

Ibero-American Integration And the New Bretton Woods

by Lorenzo Carrasco

We continue our coverage of the historic continental seminar, "Mexico-Brazil-Argentina: The Hour of Integration; March to a New Bretton Woods," held Aug. 22-23 in the city of Guadalajara, Mexico (see EIR, Sept. 6, for the presentations of the first day of the seminar). Nearly 300 political, military, and constituency activists attended, and Lyndon LaRouche addressed the gathering by telephone.

We present here sections of the Aug. 23 speech by Lorenzo Carrasco, executive committee member of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) in Brazil. In a subsequent speech, Carrasco discussed the importance of undertaking major infrastructure projects across Ibero-America, as the strategic complement to LaRouche's proposal for a Eurasian Land-Bridge that can put the world back on the path of growth and development.

Yesterday, we analyzed two key developments that took place 20 years ago—the Malvinas War and the Mexican debt moratorium—and how they ended as defeats for the continent. And what happened during those 20 years? Was it time wasted? Did we simply wait for another opportunity to come along? Yesterday, it was made clear that countries, from that point onward, suffered a process of destruction, or rather, self-destruction. But that period nonetheless provides us with a means of determining who the enemy is and what his intentions are. So, it is not true that it was a lost period, but neither can we say that

20 years is nothing, because we did lose time, and thousands of human lives withered on the vine.

Today I could say . . . that we are in much better shape than in 1982 to build an integration movement that can pull our nations out of this self-destructive process. And who is this enemy that we have learned to recognize, this common enemy that confronted us in the Malvinas, that confronted us in the Mexican moratorium, and that confronts us today, in this final phase of destruction of the nation-state?

This enemy is embodied in the utopian faction of the An-



Speakers at the Guadalajara conference, left to right: Oscar Preciado, state leader of the CROC trade union (Mexico); Vice Adm. Sergio Tasso Vázquez de Aquino (Brazil); Maj. Adrián Romero Mundani (Argentina); João Pereira of the Alumni Association of the Superior War College of Brazil; Lorenzo Carrasco, of the executive committee of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA).

glo-American oligarchy, which seeks to impose a new Roman Empire, a post-modern version of a new Roman Empire. This utopian faction began to emerge in its contemporary form, most clearly, as of 1971, when President Richard Nixon destroyed the world financial system, which was the cause of all the economic misfortunes the world faced for the next 30 years. August 1971, the breaking of the Bretton Woods agreements, launched an era in which the world political system of sovereign nation-states could not coexist with, was not compatible with, the floating exchange-rate system.

These are two essentially exclusive, essentially incompatible systems, because monetary controls and the emission of credit and money are attributes of the nation-state—perhaps the most important attributes of the nation-state—since money and credit are as important as having an army. They are symbolic expressions of the national wealth, of the growth of national wealth and of the national esteem of its citizens. This began to become corrupted, and we can see it in its exaggerated form in the Argentine situation, where basically the dollar was adopted as their own currency, and at that moment, it became clear that the limit had been reached in the process of dissolution of that nation-state. . . .

And so, in 1982, we saw the beginning of this painful process, which identified for us who were friendly forces, and who were the enemy forces. It is interesting that, while we did not know [Argentina's Col. Mohamed Alí] Seineldín, who was in combat at the time, we in Mexico were waking up to a very real sense of international life, because up until that time, we had been concerned only with Mexican politics. Yes, we had the mission to save the sovereignty of Mexico, but we paid little attention in reality to how we were going to defend the sovereignty of Argentina or of Brazil.

And so, with the Malvinas War, with the campaign that LaRouche led, the huge worldwide mobilization that he headed, we were given a responsibility that we couldn't have imagined: We were taken off the farm and told, "Look, this world is more complicated than you ever imagined." And so, the mobilization was born. And so, too, later in that same year of 1982, *Operation Juárez*, the mission for Ibero-American integration which later led us to the creation of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement.

The enormous mobilization in favor of Argentina launched us into South America, because LaRouche was the only politician who, from inside the United States, came out in defense of Argentine sovereignty, taking as his argument the Constitutional precepts of the United States itself. Today, we have in this meeting, a large number of the protagonists of that unique year. Seineldín was fighting on the [Malvinas] Islands; LaRouche was defending a principle with an unprecedented mobilization; and later, President José López Portillo joined that fight in defense of the sovereign nation-state.

We stayed in contact with President López Portillo, and he had the patience and kindness to receive politically immature youth, and to tell them that they had to ready themselves to govern the country—which was repeated to us several times.

We took it as encouragement, but not yet as a concrete responsibility. . . .

The problems we face today are not going to be resolved merely by the ideas of a seminar, or with the ideas of an elite. These ideas are guidelines, but war is won by logistics, by the improvisation of each one of the individuals who confronts the enemy. The responsibility lies within each one of you. Governments that are today aligned with globalization will fall, destroyed by the very process of the crisis. If we assume the responsibilities that lie before us, we can transform the painful defeats of 1982 into a strategic victory, which we will be able to record for all posterity.