

lands that would allow us to expand food production.

This is a vital project. There is no doubt that there could then be development of minerals—in Venezuela, Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, and Chile. And to this we can add the concept of integrating our own country from the stand-point of populating our empty spaces. Argentina must open its frontiers in an expression of solidarity with its Ibero-American brothers. Argentina currently has over 1.6 billion hectares in colonizable lands; it now cultivates only 20,000 out of a potential 70,000 hectares of arable land; it has large reserves of food and energy, and can contribute enormously to the process of Ibero-American integration through its own development.

Rush: Over the past week, the military junta has decided to postpone the Papal mediation in the dispute between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel. How will that decision affect the country's internal situation, and what do you propose as a solution to that dispute?

Taccone: The postponement of the Papal mediation is not to our liking. We believe that the criteria outlined by the Pope to resolve the dispute should have been ratified; but we also support the idea of expanding those criteria in the sense of returning to the plan proposed by Peron and Chile's General Ibañez in 1952, in which they agreed that within five years they would eliminate the borders between Argentina and Chile. Given the problems that both countries have today with their national production, I would propose that a deep-water port be built on the Pacific [in southern Chile—ed.], another deep-water port be built on the Atlantic, and a highway of a distance of no more than 1,000 kilometers built between them that would unite the two oceans and open the ports to use by either country. This is the path to brotherhood, and to destroying the "Balkanization" plan imposed on both our countries by British imperialism. Our answer must be the elimination of frontiers, and integration with brother countries.

Rush: If this dispute is not settled, how will it affect the internal situation, and what are the implications for the next government?

Taccone: Like other urgent problems, if this is not resolved it will further aggravate the tasks of the next constitutional government; from the very first day that government will find itself imprisoned by a series of urgent problems aside from the serious economic, political and social problems caused by the past seven years of non-government.

Rush: How do you perceive Argentina's relation with the United States, and what type of relation would a Peronist government seek?

Taccone: We think that we should start from the premise of a real friendship with the United States. What we want however is for financial sectors of the United States to stop interfering in the internal problems of our countries, the way that Mr. Rockefeller has been doing during the past seven years,

and imposing policies on our nations. We believe in political brotherhood with the United States and we have friends there. We believe that we have to develop that friendship, but we're convinced that it will only consolidate itself when the forces of world monetarism are also defeated in that country.

Rush: Last October, a new institution—the Club of Life—was created in Rome at the initiative of Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, to oppose Malthusian policies as expressed in the conditionalities imposed by the IMF for example. At that time Pedro Rubio of the Colombian Workers Union [UTC] proposed the creation of a North-South Labor Committee within the Club of Life in which workers from the advanced sector would unite with developing-sector workers around a program to foster the industrialization of both and in defense of the proposals put forward in [Lyndon LaRouche's memorandum] "Operation Juárez." Is there support in the Argentine labor movement for such a proposal?

Taccone: I am certain that once the Argentine labor movement is informed of Compañero Rubio's proposal, it will support it because the Argentine labor movement has always been present in every action and discussion that intends to guarantee the development of our peoples. We observe with great concern those theories proposing limits to growth, de-industrialization, or those that might mean the imposing of a new monetary system behind our backs. Workers in particular believe that we have the right to participate in all discussions on the development of our nations. So Compañero Rubio's proposal seems very positive to me, because it means that working men, from the industrialized nations as well as from the developing nations, can sit down to discuss these issues. This moment is right for this. Perhaps a few years ago, our trade-union friends from the advanced sector feared discussion with us. But today they are experiencing the same crisis as we are, and confronting the same interests of backwardness that we have confronted and continue to confront. That is why I believe that Compañero Rubio's proposal is more positive than ever at this time.

Colombian press: 'Club of Life vital to Third World'

The following article by Jaime Sanin Cheverri was distributed by the Colprensa news agency. It appeared in El Colombiano in Medellin on Feb. 3 and La Republica in Bogotá on Feb. 4, and elsewhere throughout Colombia. The author is the publisher of Arco magazine, a member of the Colombian Academy of Letters, and a close friend of President Belisario Betancur. The article was titled "'The Club of Life.'" Subtitles have been added.

An international conference of the Club of Life will be held in Bogotá on Feb. 18. This is a newborn institution, one founded in Rome last Oct. 21 under the special direction of

Helga Zepp-LaRouche and her husband, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Both are politicians and thinkers and both leaders; she, based in West Germany, and he primarily in the United States.

Ten years after the founding of the Club of Rome, a vigorous rebuttal was delivered in that same eternal city.

Polar opposites

“The Club of Life,” says its founding prospectus, “is conceived as the opposing pole to the Club of Rome, both in its conception of the universe and in its political intentions.” The entire so-called philosophy of the Club of Rome is summed up in the title of the famous French novel. *The Fear of Living*.

Employing all forms of mass media, it has impregnated contemporary man with a pessimistic and negativistic attitudes which translate as “hatred of life.”

Zero growth is the undisguised ideal nurtured by the Club of Rome. The world's population should not go beyond 2 billion inhabitants. All others are not invited to what Paul VI termed in speaking to the United Nations in New York, “the banquet of life.” To expel those not invited, the Club of Rome and its followers are not just playing around.

They have wielded their incomparable financial power with enormous audacity. They operate out of the United Nations and through the governments of the great powers and the power of American foundations. There is no country in which they have not spread propaganda for and practiced contraception, sterilization of females and males, abortion, and ultimately, the most sinister plans to assassinate the elderly and the handicapped. Never before, not even in Hitler's Germany, have genocidal plans been presented so blatantly.

David and Goliath

Against this onslaught of extermination, the Club of Life comes forward in today's world like David with his slingshot against Goliath. The LaRouche couple and the many people around the world who follow them offer an encouraging program of optimism, based on scientific postulates against the sophistry of the neo-Malthusians. They seek nothing less than to reform the world economic system. The world's resources and the infinite potential of human genius have merely begun to be utilized in the historical period which is ours to live in.

On profoundly rational foundations based on the most serious of studies, without romantic outbursts about undefined “progress,” the men and women of the Club of Life offer a promising future for all mankind, and especially for those of us who languish amid underdevelopment. It is important that this reaction has its epicenter in the developed countries, but it is necessary that those who are still on the way to development march behind those life-saving postulates, even though they must wage an unequal battle against the strength of those who today hold all the power to advertise lies.

Ríos Montt's shadow over Central America

by Timothy Rush

Pope John Paul II will arrive in Central America on March 2 on one of the most dangerous and difficult peace missions yet in a pontificate famous for extended and risky pastoral trips. From a first base in Costa Rica, he will make one-day trips to Panama and Nicaragua. On March 5, he will stop for nine hours in war-torn El Salvador, proceeding on to Guatemala, his second base of operations. From Guatemala he will make a one-day trip to Honduras, and on March 9, fly to Haiti to preside over a conclave of the Latin American Episcopal Conference (CELAM).

Four weeks before the beginning of the Pope's visit, the U.S. State Department suddenly sprang into action with a major “reassessment” of its policies in the region, supposedly triggered by the string of reversals for the El Salvadoran military starting early in January. Two high-level missions were dispatched. U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, “at President Reagan and Secretary Shultz's request,” according to the official release, undertook a sudden 10-day tour through Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador, Panama, and Venezuela. On Feb. 6, the Assistant Secretary of State for Interamerican Affairs, Thomas Enders, and ranking State Department planning staffer for Latin America Luigi Einaudi, showed up in Madrid for talks with Felipe González and other members of the new Spanish Socialist government, and a likely parley with Cuba's Vice-President Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, who “happened” to fly into Madrid the same day.

Howard Wiarda, Latin America expert occupying Kirkpatrick's old position at the American Enterprise Institute told *EIR* that “something is up. There's a lot of new thinking; new options are opening up.” He said that a cease-fire might be the next U.S. move, to be followed by some form of negotiations which would be “neither Saigon-like abandonment” of the country nor “handing power over to the guerrillas.”

At one level, the sudden flurry of diplomatic initiatives seems to allow the State Department some flexibility of maneuver in the environment of the Pope's trip. A hard-line, “send the Marines in” approach to the deteriorating army position in El Salvador would put the United States at embarrassing cross-purposes with John Paul's efforts to heal the region. A new “soft approach” grabs headlines for the State