

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.