

U.S. violated its treaty obligations, says LaRouche

Democratic Party Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued the following press release on April 2.

Fourteen years ago, the British monarchy provoked the Republic of Argentina into seizure of those Malvinas Islands, then occupied by Britain. The Malvinas, which the British occupiers named the "Falkland Islands," had been the lawful territory of Argentina at the time the U.S.A.'s Monroe Doctrine was adopted, and were implicitly the lawful claim of Argentina under sundry treaties still in force at the time of that nation's relevant 1982 actions.

Shamefully, the government of the United States violated its treaty obligations to the States of the hemisphere. The U.S.

government shamelessly betrayed the trust of the Republic of Argentina, giving covert as well as overt assistance to the British monarchy in what became known in the history of Ibero-America as the 1982 "Malvinas War."

Today, looking back across the intervening years, we of the United States have reason to fear that it was the sovereignty of our own republic which was already in the process of being betrayed, at the behest of Secretary of State Alexander Haig and the Secretary of Defense now known as Sir Caspar Weinberger.

That latter, is by no means an exaggerated historical inference. The following facts of the matter must be solemnly, and ruefully considered.

Lord Peter Carrington

Argentina's occupation of the Malvinas was provoked by a medley of duplicity, by the British monarchy and complicit agents of that monarchy inside the government of the United States.

On the British side, there were the actions, as Madame Thatcher's foreign secretary, of the same Lord Peter Carrington who later played a smelly part in Britain's incitement and orchestration of Serbian military aggression and crimes against humanity in the recent Balkan war. It was the "bait and switch" practiced upon Argentina in negotiations over the Malvinas, which incited Argentina to a preemptive unilateral action respecting its Malvinas claim.

There were also repeated assurances from British channels, that London was not seriously dedicated to holding on to the islands. There were strong assurances, from Secretary of State Alexander Haig, and others, to the effect that the U.S. government supported Argentina's claim. There were also promises to the effect, that if Argentina would lend its relevant military capabilities to U.S. projects in Central America, that certain rewards to Argentina were forthcoming, including the matter of the Malvinas.

In short, the Republic of Argentina was doubly "sandbagged" into a war which Argentina had been deliberately lulled into believing was not a risk in the matter. It was "sandbagged," on the one side, by the ever-perfidious British monarchy; it was set up by those U.S. officials whom the government of Argentina was misled to believe were honest persons.

U.S. sovereignty at risk today

Looking behind the curtain of events on stage, certain additional facts were clearly evident then. In the light of the British role in organizing the most recent, post-"Desert Storm," Balkan war, and the included role of Lord Carrington in both cases, we recognize a direct connection between the U.S. government's sordid betrayal of Argentina in 1982, and the emergence of the United Nations Organization to become what some treasonous U.S. officials presently regard as today's "The World Government."

At the beginning of 1982, when Foreign Secretary Car-

ington set up the Malvinas War for Mrs. Thatcher's government, that government was on shaky political ground. Indeed, without the Malvinas War, Nasty Nanny Thatcher might not have remained prime minister much longer. The Nasty Nanny's personal ambitions were not the monarchy's motive for the war, but the Nanny's personal, picaresque delusions of grandeur, provided a convenient string for the monarchy to pull at that time.

The key to the timing of Carrington's provocation of Argentina was an ongoing policy-debate within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The debated issue was known then as "NATO out-of-area deployment." In other words, the deployment of the German and other NATO members' military forces, as NATO forces, outside the European theater, into such places as the Middle East, Africa, and so on. To that purpose, Britain's military invasion of the Americas, in violation of the U.S. Monroe Doctrine and solemn U.S. treaty obligations to prevent that, was the precedent used for the accelerating destruction of the sovereignty of Ibero-American republics which has unfolded since 1982. To similar effect, the active support for the British 1982 war against Argentina, by the U.S.A., and others, was a step toward establishing the U.N.O. as "The World Government," through a later concoction of the same, deplorable Mrs. Thatcher, "Desert Storm."

The disgusting 1989 U.S. invasion of Panama, to the purpose of suppressing evidence of Vice President George Bush's role in international drug-trafficking, was President George "Globaloney" Bush's continuation of the Malvinas precedent, on the treasonous road to establishing the U.N.O. as "The World Government."

The tens of millions of today's U.S. citizens who are victims of policies such as NAFTA and GATT among U.S. citizens are suffering the effects of Bush's "Globaloney," a trail of diplomatic sleaze which is tracable from the precedent of U.S. treachery fourteen years ago, in the Malvinas War of 1982.