” Citing Spanish anti-terrorist authorities, the newspaper adds that the large ETA colony in Mexico “contributes with money, as well as with indoctrination and ideological support, to the EZLN. Nearly 200 people linked to the ETA live in Mexico, primarily in cities in Mexico state, Querétaro, and Guanajuato, of which 50 are considered active members.”

The counterattack

To prevent the Mexican President's order from being carried out, the EZLN support networks launched rallies, demonstrations, declarations, threats, and dozens of articles against the government, for the purpose of internationalizing the conflict, the EZLN's goal from the beginning.

The National Mediation Commission (CONAI) created by Bishop Samuel Ruiz, asked that the “free zones” in Chiapas be restored, and that the International Red Cross “vouch for” the security of the Zapatistas.

Amnesty International mobilized in defense of those arrested and the CONAI called on the Organization of American States and others to denounce the Army's so-called violations of human rights. Spain's foreign minister, on a late February visit to Mexico, did not talk about the ETA's financing of the Mexican guerrillas, but rather he proposed that peace talks between the Mexican government and the EZLN “be held in Spain.”

The press of the international financial oligarchy did its part as well. The *Wall Street Journal* said that “the attempt to destroy the Chiapas insurrection is a great risk . . . because the Zapatista movement still inspires sympathy. . . . Investors could get frightened and withdraw their money.” *The Los*

A Zapatista network in the U.S. military?

A network of so-called “democratizers” within the U.S. national security community has taken up the Zapatista cause, arguing that 1) the EZLN does not represent any security threat to the United States, and 2) that the United States should use the Zapatista uprising as an instrument to force through radical “democratic” reforms in Mexico's political structure.

A 33-page study, published by the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) of the U.S. Army War College on Dec. 30, 1994, exemplifies the propaganda being circulated by this crowd. “The Awakening: The Zapatista Revolt and Its Implications for Civil-Military Relations and the Future of Mexico,” was co-authored by Lt. Col. Stephen J. Wager, a professor at the U.S. Military Academy, and Donald E. Schultz, professor of National Security Affairs at the War College. Senior Army War College professor Gabriel Marcella advised the study.

In March 1994, the SSI had published another study, co-authored by Shultz and Marcella. In *Reconciling the Irreconcilable: The Troubled Outlook for U.S. Policy toward Haiti*, the duo argued that the United States should restore São Paulo Forum leader Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power in Haiti, as the way to break the “Haitian power elite.” They also complained that Haitian independence 200 years ago destroyed Haiti's role as “perhaps the most profitable colony in the western world”—because it ended slavery.

Angeles Times put pressure on the human rights front, stating that “a military victory would bear a high political and diplomatic cost.”

The EZLN directly intensified its connections, using “Internet” to mobilize its international support network and issue slanders against the Mexican Army, charging it with “killing children, and beating and raping women.” They called for “stopping this genocidal war,” a “dirty war of bombings, shootings, rapes, beatings, lies and deaths.” Dozens of journalists and human rights activists tried to confirm the Zapatistas' propaganda, but no one found evidence of bombings, or was able to prove these supposed violations of human rights. One military officer described the situation as genuine psychological warfare.

Within the country, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas's Revolutionary Democratic Party (PRD), and other political fronts of the Zapatistas like the National Democratic Convention (CND), mobilized to stop the military actions. The CND includes prominent individuals, such as

The two SSI studies represent the thinking of a specific current within the U.S. national security community, associated with senior State Department adviser Luigi Einaudi, for over 20 years the leading theoretician for the demilitarization of Ibero-America within that community, and widely referred to as “Kissinger’s Kissinger for Ibero-America.” Marcella and Shultz work closely with Einaudi, and Einaudi advised their Haiti study.

On Dec. 5, 1994, the *Miami Herald* published a lengthy article reporting that, “from Guatemala to Brazil,” military officers are listening to Lyndon LaRouche, buying “like hot cakes” *EIR*’s book, *The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and Nations of Ibero-America*. In the article, Marcella complains: “When Lyndon LaRouche has more credibility in Latin America than the Pentagon, that’s troubling.”

Studies such as the one the SSI produced on the Zapatistas, exemplify why LaRouche has gained that credibility—and why the Pentagon has lost it. The study makes no pretense at serious evaluation of Mexico’s crisis, but reads like a propaganda tract for the Zapatistas. One would think the U.S. Army War College could do better than publish a study which holds that, under the black ski mask of Subcommander Marcos, Mexico’s would-be Abimael Guzmán (the leader of the terrorist Shining Path in Peru), “one could detect his handsome features, captivating green eyes, and light complexion.”

In this study, Schultz and Wager:

1) praise the Zapatistas for having “done more to accelerate the process of Mexican democratization than the previous five years of dramatic economic reform under

the Salinas administration. . . . At a critical moment in Mexican history they forced reform on a reluctant President and an even more reluctant political system”;

2) argue that the EZLN is “unlike most traditional guerrilla movements,” and does “not seek to destroy the state or take power itself.” Rather, it is painted as a legitimate armed response to oppression, representing a “catharsis of collective anger” by Indians against “white domination.” Included as an example of such oppression of the Indians, is the 1970s introduction of “modern farming methods, including fertilizers and herbicides,” which, the authors allege, “had destructive side effects”;

3) reject Mexican government charges that external actors, including either Central American guerrillas or the drug trade, are involved in the uprising, and praise the role of “the non-governmental organization network” in the region for allowing “the movement to gain extensive national and international attention”; and

4) dismiss as speculation reports that a *national* terrorist infrastructure exists in Mexico, which could be activated to create “other Chiapas.” They write: “One can only speculate. . . . The numbers and viability of these groups remain very much in doubt. Where they exist at all—and some of them are probably nothing more than rumor—they appear to be small, based on local land disputes, and lacking a national political agenda.”

From those allegations, the authors conclude that the Mexican government should adopt a strategy that will “bring the Zapatistas in from the cold,” and “coopt” them by acceding to the political and economic reforms they demand.

● the former dean of UNAM Pablo González Casanova, who is a member of the editorial board of *América Libre*, magazine of the São Paulo Forum;

● Mariclaire Acosta Urquidi, member of the Inter-American Dialogue who orchestrated the national network of human rights organizations in defense of the EZLN; and

● Gustavo Esteva, British ecologist Teddy Goldsmith’s “man in Mexico.” Esteva’s book, *Fin de una época (End of an Era)*, is an apology for the indigenist separatist project of the EZLN.

Six days after the operation against the EZLN was launched, President Ernesto Zedillo ordered the Army and the Attorney General’s office to avoid any kind of confrontation with elements of the EZLN, virtually suspended the legal operation, and offered a new amnesty law whose terms would be submitted to the Congress in search of a “political solution.” Zedillo was forced to retreat by the formidable blackmail campaign both at home and abroad, as had happened one year earlier with the Salinas de Gortari government. Only

this time, the territory that the Armed Forces had successfully reintegrated under national sovereignty was not handed over to the guerrillas again. On Feb. 19, President Zedillo confirmed that “for no reason can the government, much less the President of the Republic, abdicate its responsibility to preserve the sovereignty over all the national territory.”

How British intelligence created the Zapatistas

The obvious way in which the British oligarchy has put in place, one by one, all the pieces of this separatist operation against Mexico might surprise some, but they are the same forces identified since the beginning by the *EIR Special Report*.

In a certain sense, British intelligence’s “Chiapas operation” began a century and a half ago. In 1821, all of Central America (which then included the area now known as Chiapas) formally joined the Mexican Republic. Two years later, Central America declared itself independent of Mexico, but Chiapas decided to stay on as part of Mexico.