

War of the Pacific). Under the free trade banner, Montgomery reported, he has taken an even "more aggressive stance" against U.S. restrictions on trade with Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Bemoaning the possibility that Samper might be forced to resign because of the "arbitrary" action of the U.S. government, Montgomery complained that decertification "put Colombia in the same league as Nigeria . . . [and other] pariah states . . . a very orthodox, hardworking democratic country like Colombia . . . grouped with dictatorial states in other parts of the world. . . . Not a nice thing to have happen, to a country which has got such impeccable democratic credentials."

"I know that President Samper is in danger," he added, "but then . . . the drug barons probably suborned all the political parties." If Samper is forced out, he should be treated "with dignity," because he has been "an extremely efficient President. I think it's all very sad, really."

It was Viscount Montgomery who on April 2 asked Baroness Lynda Chalker of Wallasey, the Crown's Minister of Overseas Development, "Does my noble friend recall that when President Gaviria visited Britain in 1993, it was clear that we had a long-standing and warm relationship with Colombia?" (see *EIR*, April 26, p. 47). "We have excellent relations with Colombia," answered Lady Chalker, the very official who has taken the point in running genocide against Africa, in the name of the same "democracy" under which she defends Samper's cocaine rule. "There are accusations against certain members of the government of Colombia, but they are only allegations." She promised her "noble friends" that she would make "representations" to Washington.

### Drug legalizers

Baron Pearson of Rannoch was another one proud to have spoken up for Samper in the debate on April 2, when reached on April 20. Pearson had been in Colombia last September, and plans to return in July; Colombia's ambassador to London had sent him "a nice letter" thanking him for his participation in the debate.

Pearson suggested the lords should next debate drug legalization, because "that *must* come to the surface more. . . . People have got to look at it." This could be organized by Lord Mancroft, a former drug addict who "feels strongly that everything should be legalized and taxed, and hard drugs available under prescription."

Montgomery reported that he, too, would be eager to participate, adding, "I would personally be in favor of legalization, because I think it is better to have it in the hands of responsible democratic governments."

Both lords pushed the line that the United States is the cause of the global narcotics trade, with the lie that, in Montgomery's words, "demand is what is causing the whole drug problem . . . and the biggest demand is something that exists in the U.S. It *comes from* the U.S., which is the world's largest area of consumption."

## Inter-American Dialogue's 'hit list' targets armed forces

by Cynthia Rush

The supranational assault against Paraguay by the networks of the Inter-American Dialogue was publicly announced three months before it occurred. An article appearing in the Argentine daily *La Nación* of Jan. 27, named Paraguay's Gen. Lino Oviedo, as part of a hit list of military "problem cases" in Ibero-America that need to be eliminated, in order for the British one-worldist strategy to proceed unopposed.

The article purported to review the status of civil-military relations continent-wide, in the aftermath of the July 1995 meeting of the region's defense ministers in Williamsburg, Virginia, and with an eye to the October 1996 follow-up meeting of defense ministers in Bariloche, Argentina. The information and analysis came from "reliable sources in the ministry headed by Oscar Camilión." Camilión is Argentina's defense minister; he is also a long-standing member of the Inter-American Dialogue. The views presented in the *La Nación* article thus reflect the thinking and strategy of the Dialogue, and of its British sponsors.

What is the Dialogue's agenda leading up to the October defense ministers' meeting?

In most countries in Ibero-America, "leadership of the armed forces is still not under the firm reign of civilians," the article complains. "The only countries that have a proper relationship with their armed forces are the United States, Canada, and Argentina." The reference to Argentina is telling: That country's Armed Forces have been "restructured" out of existence. They are unable to defend the nation from any external threat; they have been deprived of a national mission or operating budget; and they are intended to serve only as a waterboy for the United Nations' supranational adventures.

The Dialogue's leading targets include:

**Paraguay:** "The head of the army, Gen. Lino Oviedo, has a personal style which is very much like that of a medieval boss." The Dialogue crowd objects to Oviedo's defense of "antiquated" concepts such as national sovereignty and the importance of the Armed Forces.

**Peru:** "President Alberto Fujimori rules, but no one knows how much is his own inspiration, and how much that of the Armed Forces." Of particular concern to the one-worldist crowd, is Army Commander Gen. Nicolás de Bari

Hermoza Rios, whose leadership was central to the successful anti-terrorist offensive launched by the Armed Forces against the Shining Path narco-terrorists, and who continues to defend a significant role for the military in national life. The international “human rights” mafia and its local adjuncts have long sought General Hermoza’s removal. A headline in the Peruvian leftist daily *La República* on April 26, reporting on General Oviedo’s fight with President Wasmosy, is revealing: “The Paraguayan Hermoza Rebels.”

**Colombia:** “The issue of drug trafficking shapes the rest of the relationship with the state.” This is a protest over the fact that the Colombian Armed Forces, under the leadership of Army head Gen. Harold Bedoya, have played a prominent role in the war against the drug cartels. General Bedoya has also drawn the line against the narco-terrorist apparatus in the country, much to the dismay of the British-sponsored human rights network which is pushing for UN-supervised “peace negotiations,” under which power-sharing with the guerrillas would be arranged. Because of his firm stand against the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and “European powers” meddling in Colombia’s Urabá region, Bedoya has been slated for political and/or physical elimination by the British.

**Brazil:** “There is no Defense Ministry; every arm has its own cabinet post, because the Constitution so prescribes.” The proponents of demilitarization have long viewed the existence of a single, civilian-controlled Defense Ministry as a crucial step toward emasculating the military and undermining its political power. Brazil has for years been a target of this strategy, because its Armed Forces remain relatively strong, compared to those of other Ibero-American nations, and they maintain four separate cabinet posts in the government. Budget cuts, however, have dug deeply into the institution’s operating capacity, while strategically important military-run companies have gone on the chopping block for privatization.

**Chile:** “The Armed Forces have their own source of funds. . . . Here, the presence of Gen. Augusto Pinochet is decisive. . . . President Eduardo Frei rules, only up to the barracks doors.” General Pinochet is a willing collaborator in British geopolitical machinations, but he remains an important obstacle to the plot to dismantle or weaken the Armed Forces. Since a certain percentage of the revenues of the state-controlled copper company, Codelco, goes directly to the Armed Forces, the defense budget cannot be held hostage the way it is in other nations.

**Mexico:** “They didn’t send their defense minister to the Williamsburg meeting,” the Dialogue crew protests. Mexico sent a low-level delegation, because it has historically opposed any form of supranational military deployment, or any attempt to establish the concept of limited sovereignty. These were two of the major topics on the Williamsburg agenda, and which the Dialogue now intends to fully impose at the upcoming Bariloche gathering.

## EIR warned you about ‘The Plot’

*In July 1993, EIR published a 460-page Spanish-language exposé, The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and the Nations of Ibero-America, detailing how the offensive against the militaries of Ibero-America was intended to destroy the nation-state and impose world government. The book’s preface was written by Argentine nationalist Col. Ali Mohammed Seineldín, and the introduction was by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. An English-language edition was published in 1994, and is available from EIR News Service. The following excerpt is taken from the first chapter, “The History of the Anti-Military Project.”*

The project to dismantle the Armed Forces is a matter of importance not only for the military. At stake in this battle is nothing less than the continued existence of the nation-state itself. If this vile plot is not stopped, the disintegration of the economy and national institutions that it will unleash will bring genocide of unimaginable proportions. Entire nations will disappear.

Therefore, it is imperative that civilians also join this battle. In June 1991, *EIR*’s Spanish-language magazine, *Resumen Ejecutivo de EIR*, published a special issue, entitled “Bush’s ‘New Order’: Eliminate the National Sovereignty and Armed Forces of Ibero-America,” which detailed the anti-military project. There we warned that the policy of destroying the Armed Forces “is not only directed against the institutions of the military, but also against the Catholic Church, the trade unions, national industry, and any institutionalized force which could offer resistance to the final objectives of George Bush’s New World Order: colonial subjugation, looting of natural resources and genocide against the supposedly excessive population of the South.” . . .

The underlying premises upon which the anti-military project is based are three:

1. International Monetary Fund (IMF) rule over the world economy remains sacrosanct. In other words, usury and its constant companion, malthusianism, must govern all economic activity.

2. Sovereignty is passé, an outdated concept replaced by the “globalism” of the so-called post-modern era. This is not some minor shift of emphasis in world affairs, but a commitment to *eliminate the nation-state itself as the form in which human social life is organized.*

3. Communism is dead, leaving the Anglo-American