

Brazil, Mexico join challenge to Haig

by Cynthia Rush

When the allies of Alexander Haig and the Israeli Mossad dumped General Golbery de Couto e Silva from the Brazilian government last month, they did so with the hope of aligning South America's southern cone with the State Department's policy of strategic confrontation. The surprising removal of Presidential Minister Golbery, the man who masterminded Brazil's "political opening" and pushed Brazil to become an independent world power, was expected to strengthen those factions in neighboring countries which favor Haig's "aura of power" charade, while at the same time provoking instability within Brazil.

Instability for Brazil is definitely on the agenda; but in the weeks since the Golbery ouster, the Figueiredo government has delivered a shock to Alexander Haig. Brazil has *distanced* itself from the secretary of state's goals, and has in addition harshly criticized U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker.

Brazilian Finance Minister Ernane Galvêas told Paul Volcker to his face what he thought of his policies during a Sept. 8 seminar in Brasilia entitled "The Perspectives for the World Economy." "When Mr. Paul Volcker raises U.S. interest rates by 1 percent," Galvêas said, "Brazil directly loses \$500 million dollars. Nor is this all that we lose . . . because high interest rates inhibit the formation of [capital] stocks, affecting the sale of our products in the international markets."

In the presence of many high-level banking and financial officers, including the president of the Brazilian central bank, Carlos Langoni, Galvêas requested that the Fed chairman raise Brazil's "profound concern" over these policies in discussions with his colleagues in Washington, and remember how much "keeping rates at 20 percent annually has cost Brazil."

In a Sept. 4 press conference at Brazil's Superior War College, Foreign Minister Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro assailed South Africa's invasion of Angola and implied that the shift in U.S. foreign policy following the election of Ronald Reagan had led the South Africans to believe they could take such a step with impunity. The Brazilian minister also commented that Soviet and Cuban presence in Angola was provided for by the "legal framework" of the United Nations Charter, and that the same statutes

would apply to Brazil if it were ever requested to send troops to defend the Luanda government.

Saraiva trampled on Haig in a number of other ways during that Sept. 4 press conference.

- He pointedly quashed Haig's hopes of obtaining Brazilian cooperation in creating an anti-Soviet South Atlantic Treaty Organization—SATO—any time in the near future.

- He revealed the way in which the United States is trying to blackmail Brazil into adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and threatening not to furnish it with enriched uranium needed for its Angra-1 facility.

- He called for reversing the "unbridled arms race."

- He defended the "inalienable rights of the Palestinian people," warning that there would never be peace in the Middle East until these rights were fully respected.

- He stated that "there is no inevitable confrontation between North and South," and that the United States' attitude at the North-South summit at Cancún, Mexico, will be "crucial."

A columnist writing in the Sept. 10 edition of the daily *Folha de São Paulo* reported that Saraiva Guerreiro's broad-ranging press conference had set off heated debate in the country's political circles. "In the last analysis, the fact that it was not limited . . . to the area of Latin America or to conventional U.S.-Brazilian relations is an important signal. It is a signal that our foreign policy has become sufficiently active, outside of the Rio de la Plata Basin, to become discussable."

International coordination

Brazil's outspoken criticism of U.S. strategic policy might not be so disturbing to Haig were it not for the fact that both Mexico and West Germany are moving along a similar track.

In a dramatic move on Sept. 11, the Mexican Senate attacked the Reagan administration's decision to produce and deploy the neutron bomb, charging that "the military strategy of the N-bomb has strengthened one of the most absurd theories of war-fighting, the so-called theory of 'limited' nuclear war. This kind of war simply does not exist."

The Senate action follows President López Portillo's denunciations of the N-bomb deployment decision in his State of the Union address Sept. 1, and repeated attacks by both López Portillo and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany on Volcker's interest-rate policy. The Mexican daily *El Sol* charged on Sept. 5 and 7 that the goal of the neutron bomb deployment and "limited nuclear war" doctrine was the implementation of the *Global 2000 Report's* policies for depopulating the Third World (see page 36).

Brazil's decision to align itself with these nations on the crucial issues facing the international community minimally holds the potential for foiling Haig's plans to

convert the Cancún summit into a debate on how best to impose mass depopulation in the Third World. The history of Brazil's collaboration with West Germany in the development of its nuclear program, and its reluctance to be dragged into the Central American crisis in any way, enhances the possibility of closer coordination with these nations as the Cancún summit draws near.

Haig and fellow social-democrat at the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick intend to make Brazil pay for its boldness by encouraging the same kind of internal destabilization there that they have tried to set off in Mexico.

The effort surfaced several weeks ago when members of the largely Jesuit-run radical clergy, a numerically strong faction that controls the National Bishops Council, CNBB, began inciting urban squatters and rural sharecroppers to carry out land invasions and other acts of violence. Implicated in the organizing of the invasions were members of the Brazilian Democratic Movement—*MDB*—opposition party linked to the Socialist International.

In the aftermath of Golbery's removal, the clergy's organizing in the name of "socialism," and destruction of private property is intended to provoke repression by the hard-line generals—perhaps even the cancellation of next year's elections—laying the basis for further violence and social upheaval.

Brazilian comments on differences with the U.S.

The following are excerpts from an editorial comment entitled "Diplomacy Under Pressure" published in the Folha São Paulo on Sept. 10, 1981.

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the motives which led Brazil to ignore ideological barriers and give decided support at this time to Luanda's socialist regime. From the standpoint of our international policy as well as of our commercial interests with black Africa, this was the only rational attitude in the face of South African aggression.

Nonetheless the understanding of the United States appears to be different, and even before the current crisis it had been calling on Brazil to establish a military alliance with Pretoria in the name of [defending] Western security in the South Atlantic. The recent press conference by foreign minister [Saraiva] Guerreiro at the Superior War College, underscoring the difference between a "loyal friend" and a "docile ally" in international relations, can be understood at least in part as a reply to this type of pressure, which has certainly intensified recently.

With a line reminiscent of the era of the Cold War,

the tendency of the Reagan administration appears to be to try to impose on Brazil an alignment that would obviously isolate it from the rest of Africa, thereby annulling our efforts of the last few years at rapprochement. We don't doubt the ability of the Brazilian government to resist the invitation. . . .

In an Aug. 29 interview with Estado de São Paulo and in a Sept. 4 press conference at Brazil's Superior War College, foreign minister Saraiva Guerreiro expressed views on several foreign policy issues:

On South Africa's invasion of Angola: . . . In the first place the South African presence in Namibia is illegal. . . . Then, from the Namibian territory which it illegally occupies . . . South Africa made incursions into Angola's territory. South Africa made an armed attack against a sovereign state. This clearly represents an armed attack that would even justify . . . that the country which was the victim of the armed attack not be condemned in any manner for requesting foreign assistance to defend itself. . . .

We cannot ignore Article 51 of the U.N. Charter which recognizes the inherent right to self-defense, even with the assistance of others. . . . I also believe that the presence of Cuban and South African troops cannot be assessed from identical juridical standpoints, nor from the same political standpoint. We do not like the situation but we have to understand that it came about through the request of a government with which we maintain diplomatic relations and whose territory was being invaded.

On the creation of a South Atlantic Treaty Organization: Of all the oceans, the South Atlantic has the fewest indications of an international military presence. It is today, as it has always been, a peaceful region . . . this is a situation that should be preserved. . . . Brazil and the other developing countries lining its shores . . . have expressed an interest in keeping it safe from all international tensions and confrontation. . . .

On North-South Relations: There is no inevitable confrontation between North and South. . . . Confrontation is inevitable when there is no spirit of negotiation. . . . In the same way that the attitude that the United States assumes at the upcoming North-South meeting will be crucial, the socialist countries must participate in the process of international economic negotiation, and assume a role coherent with the relative position they occupy in the world.

The advanced countries of the West should have a more precise perception of the essentially Western dimension to North-South relations, because the industrialized economies and the developing ones form one system, a totality. . . .

Mexico's El Sol ties Global 2000 to war policy

Mexico's national newspaper chain, El Sol, last week exposed "Global 2000"—the Carter administration authored scheme to eliminate at least 2 billion of the world's inhabitants by the year 2000. Here are excerpts from two El Sol articles written by Guillermo Chao Ebergenyi and published Sept. 5 and 7.

Have you ever heard of something called the "Global 2000" plan? Let me explain it to you.

Officials of the Mexican government have begun an investigation of the philosophy which led to the creation of the genocidal "Global 2000" plan within the U.S. government; of the profile of its authors; the past, present and future of its defenders; and, in general, the thinking which leads the White House to plan the annihilation of one-third of humanity on the threshold of the year 2000.

I will start with the authors. Richard Perle. Age: 40. Assistant Secretary for National Security Policy. Responsibilities: supervise military relations between the United States and Europe and Canada; and the stationing of atomic missiles. Permanent Senate Committee on Investigations (1972-1980). Political orientation: a hard-line confrontationist. Adviser to Henry Jackson on the White House. Former official of the Abington Corporation, a military firm defending the doctrine of "limited nuclear war."

Francis J. West. Age: 41. Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs. Responsibilities: identical to the Perle case. Last previous post: consultant to the secretary of the Navy and chief of Naval Operations, from 1977 to 1981. Political orientation: defender of the doctrine of "limited nuclear war." It is believed that he drafted a good part of the document known as MC 14/4, which is the nuclear strategy of NATO.

This pair of birds, together with the current U.S. Secretary of Defense, a group of senators, and the White House itself, are the authors of the most abominable theory of "purification" in the world.

The followers of these Malthusian tendencies conclude their reasoning in the following manner: the human race reproduces itself disproportionately in relation to food. While it grows geometrically, food grows arithmetically. If we continue this way, by the year 2000 the world will be so polluted and congested, that despite developing multiplication of human production, the inhabitants of that time will be poorer than those today.

This leads the adherents of this view to think that a

"limited nuclear war," and not a nuclear war involving intercontinental bombardment, would resolve the problem without falling into total annihilation.

"Limited nuclear war" is the modus operandi of the so-called "Genocide 2000 Plan." This doctrine was introduced into NATO by Schlesinger, and includes among its strongest supporters Fred C. Iklé, U.S. Undersecretary of Defense. . . .

The story started with a document called *Global 2000 Report to the President*, which was prepared by the Department of State and the Council of Environmental Quality under the Carter administration.

According to this plan, involving statistical reports and analysis of 13 government agencies, from the Department of Agriculture to the CIA, the solution to be imposed is a form of world genocide.

This would be put into effect through nuclear exchanges with the Soviet Union in specified areas which, of course, would be outside U.S. and Soviet territory.

The areas placed under "observation" by advisers like Francis J. West include: the Caribbean, Africa, Middle East, and some Asian countries.

Contents of the Global 2000 Report

By the year 2000, following current and projected rates of demographic growth, world population will consist of 6.350 billion inhabitants, of which 4.444 billion will be pariahs, living in slums without any urban services whatever. Mexico City—the study claims—currently overpopulated, will have by then 31 million people; Calcutta, 20 million; Cairo, Bombay, Jakarta, and Seoul, 15 million each.

The document does not say so, but it's obvious that the macro-cities will be one of the principal objectives of "limited nuclear war. . . ."

The study predicts that by 1990 there will be inadequate supplies of oil and other energy sources. The poorest nations will have to slowly return to wood as a fuel source. Through cutting of forests there will be shortages of water. . . .

These are some of the highlights of the study. It was distributed by the Carter administration to all the foreign embassies accredited in Washington, and therefore is no state secret or anything of the sort.

If this [resource scarcity] method should fail, the Pentagon has its own, consisting of the "Global 2000 Plan." We can be sure that the Pentagon will apply the plan in all aspects until it obtains the desired effect through "limited nuclear war" in regions which merit the practice of population "purging". . . . Washington is definitely headed toward war. And if we keep in mind that the Kremlin hasn't the slightest interest in being left behind in this arms race, we must recognize that this time, the result will be measured by the thousands of deaths.

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

Special Reports

The special reports listed below, prepared by the EIR staff, are now available.

- 1. Prospects for Instability in the Arabian Gulf**
A comprehensive review of the danger of instability in Saudi Arabia in the coming period. Includes analysis of the Saudi military forces, and the influence of left-wing forces, and pro-Khomeini networks in the country. \$250.
- 2. Energy and Economy: Mexico in the Year 2000**
A development program for Mexico compiled jointly by Mexican and American scientists. Concludes Mexico can grow at 12 percent annually for the next decade, creating a \$100 billion capital-goods export market for the United States. Detailed analysis of key economic sectors; ideal for planning and marketing purposes. \$250.
- 3. Who Controls Environmentalism**
A history and detailed grid of the environmentalist movement in the United States. Analyzes sources of funding, political command structure, and future plans. \$50.
- 4. Prospects for Instability in Nigeria**
A full analysis of Nigeria's economic development program from a political standpoint. Includes review of federal-state relations, analysis of major regional power blocs, and the environment for foreign investors. \$250.
- 5. The Significance of the Shakeup at Pemex**
EIR correctly forecast the political troubles of former Pemex director Jorge Díaz Serrano, and this report provides the full story of the recent shakeup at Pemex. Includes profile of new Pemex director Julio Rodolfo Moctezuma Cid, implications of the Pemex shakeup for the upcoming presidential race, and consequences for Mexico's energy policy. \$200.
- 6. What is the Trilateral Commission?**
The most complete analysis of the background, origins, and goals of this much-talked-about organization. Demonstrates the role of the commission in the Carter administration's Global 2000 report on mass population reduction; in the P-2 scandal that collapsed the Italian government this year; and in the Federal Reserve's high interest-rate policy. Includes complete membership list. \$100.
- 7. Near-Term Prospects for Gold Price Increase**
A political guide to the reasons for the recent decline in the price of gold, and likely price movements in the future. Includes analysis of control over international private gold stocks, ongoing efforts to corner the market, and review of scenarios now in circulation for remonetizing gold. \$500.

EIR

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

I would like to receive these EIR Special Reports:

Order Number(s) _____

Bill me for \$ _____ Enclosed is \$ _____

Please charge to my VISA Master Charge

Card No. _____

Signature _____ Exp. Date _____

Name _____

Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone (_____) _____
area code

Make checks payable to:

Executive Intelligence Review, Dept. MC-1, 304 West 58th Street, 5th floor, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 247-8820.