

The 'Williamsburg Process': from blunder to fiasco

by Gretchen Small

To understand how it is, that narco-terrorism continues to spread across the Americas, largely unchecked outside of Peru's exemplary victories, consider the implications of an event which took place on Feb. 4-6, 1997, in Miami, Florida. The U.S. Army Southern Command's II Human Rights Conference, on "Armed Forces, Democracy and Human Rights on the Threshold of the 21st Century," was co-chaired by the head of the U.S. Army's Southern Command, Gen. Wesley Clark (since tapped to be the next commander of NATO), and by Juan Méndez, a "human rights" activist notorious throughout the Americas as an agent of one of George Soros's international drug legalization lobby outposts, Human Rights Watch/Americas. This was the same Juan Méndez who admits to dealing with Peru's Shining Path killers going back to at least 1984, and who in 1990, visited Colombia to campaign on behalf of the heads of the Medellín drug cartel, whose "human rights" he charged were being violated by Colombian military anti-drug operations.

Méndez, named director of the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR) in September 1996, co-chaired the conference, the second time in which the Southern Command had co-hosted a human rights conference with the IIHR, a Costa Rican-headquartered "international NGO," run by a nest of Soros agents, drug legalizers, indigenous ideologues, and Inter-American Dialogue members. (IIHR's board of directors sports the names of Diego García-Sayán, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, José Miguel Vivanco, Sonia Picado, and others.) Both conferences were run as invitation-only, touchy-feely, consensus-building sessions, directed at imposing a "culture of human rights" upon the Ibero-American military.

What is the message delivered to the governments and security forces of the region, to the narcotics cartels, and to the narco-terrorists, by having the U.S. Army invite Juan Méndez to lecture Ibero-American civilian and military leaders on democracy and human rights? By having the U.S. Army's SouthComm announce that it has established "a real productive relationship" with an NGO run by some of the hemisphere's most notorious anti-nation-state operatives? Who becomes the enemy, and who the friend, if the IIHR leads, under the U.S. military's sponsorship, the inter-govern-

mental commission which the Second Human Rights Conference agreed upon, to design institutional reform to fit this notion of human rights and democracy? Is it any wonder that the only effective fight against terrorism is being waged by those, such as the Fujimori government, who have refused to be ruled by such an agenda?

LaRouche warned you

Such an obvious, stinking, breach of hemispheric security is not, however, an aberration which was initiated out of the U.S. Southern Command, per se. Rather, it is the result of the policy package known as the "Williamsburg Process," the agenda put forward as United States policy at the first Defense Ministerial of the Americas, held in Williamsburg, Virginia, in July 1995, and elaborated in the September 1996 Department of Defense document, *United States Security Strategy for the Americas*. Lyndon LaRouche, then a Presidential candidate, warned in an October 1995 campaign strategy document, *The Blunder in U.S. National Security Policy*, that implementation of the insane policy there outlined, would lead to precisely such security disasters as that seen in Miami in February.

The underlying assumption of the "Williamsburg Process," is that Ibero-American military capabilities and institutions must be reshaped, to conform with so-called globalization, both financial and political: That is, they must be shrunk, and run by the bankers, who now, by and large, run the already-shrunken governments of the region.

To justify such a policy, the Pentagon's *Security Strategy* lied that the "impact [of insurgent and guerrilla forces] has diminished" in the Americas (no mention was even made of narco-terrorism), an assertion which was not true then, and is not true today. The Defense Department document then argued that the United States should support "civilian-led peace negotiations" with narco-terrorists such as Colombia's FARC and ELN, Peru's Shining Path and MRTA, and Mexico's EZLN.

LaRouche responded in his *Blunder* document: "The impact of the terrorist forces associated with the São Paulo Forum, the chief terrorist political cover of Central and South America, has not decreased; it has greatly increased during the recent several years. . . . The largest potential for terrorist insurgency in South America is found within the Forum's assets within Brazil." The Pentagon document, LaRouche explained, "emphasizes the relics of the past, and cheerfully ignores the fact that the new terrorist capabilities now being mobilized within the region, are far more numerous and dangerous than those of past experience."

LaRouche warned that the "Hobbesian 'conflict resolution' approaches" promoted as the solution to both terrorism and border disputes, "can have no effect but to accelerate the destruction of the sovereignty and national security of every nation affected, including the United States itself. . . . It reeks

of the London Tavistock Institute psychiatrists' doctrine of managed irregular warfare."

LaRouche identified the source of the insanity in U.S. policy, as the "utopian" tradition increasingly dominating the permanent national security bureaucracy in the United States, since the respective reigns in security posts of McGeorge Bundy, Robert S. McNamara, and Henry Kissinger. In the case of Ibero-American policy, it is the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD) which functions as the strong-arm deployed to ensure Washington's continued adherence to utopian doctrine, even as it leads to such calamities as the cited Miami conference, a flagrant sabotage of the Clinton administration's otherwise manifest efforts to take on the global narcotics threat.

The Dialogue was founded in 1982 by McGeorge Bundy and Robert McNamara, amongst others. Today it claims among the ranks of its 100 "prominent" members former National Security Adviser Gen. Sir Brent Scowcroft (a former president of Kissinger Associates), and Alan Batkin, the current vice chairman of Kissinger Associates. It promotes itself as "the premier U.S. center" for policy and communication within the Western Hemisphere, boasts of having members "on loan" to various governments in the Americas (e.g., the Presidents of Brazil and Bolivia), runs the 100-plus Washington-based NGOs which deal with Ibero-America, and deploys key media figures in its ranks to help shape its aura of power. (Among its members, for example, are the president of the *Chicago Tribune*, the publisher of the *Miami Herald*, CNN's prime anchor and senior correspondent, the national news assistant managing editor of the *Washington Post*, and the chairman of Abril, S.A., Brazil's largest publishing company.)

Power, they have; respect, they do not. The Inter-American Dialogue's activities are carefully studied by patriotic circles throughout the Americas, under the maxim, "know thy enemy." Since *EIR* first took on the Dialogue when IAD came out for drug legalization in 1986, *EIR* has become the bane of the Dialogue's "consensus." The damage done to their aura of power by *EIR*'s book, *The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and the Nations of Ibero-America* (a best-seller in the region published in Spanish, English, and Portuguese), is incalculable. *The Plot* details why, when, and how, the Dialogue put together the plan to take down the Ibero-American military, in order to remove the major remaining institutional obstacle to replacing sovereign nation-states with a regional government, subservient to the United Nations.

The Dialogue's latest report, *The Americas in 1997: Making Cooperation Work*, released on April 23, expresses near-hysteria over the resistance their globaloney schemes have met: "There is little interest in Latin America and the Caribbean to take advantage of post-Cold War opportunities to revamp hemispheric security relations," they complain. "Expectations for regional cooperation could well have been too

high. The convergence of interests and values among the countries of the hemisphere may have been exaggerated. The obstacles to more cooperative inter-American relations are, after all, still formidable, and should not be underestimated."

Dialogue 'deeply troubled' by Peru

The Dialogue has clearly identified the Peruvian government and military as a major source of this resistance—from well before their recent victories against narco-terrorism. For example, an article published in the January-February 1997 issue of the New York Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs*, by Dialogue member Jorge Domínguez, happily reported that guerrilla and paramilitary movements are now taking the lead in the political process in Ibero-America: "These forces born in violence . . . today . . . show the way toward hoped-for stability in Guatemala, Colombia and Peru." Domínguez singled out the "Fujimori model," however, as the "grave threat" in the region, arguing unabashedly that it is the very *success* of the emergency anti-terrorism measures taken by Fujimori in 1992—including shutting down a thoroughly corrupted Congress and judiciary—which constitutes the threat. Domínguez warns against "the potential appeal of a caesar who proclaims the need for a temporary interruption of constitutional government to save the country and constitutionalism in the long run."

When the MRTA went into action, so did the Dialogue. On Jan. 10, 1997, the Dialogue called a press conference in Washington, for one of their staff, Carlos Iván Degregori, to issue the Dialogue's demands: "Negotiations which assure the political future for the MRTA terrorists, in exchange for the freeing of the hostages, better conditions in the jails, and the definitive end to violence would be the best possible outcome for the crisis," said Degregori, a Peruvian who had been in contact with Shining Path from his days as anthropology professor at the University of Huamanga, where the Shining Path was hatched. On Jan. 28, Dialogue executive committee member Osvaldo Hurtado deployed into Peru, to declare at a Lima forum that groups like the MRTA "do not represent a danger to democracy in the region"; the Peruvians should bring the MRTA into the political system, as the M-19 has come in to run Colombia's government.

Then on April 11, the Dialogue organized a full-day seminar in Washington to debate the future of Peru, and called in the leading ideologue of the anti-military project within the U.S. permanent security bureaucracy, the State Department's self-proclaimed Kissingerian, Luigi Einaudi, as the keynote speaker. Einaudi threatened that the hostage crisis must end "in a way that is negotiated," or Peru would become stigmatized worldwide as a violent nation.

Since the successful rescue, Dialogue spokesmen have taken to the media, to state they are "deeply troubled" by the outcome, because "dialogue and negotiation may well have been further discredited."