

Stop 'Eco-92,' warns EIR correspondent in Brazil

The Earth Summit, the so-called "Eco-92," must be stopped unless Third World nations want their populations and sovereignty curbed and their resources internationalized, journalist Lorenzo Carrasco Bazúa told an international audience of journalists, diplomats, and representatives of environmental organizations at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on Sept. 20. Carrasco, who heads the *Executive Intelligence Review's* bureau in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, gave a detailed report on the background of the United Nations summit scheduled to be held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992, the specific targeting of Brazil, and the malthusian world order that the summit is intended to put in place.

The press conference was opened by Marjorie Mazel Hecht, managing editor of *21st Century Science & Technology* magazine. Said Hecht, "We have called this briefing on the Earth Summit because we intend to stop it from happening, and we want to tell the world why it should be stopped." She added that behind the pleasantries of cleaning up the environment is the ugly malthusian policy of vastly reducing the world population, through the deliberate targeting of people of color. Further, she said, the summit intends to make binding global laws on the environment, removing national sovereignty, and enforcing these laws with a global green police force.

For the skeptics who doubt the malthusian goals behind the Earth Summit, Hecht read some quotations from the Club of Rome's newly published book, *The First Global Revolution*, which explicitly attacks "humanity" as the problem (see *EIR*, Sept. 27, 1991, p. 34). She then introduced Carrasco, whose presentation is excerpted below.

Attending the press conference were 21 people, consisting of U.S. government officials from the State and Agriculture departments and the congressional Office of Technology Assessment, science and agricultural attachés from several Asian embassies as well as from the Soviet embassy, press representatives from Brazil, the United States, and Japan, and several representatives of the environmentalist movement.

Coverage of the presentation appeared in the Brazilian newspapers *Jornal do Brasil* and *O Globo* the next day, prominently including Carrasco's debate challenge to Brazilian Environment Secretary José Lutzenberger. While reporting on Carrasco's statements, *Jornal do Brasil* attempted

to discredit them by presenting Lyndon LaRouche, *EIR's* founder, as an "extreme right-winger" who nonetheless uses leftist rhetoric.

Documentation

Eco-92: imperialism of the 'new world order'

Excerpts from Lorenzo Carrasco Bazúa's press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on Sept. 20.

In my capacity as correspondent for *Executive Intelligence Review* in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, I have had the opportunity in the past few years to witness an international environmentalist offensive on the occasion of the preparation for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), which will occur in Brazil in June of 1992 under the pompous title of "Earth Summit." For Brazil, in particular, this environmentalist campaign was intensified by the Anglo-American oligarchy as a result of the lamentable murder of the environmentalist leader Chico Mendez, an individual who before then was little known even in Brazil outside of a small group of trade unionists and environmentalists, and who, over a period of just a few days, was converted by the international media into what the *New York Times* called "a martyr of the Amazon holocaust." This campaign had the intention of deliberately imposing the idea that Brazil was incapable of dealing with the problems related to its environment, and this suggestion was appropriately accompanied by the surreptitious corollary that the task of such defense of the environment should be entrusted to exogenous or foreign hands.

The enormous pressures which were imposed by the Anglo-American oligarchy, with the support of their Soviet partners in the world condominium of power and in association with the leaders of the Socialist International, led to the appointment of at least two important members of the inner cabinet of Brazilian President Fernando Collor de Mello:

Secretary of Science and Technology José Goldemberg, who is today education secretary, and Secretary of the Environment José Lutzenberger. These appointments received an unprecedented expression of support from about 10 U.S. senators.

According to press reports, Lutzenberger in particular was personally proposed by Prince Charles, heir to the British throne and one of the main, highest-level leaders of the international environmentalist offensive. Prince Charles and Secretary Lutzenberger are leaders of the Gaia Foundation, the most important center for the ideological spread of pagan cults which promote the worship of Mother Earth-Gaia against the Christian principle of the preeminence of the human species above the rest of Creation.

Since these facts were well documented in various articles of mine published in the Brazilian press and also in the pages of *EIR*, Congressman Atila Lins, the president of the Investigation Commission of the House of Representatives of Brazil, a commission which is investigating the threats of the internationalization of the Amazon, called me to appear and testify before his commission last Aug. 20, and to present the facts, of which I had knowledge, which might compromise Brazilian sovereignty with regard to the extensive Amazon region.

One week later, on Aug. 27, I received a personal telephone call from Secretary José Lutzenberger himself at my office in Rio de Janeiro, requesting certain explanations regarding the contents of my criticisms and expressing his open disagreement with them. So that the matter would not be left at the level of a personal squabble, I invited Secretary Lutzenberger to present, in a public debate with me, our opposed points of view, thinking this would be of enormous use for the interests of the Brazilian nation.

I have now found out through the Brazilian newspapers *Jornal de Commercio* and *Folha de São Paulo*, that as a result of Secretary Lutzenberger's testimony before the congressional commission which I mentioned before, and on the basis of the information which I had previously provided, the president of the congressional commission, Congressman Atila Lins, will officially request the resignation of Secretary Lutzenberger. I want to take this opportunity to reiterate my willingness to publicly debate Secretary Lutzenberger in the expectation and hope that this will help to establish the truth before Brazilian and world opinion. . . .

Twenty years of struggle

To fully understand Eco-92, we must take a brief retrospective look over the last 20 years, starting with the earlier conferences of the U.N. on the Human Environment, which occurred in Stockholm in 1972, the Conference on Population and Development in Bucharest in August 1974, and a conference on food in Rome in November of that same year. In all of these, the proposals presented by the one-worldist Anglo-American oligarchy to condition economic develop-



Lorenzo Carrasco testifying at the hearings in Brasilia, Aug. 20. Next to him is Congressman Lins.

ment to ecologist or population demands were defeated by the opposition of the countries of the Third World.

It is worth emphasizing, in particular, the role of Brazilian diplomacy on those occasions. Since 1971, the Brazilian diplomat Araujo Castro characterized these efforts as an attempt to "freeze world power." . . . He added, "These people emphasize the dangers of pollution . . . while the majority of the planet still lives in an era of pre-contamination, two-thirds of humanity is much more threatened by hunger and penury than they are by the problems of pollution."

Similar idea were expressed by Brazilian Amb. Miguel Ozorio de Almeida during the World Conference on Population in Bucharest in 1974: "Brazil does not accept foreign interference in regions such as that of the Amazon, which is being presented as the necessary lung of the world, to compensate for the pollution and devastation which is occurring in other areas. The national position is that the worst pollution is that of poverty. Brazil will not accept any sort of foreign interference, and will view with mistrust certain international documents such as one recently issued by the U.N., which says: 'We should not continue to tolerate irresponsibility carried out under the cover of sovereignty.' "

Rockefeller accused of genocide

During the Bucharest meeting, on the other hand, Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Club of Life and of the Schiller Institute, blamed John D. Rockefeller and accused him to his face of genocide for defending the theories of the need for drastically reducing world population. The Brazilian government opposed on identical grounds the proposal presented by the U. S. government in November 1974 at the conference on food in Rome, which called for the

establishment of an international agency to control the surplus of food products of the planet. . . .

Since 1984, efforts have been centered around the work of the World Commission on Environment and Development, established in 1984 by the United Nations General Assembly, led by the prime minister of Norway, Gro-Harlem Brundtland. Its proposals, presented in the report *Our Common Future*, published in 1987, have as their central themes the limitation of sovereignty and so-called "sustainable development." . . .

These proposals of the Brundtland Commission were given vigorous support not only by the leaders of the Western powers, but they were also the basis for the understanding of the Western powers with the Soviet *nomenklatura*, as was demonstrated by the speech by then Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in September 1988 before the United Nations General Assembly. . . . An identical position was advanced two months later by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov before the same body.

France, through its President, François Mitterrand, was not far behind, and in the meeting at The Hague, Holland in 1989, he proposed not only that countries should cede part of their sovereignty, but that they should also join in the creation of an international agency that would try and punish supposed ecological crimes. . . .

The United Nations General Assembly of Dec. 22, 1989 decided to hold the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil, because Brazil is considered one of the priority targets of the "new world order" of President Bush. The reason is that Brazil combines human and natural resources which bestow on it a certain privileged condition in order to be able to achieve accelerated economic growth on a broad scale, and also because Brazil exercises a certain political leadership in the developing sector, as was seen in the conferences of Stockholm and Bucharest, a leadership which can bring down the goals and purposes of the Anglo-American oligarchy and that of their associates in the Socialist International.

It is in this context that the threat to the limitation of Brazilian sovereignty over the Amazon region takes on a reality, a threat which is occurring under different pretexts such as that of the preservation of the tropical rain forests, [and] the creation of Indian enclaves. . . .

Who runs the ecologist offensive?

If we glance very briefly at the spectrum of environmentalist organizations that are moving around Eco-92, we can locate the center of the radiation of these ideas primarily in the International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED) of London, many of whose members also participated in the Brundtland Commission. The IIED of London is currently headed by oil magnate Robert O. Anderson of Atlantic Richfield Co., and receives funding from the American Express Foundation, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Citibank,

Barclays Bank, Bankers Trust Foundation, Morgan Guaranty Trust, National Westminster Bank, the Royal Bank of Scotland, the Security Pacific Foundation, Shell Companies Foundation, Royal Dutch Shell, and a gaggle of other institutions.

Another private environmentalist organization is the Center for Our Common Future, headquartered in Geneva, which presents itself as an international auxiliary committee to help organize Eco-92, with financing from the Gro-Harlem Brundtland Environment Foundation, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation of Chicago. The latter—together with the Ford and Rockefeller foundations—is one of the principal sources of funding for environmental activities in the United States, and its most important creation is that of the World Resources Institute (WRI) of the United States, a group in which the ecologist movement intersects the so-called intelligence community of the United States. The MacArthur Foundation also finances the projects of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Worldwatch Institute, Environmental Defense Fund, and so on.

The Center for Our Common Future coordinates its activities with other environmentalist groups, such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the World Wide Fund for Nature, and so on. In fact, all the command centers of the international environmentalist campaign lead to London, and particularly to those organizations led by the royal Anglo-Dutch families and Scottish Freemasonry. Its one-worldist model of organization, adopted by Bush's new world order, is based on the Roman Empire, including the proposal for a New Age, based on the promotion of pagan cults against the fundamental values of Christianity.

Fight for a new economic order

The 1992 conference in Rio de Janeiro was planned for Brazil to try to avoid the distrust of this and other developing sector countries. Despite appearances, however, the conference was conceived as a key element in the consolidation of the "new world order," whose central purpose would be the imposition of a system of limited sovereignties.

For Brazil, this will mean enormous obstacles to the full development of the natural resources of its territory, and in particular, of the Amazon region. . . .

The 1992 conference poses two alternatives to the developing sector countries. Either these countries obediently submit to the guidelines proposed by the powers of the new world order, which would mean renouncing sovereign economic development and submission to malthusian policies, or, reversing current trends, they could relaunch the fight they waged at the earlier meetings in Stockholm and Bucharest. They could push for the indefinite postponement of Eco-92, proposing instead that a world conference be held to establish a new international economic order, based on principles of equality among sovereign nations and on the dignity of the human individual.