

Moscow strategy for Ibero-America: IMF colonialism with red banners

by Gretchen Small

Moscow has decided to take up the cause of the "debt crisis" as a new flank in its ongoing efforts to seize control of the growing popular unrest in Ibero-America. Viktor Volskii, director of the Latin American Institute of the U.S.S.R.'s Academy of Sciences, went to Argentina, Mexico, and Peru at the end of March for a first-hand assessment of the opportunities in this fight.

Volskii arrived in Buenos Aires for the final days of the dramatic end-of-the-quarter debt crisis between Argentina and the international bankers. In a speech March 28 before the Argentine Center for International Relations (Buenos Aires' would-be Council on Foreign Relations), Volskii denounced international creditor countries for carrying out "bare-faced robbery" with their high interest rates, and exhorted countries of the continent to confront "the problem of the foreign debt in a joint form," and form a "common debtors' front."

Volskii's "anti-banker" campaign began in the February 1984 issue of *America Latina*, the Spanish-language monthly published by Volskii's Latin American Institute. There, for the first time since the Ibero-American debt crisis exploded in August 1982, *America Latina* addressed the "Financial and Monetary Problems of the Continent" as "the epicenter of the serious unrest in the Latin American countries."

These days, with Henry Kissinger running operations against every Ibero-American nation and with the continent's interest-rate bill increasing by \$2.5 billion last month alone, Soviet "anti-imperialism" comes cheap. Read Volskii's *America Latina*, however, and you will see how hypocritical is Soviet "anti-imperialism"—whether of the "anti-IMF" variety or the outpouring of pious propaganda against U.S. "interventionism" in Central America.

The creation of 'new Irans'

Outlined in the pages of that magazine are marching orders for how to ensure the *disintegration* of the existing Ibero-American nation-states, nations Soviet rulers charac-

terize as "sub-imperialist" and whose existence as "autonomous centers of power" the Soviets call a "new and substantial destabilizing factor in the international political situation."

Soviet policy is to create "new Irans" in the Western hemisphere—turning the massive unrest there, not against the International Monetary Fund and its oligarchic promoters, but against the Ibero-American nation-states themselves. *EIR* has previously documented the active Soviet collaboration with old Nazi networks in South America in promoting separatist uprisings, under the cover of "indigenous" movements in the Andean and Central American regions (*EIR* March 6, 1984). In our last issue, we documented the Soviets' use of their Jesuit allies in Central America to ensure "the United States fights the war the Soviets want it to fight."

Here, taken from Soviet writings, we provide the documentation of the fundamental premise upon which those policies are based: the fanatical opposition by Soviet policymakers to the development of strong, sovereign nation-states, capable of determining their own history.

Too rapid growth?

Henry Kissinger's arguments on Third World indebtedness bear a striking similarity to February's reporting in *America Latina* on the financial crisis of the region. Like Kissinger, the Soviet publication argues that Ibero-America's political and economic problems stem from the effort to "grow too fast." Wrote Svetlana Kosobchuk and Nikolai Jolodkov, Soviet experts on Latin American monetary systems:

The policy of pursuing economic progress, practiced by many Latin American countries, accentuated the imbalance in foreign exchange. . . . This orientation . . . was demonstrated most notoriously in the case of Brazil. Not only the internal financial credit system, but also, to a considerable degree, interna-

tional credit, were put at the service of modernization and rapid economic growth. In this way, the interests of the imperialist creditors in broadening their positions in Brazil were taken into account.

Rather than modernization, the two experts advocated that Ibero-America should rely solely on internal resources, raised "at the expense of private capital."

In another article, Vyacheslav Kuznetsov offered proposals on how to abolish the "serfdom" represented by the International Monetary Fund. Asserting that the "pro-imperialist character" of the IMF stems from its "unjust distribution of votes," Kuznetsov called for the "democratization of the decision-making powers" of the IMF, giving the developing sector a "larger voice" and more Special Drawing Rights.

Kuznetsov then suggested that Ibero-American nations put up their raw materials as collateral for a new financial system—the very proposal championed by Henry Kissinger, from his 1975 call for the creation of an International Resources Bank, to his advocacy today of "debt for equity" schemes which turn strategic areas of the economy over to private foreign interests. "Some of [these nations], above all the members of OPEC, have raw materials vitally important for the world economy at their disposal: oil, gas, metallic minerals, which could serve as the firm commercial guarantee for the creation of a regional reserve medium," echoed the Soviet expert.

Destroy the nation-state

Soviet opposition to strong nation-states formed the central subject of a roundtable discussion sponsored by Volskii's Latin American Institute in November 1982. Soviet experts from eight institutions dealing with Ibero-America participated. In a three-part series beginning in November 1983,

America Latina introduced its transcript of the discussions with a note explaining that Ibero-America's relationship to "international capitalism" had been chosen as a case study of how the "scientific and technical revolution" had given the developing sector "a new role in the international division of labor." The transfer of "many types of industrial production" to the Third World has served as the "advance force of contemporary imperialism . . . attenuating the sharpness of political, social, and economic antagonisms" of capitalism.

Ibero-America, as the most developed part of the "developing sector," said the Soviet theoreticians, is the most "penetrated" by imperialist institutions. But as one Victor Sheinis argued, from the Soviet standpoint, while many of these countries can be characterized as "sub-imperialist . . . in reality, the 'sub-imperialist' tendencies are not originated . . . by multinational corporations, but by *national state monopolies* [emphasis added]."

Brazil and Mexico must be considered "second echelon capitalist states," with "probably Argentina and Venezuela" also in that category, expert Irina Zorina continued, noting that their development to that status "coincided with the acceptance of the idea of 'nationalism of the state.'" Zorina centered her discussion on the implications for international policy of the development of "autonomous 'centers of power'" in the Third World, citing the example of the Malvinas War. While it is true that the war activated anti-imperialism in Latin America, she said, the war also "accentuated the aspirations of the governing cliques of the 'ascending powers'" in Ibero-America, in particular the desire of Ibero-American nations to "modernize their military potential . . . acquire modern weapons, diversifying their sources and developing their own war industry [emphasis added]."

Zorina concluded: "The activation of new regional 'centers of power' could be a new and substantial destabilizing factor in the international political situation."



The Soviet Union's Latin America experts are trying to spark "indigenous" uprisings in Ibero-America against the "capitalist" nation-states.



Latin America's experience has shown that the "yoke of imperialism" cannot be thrown off without "liquidating the power of great local capital," according to Konstantin Obiden, in a discourse on the dangers of "state nationalism."

Nationalizations did nothing but further the process of enrichment of the national bourgeoisie . . . furthering the fusion of local monopolistic capital with that of foreign capital. . . . It is necessary to organically combine the struggle against imperialism and the struggle for socialism. . . . The direct support by the progressive forces for nationalization of foreign businesses led in great measure to the strengthening of the economic and political positions of the national bourgeoisie, and in many cases, put a brake on revolutionary processes.

Obiden cited as examples of "the strengthening of monopolistic control" the critical historical events in Ibero-America's battle to gain sovereign control over its economy: the 1930s nationalization of Mexico's oil industry and railroads by President Cardenas, Bolivia's taking the tin industry out of private foreign interests in the 1950s, and the state takeover of oil and mining concessions in Venezuela in the 1970s.

Obiden's words translate into mass uprisings, new "struggles for independence" from the advances achieved at great costs by Latin American nations. Soviet instructions to Moscow's "official" assets in the region, its communist parties, are blunt: Drop any local activities for national interests, the time for "social revolution" has arrived. An article by Narcisso Isa Conde, Secretary General of the Communist Party of the Dominican Republic, published in *America Latina's* March edition, calls for dropping any alliance with local "reformist" parties, including the ruling Socialist International-linked Revolutionary Dominican Party. Communists must understand that the current economic crisis is a "structural crisis of the dependent capitalist system," Conde wrote. Communists therefore must "promote social revolution and the establishment of revolutionary power in the country."

But not only those waving bright red flags are to be activated in this battle. "To understand more deeply the history of a people, their traditions, and in particular their struggle for independence, we must return to the origins of the national culture, to popular art," *America Latina* explained in an introduction to a new series on "popular culture" and "independence struggles" begun in January. Examples of "popular culture" to be mobilized? In February, the Huichole Indians of Mexico were singled out because "their attachment to independence is traditional." Amongst the customs the Indians have been able to "protect," writes *America Latina*, is that of ingesting peyote, the powerful hallucinogenic cactus that allows the Indians to "communicate with their gods and nature."

WANTED

Investment opportunity in data communication technology

Fiber optic mass communications technology is one of the new high-speed data communications methods available for the 90's.

A new medium-sized redundant fiber optic communication concept is available on a joint venture basis or under other suitable agreements.

APPLICATIONS

- Offshore
- Process control communication
- Military applications
- Nuclear power plant systems
- Local Area Networks (LANs)
- Critical alarm transmissions

SYSTEM SIZE

Up to 1,000 connections per real time unit

SYSTEM STATUS

Installations already in operation
References available on request

SPECIAL FEATURE

Radiation-induced error automatically rejected

INQUIRIES

In the U.S.

F.W. Engdahl
c/o Executive Intelligence Review
304 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019
Phone: (212) 247-8820 ext. 745

In Europe

MCS Comtech
Strandvägen 7
S-191 45 Stockholm
Sweden
Telex: 14024
Phone: (468) 7510195