
Documentation

Amazon battle is key to Brazil's development

The following are excerpts of the testimony given Aug. 20 in Brasilia by EIR correspondent Lorenzo Carrasco Bazúa, before the congressional commission of inquiry investigating the "internationalization of the Amazon."

It gives me enormous satisfaction to appear before the House of Deputies Commission of Inquiry on the Internationalization of the Amazon, particularly at a time when we are witnessing the emergence of a "new world order," coined by President George Bush, which has among its explicit purposes the limitation of national sovereignty—especially for those resource-rich developing nations such as Brazil, within whose national borders most of the Amazon region is included.

First, let me briefly discuss the significance of my presence in this hall, before proceeding with the topic at hand. I am a correspondent for the *Executive Intelligence Review*, a magazine founded 18 years ago by the American economist, statesman, and philosopher Lyndon LaRouche, for the basic purpose of exposing the plans of the Anglo-American oligarchy—led by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—to impose a malthusian order on the world, based on the promotion of speculation and usury as the primary elements of an international financial system and world control of natural resources. Population control, limiting technological and economic development, as well as national sovereignty, particularly in the developing countries, are the fundamental means to achieve this goal.

The cost of this fight for LaRouche and his associates has been an insidious campaign of political persecution, personally led by Kissinger, which culminated in January 1989 with the jailing of LaRouche and six of his collaborators, sentenced to arbitrary prison terms of up to 15 years. Let me remind you that, in that same year, 70 Brazilian parliamentarians, led by the eminent Deputy Oswaldo Lima Filho, signed a document sent to U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh requesting an explanation of the clear violation of LaRouche's and his collaborators' fundamental rights.

LaRouche's imprisonment, and continued efforts to destroy his political movement, are one of the clearest indications that George Bush is willing to use any means at his disposal to neutralize the political opposition to his "new world order." This fact became even clearer in December 1989, when the Bush government, based on Thornburgh's doctrine that the United States has the right to militarily intervene and arrest or even eliminate foreign leaders, or-

dered the invasion of Panama. This was allegedly to arrest Gen. Manuel Noriega, accused of drug trafficking; but in reality, it set the precedent for future interventions against the South. . . .

This precedent takes on special relevance regarding the real threats to the Amazon region. In recent weeks, several reports published in the Dutch, Austrian, and German press reveal that the U.S. government, acting through the State Department, is pressuring the Dutch government to intervene militarily in its former colony, Surinam. The pretext is the same one used in the case of Panama. Let me read an excerpt from an article I wrote on the subject, published in the Aug. 13 edition of *Jornal do Commercio*:

"Statements by British Prime Minister John Major last June 7, on the eve of the Group of Seven meeting . . . when he stated that the Eco-92 Conference would be an opportunity for the developed nations to 'extend the dominion of the law to what is common for the whole world,' in a veiled allusion to the tropical rainforests, make clear that the international ecology campaigns, which seek to limit national sovereignty over the Amazon region, are leaving the propaganda phase to enter the operative phase which could definitely include direct military intervention into the region.

"There is no other motive behind U.S. pressure on Holland to intervene into its former colony, Surinam, to overthrow its President, Col. Desi Bouterse.

"A Dutch intervention into the Western Hemisphere, reminiscent of the East India Company's past activities, in fact would mean an 'extra-jurisdictional' deployment of NATO to the Amazon region, a convenient opportunity to implement the Anglo-American oligarchy's plans to establish enclaves in the Amazon, under any number of pretexts, from protecting the environment to creating 'Indian nations,' as many environmental organizations have demanded. . . ."

To this threat can be added several other maneuvers already outlined by the backers of the new world order, regarding the establishment of "ethnic enclaves" within sovereign national territories, as has been proposed for the case of the Kurds in Iraq, for Kashmir in India, and, by extension, the possible establishment of "Indian nations" in the Amazon. . . .

'Stabilization' means underdevelopment

In recent history, global control of raw materials was proposed in 1975 when then-U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger proposed the creation of an International Resources Bank as the solution to the Third World's financial problems. The proposal went nowhere, by the way, due to the opposition of many developing nations, among them Brazil.

During the same period, the U.S. National Security Council led by Kissinger issued a confidential document entitled National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM-200), which listed "13 key countries" that were to be priority targets for population control "due to their growing political

and strategic role,” and because they were considered to be of “special strategic and political interest” to the United States.

It should be noted that the emergence of this new world order was foreseen independently at the beginning of the 1970s by two prominent personalities: the above-mentioned Lyndon LaRouche, and the Brazilian ambassador João Augusto de Araujo Castro, who exposed the plans of “Kissingerian” diplomacy to “congeal” the unjust world *status quo*, by means of what he characterized as *resources diplomacy*. With remarkable clear-sightedness, Araujo Castro coined the phrase “freezing of world power,” to express his view of the developed nations’ intention of maintaining other nations in an inferior phase of development.

Particularly regarding the environmental question, in June 1971 during a forum to students at the Superior War College, Araujo Castro warned:

“Brazil has characterized what can now be clearly defined as a firm and undisguishable tendency, in the sense of freezing world power. . . . There are other factors, among many, which begin to emerge within this same process. . . . We refer specifically to those tendencies which emerge in the treatment of the preservation of the environment. It is said that the so-called population bomb will be more fatal and more deadly than the atomic bomb, and a tendency to deal with the problem from a uniformly universal standpoint is embraced. . . . In other words, there is an attempt to turn the serious problem of underdevelopment into a simple problem of stabilization, forgetting the fact that if we were to stabilize many countries at their current economic level, we would be proceeding toward stabilization at an extremely low level.

“On the other hand, in considering the problem of preserving the environment, the tendency is to place too much emphasis on the dangers of rapid industrialization. Emphasis is placed on the dangers of pollution, which is certainly serious for highly industrialized nations, when the major part of the planet still lives in the pre-pollution state. . . . Two-thirds of humanity are far more threatened by hunger and penury than by the evils of pollution. Thus Mr. Robert McNamara’s recent statements, that from now on the World Bank will not authorize any economic development project without a minute evaluation of its eventual effects on the environment, are a cause for concern. . . . Now, these developing countries start from the premise that any program for the preservation of the environment must take into account the basic factors of development, since underdevelopment, by itself, represents one of the worst forms of pollution.”

To obtain their desired goal of establishing planetary control over natural resources, the new order’s strategy demands:

- Shifting world conflicts from the East-West axis to the North-South axis;
- Establishing a system of limited sovereignty over vast areas of the planet;
- Imposing a regime of “technological apartheid” on the

developing nations;

- Imposing neo-liberal economic policies on the entire developing sector, particularly in Ibero-America where George Bush’s “Enterprise for the Americas” will turn the entire subcontinent into an entrepôt of raw materials and cheap labor, to be complemented by a vast program of privatizing the region’s large strategic state companies;

- Dismantling the armed forces of the developing nations—particularly those of Ibero-America—which are to be transformed into local police forces with no effective capability of defending national sovereignty.

This proposal was presented on April 25 at the recent joint meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Washington by former U.S. Defense Secretary and former World Bank president Robert McNamara. He called for the creation of a “world collective security system” under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Security Council, led by the United States. . . .

Mineral resources grab

Regarding the region’s mineral resources, let’s look at what one of the most knowledgeable experts, geologist Breno Augusto de los Santos, discoverer of the first deposits at the Carajas Sierras, has to say in his 1980 book *The Amazon: Mining Potential and Perspectives for Development*:

“Its iron, aluminum and manganese deposits occupy an important position on the world scene; recent copper discoveries are perhaps the most notable development of the last ten years, in terms of new sources of this mineral; its gold and tin deposits, barely evaluated, could attain great economic importance.”

It should be noted that, beyond the minerals mentioned by the author, the region has tremendous potential for some of the so-called third generation minerals such as titanium, niobium, and platinum. The author also points to the region’s other positive characteristics:

“It holds a strategic position in terms of international markets, particularly the U.S. and European ones, making its products highly competitive. Of particular interest are the Venezuelan and Mexican markets, with which a ‘symbiotic’ trade could be established, exchanging the Amazon’s raw materials for oil, and offering advantageous conditions for the development of the countries involved without the risk of a ‘parasitic’ trade, dictated by the world economic powers with their rules of dependency and conditionalities.”

The discoverer of Carajas continues with a discussion of a strategy for the region’s development:

“Utilization of its considerable hydroelectric potential, on the order of 100 megawatts, will allow for the installation of regional metallurgical plants, creating conditions for a solid industrial development.”

It should be emphasized that the hydroelectric potential mentioned is almost double Brazil’s current installed electricity generating capacity, and that the proposed Amazon hy-

droelectric projects are under fire from agencies such as the World Bank and international environmental organizations. The author himself warns about foreign interference:

“During the various cycles of its economic history, the Amazon has always had its interests manipulated by foreign centers which controlled the markets for its products. In practice, what has occurred is a policy of exploring the ‘storehouse,’—or the ‘warehouse,’ to use a more up-to-date image; from time to time, spokesmen for the great world powers emerge to preach the internationalization of the ‘storehouse,’ and some more indirect and concrete attempts are made, sometimes successfully, such that the looting of its wealth can be carried out more freely and efficiently.”

At the end of his discussion, Breno Augusto de los Santos notes the importance which the full exploration of the Amazon’s mineral resources could have for the country’s future:

“In this context, Brazil today occupies quite a privileged position, as perhaps one of the few nations possessing the potential and conditions to transform itself in the short term into an important producer of mineral and metallurgical goods, with the ability to achieve a position of distinction, alongside Australia, Canada, the U.S.S.R. and South Africa.”

The Eco-92 threat

Before I finish, I would like to make some observations on the event which has captured the attention of the world’s environmental movement: the Eco-92 conference, and its possible repercussions on countries like Brazil.

In fact, this conference represents a revival of the international malthusian lobby’s political guidelines proposed at earlier conferences—Stockholm in 1972, Bucharest and Rome in 1974—at which the developing countries, with Brazil playing a noteworthy role, prevented the establishment of international controls on economic growth. . . .

Today, the organizers of Eco-92 want to bypass any possible resistance through adoption of the concept of “sustainable development,” which, despite incorporating the developing countries’ basic argument expressed at previous conferences—the idea that poverty constitutes the worst form of environmental degradation—is only a new version of the old “limits to growth” thesis, pushed by the Club of Rome and other malthusian agencies. This is clear in the formulation that the planet doesn’t have the natural resources or sufficient “ecological support” to permit the developing countries to attain the living standards of the developed nations. . . .

Beyond the changes in the parameters for development, Eco-92’s unofficial agenda includes the attempt to consolidate a real cultural “paradigm shift,” as presented by the backers of the New Age movement, against traditional Christian values on the preeminence of the human species over the rest of creation, which is one of the principles underlying Western civilization. The intent here is to substitute the principle of the sacredness of human life, based on the idea that man was created in the image and likeness of the Creator,

Other resistance to Eco-92 is growing

EIR’s article “Environmentalists Launch War on Malaysia” is quoted, without attribution, in the Aug. 19-20 issue of *Crosscurrents*, a newsletter of a non-governmental organization to the U.N. Conference on the Environment and Development which was distributed in Geneva during the preparatory meeting there for next year’s Earth Summit. The newsletter reports Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad’s threat to boycott the summit.

A group of 38 NGOs warned at the meeting that the South will again bear the burden caused by environmental imperatives, in an Aug. 19 statement. The South is already suffering the social and economic effects of “structural adjustments . . . [which] instance, resulted from failed development policies promoted and financed by U.N. agencies, multilateral banks and international investments.” The concepts of “global commons” and “common heritage of mankind” could result in increased control by the North, especially transnational corporations, over the resources of the South, the group warned.

Earlier, Ahmed Djoglaf, Algeria’s delegate said that the meeting was acting as though “all countries were at the same level and have the same responsibility. . . . A country like India does not have the means of countries like the United States. . . . We have the old pattern of the North imposing the system and the South having to accept. Non-governmental organizations are saying that the North has hijacked the agenda and they are right. . . . They are prepared to let people die but not forests.”

with a new form of pagan animism, centered around the adoration of “Gaia,” the “Mother Earth.” In other words, the human being is no longer the center of the process of evolution, but rather equated with inferior forms of life. . . .

Finally, the 1992 conference presents Brazil with two alternatives. On the one hand, the country could adopt the framework proposed by the condominium of the new world order, which means renouncing sovereign development. On the other hand, following Malaysia’s example at the preparatory meeting for Eco-92, currently taking place in Geneva, it could again take up its traditional independent foreign policy, which, given the country’s considerable weight within the developing sector, could represent a sizable obstacle to the implementation of the new world order.