

Dispel the ghosts at Brazil's Itamaraty

Some among the elites are calling for a break with the Foreign Ministry's subservience to British policies. Silvia Palacios and Lorenzo Carrasco report.

The nuclear explosions recently detonated by India and Pakistan, while they had no radioactive fallout, did produce a shock wave which devastated the illusions of the Brazilian diplomatic apparatus, which believed that, with "good behavior" and public relations, it could secure a permanent, if symbolic seat on the UN Security Council. (The five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Russia, China, France, and Great Britain—also constitute the so-called "Nuclear Club" of countries that possess nuclear weapons.) Now, the world strategic chessboard has been overturned, and the calculations of Brazil's pro-British factions have been dashed; some people are daring to state that Brazil should resume a foreign policy in its own national interests, rather than the interests of the British oligarchy.

The pro-British policy of Itamaraty Palace, the Brazilian Foreign Ministry, began in 1990, under the government of President Fernando Collor de Mello, a puppet of George Bush—the man who, on orders from Britain's Margaret Thatcher, sought to establish a "new world order," whose murderous nature was demonstrated in the "splendid little war" against Iraq. Collor's government was taken over by the one-worldist faction at Itamaraty; he demolished the traditionally independent foreign policy of Brazil, especially that regarding the Arab world and northern Africa, and submitted to the designs of British intelligence and its American clones.

In his two-year rule before being removed from the Presidency, Collor succeeded in reducing the role of the Armed Forces in national political decisionmaking, reversing a tradition which stems from the establishment of the Republic in 1889. He questioned the need for every high-technology project under the aegis of the Armed Forces, and echoed the campaigns of one-world-government mouthpieces, who alleged that Brazil was on the verge of producing the atomic bomb, through so-called "dual use" nuclear technology. Under these pressures, Collor yielded entirely to the "non-proliferation" policy: technological apartheid against national scientific development. Thus, Brazil began to travel down the road to signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Collor was also a carrier of the British policy for creating enormous Indian reserves in mineral-rich regions of the Am-

azon, a policy which culminated in the creation of the Yanomami reserve in 1992, as part of secret agreements with the British Crown during the 1992 UN Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro.

As Collor recently revealed, current President Fernando Henrique Cardoso had repeatedly begged Collor to select him as Foreign Minister, the better to personally execute this pro-British policy. Cardoso only got his wish after Collor's fall, with the advent of the Itamaraty government. As Franco's Foreign Minister, Cardoso reestablished Brazil's special relationship with England, harking back to British geopolitics of the last century.

After his election to the Presidency in 1994, Cardoso consolidated this "special relationship," which culminated in his visit to London last December, from which he departed crowned, not exactly as Julius Caesar—with whom he was compared by the dean of Cambridge University—but with the title of "Sir." The visit also revealed the hegemony inside Itamaraty of another servant of British policy, although without a title (at least in public): the Brazilian ambassador to London, Rubens Barbosa.

Itamaraty's split

Itamaraty imagined that within the "one-world" regime of globalization and the supposed decline of the sovereign nation-state, it would fall to Brazil to head up the Mercosur bloc, which would weigh in the balance between U.S. interests and those of the European Union, under London's financial hegemony.

There clearly existed a consensus inside Itamaraty that indiscriminate economic opening, the basis of monetary policy of the current Cardoso government, would bring with it a substantial increase in Brazilian exports, of an amount equal to or greater than the increase in global trade. Not only did this not occur, but the free trade opening plunged the country into enormous deficits in its balance of payments, and caused major social problems which, in certain areas of the country, already prefigure convulsions and even civil war.

Faced with the evident collapse of the financial system and the bankruptcy of globalism, and in view of the sovereign examples of India and Pakistan, Itamaraty realized that it

had lost the possibility of the permanent UN Security Council seat, and sank into an internal crisis.

A binational ecological reserve

On the one hand, there are factions which cling to the illusion that, by submitting to the dominant power of the one-worldist financial oligarchy, they will succeed in turning Brazil into a world power, forever faithful to the inheritance of a decadent pro-slavery oligarchy which survived the fall of the Empire. The kind of power they imagine is that of a Dark-Age feudalism, in which an exceptionally affluent minority would dominate the starving and illiterate masses, who fight without hope to survive.

The most recent action of this pro-British group, of which President Cardoso is the head, was the “accidental” leak of a private document prepared by Itamaraty for the bilateral Peru-Ecuador meeting, to seek a peace formula for the border conflict between those two nations, of which Brazil would be guarantor, along with Argentina, Chile, and the United States. The Brazilian proposal is nothing less than a British project to create a *binational* ecological reserve in the disputed region, to be administered by a joint Ecuador-Peru mission, which would proceed from the standpoint of “shared sovereignty.” The document is explicit in assuring “the exclusion of all military units from the region, and thus denying access by the Armed Forces to the conflict zone in 1995.”

As *EIR* charged in our issue of Aug. 22, 1997 (“The ‘Parks for Peace’ Ploy for Bloody Border Wars”), the proposal to create international ecological reserves along contested borders between countries, especially Ibero-American ones, is one of the favorite tricks of the environmentalist apparatus in the service of the British Empire, in particular, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). As we said at that time:

“The IUCN’s park program has been adopted by the State Department team on Peru-Ecuador, as the preferred ‘solution’ for the conflict. No one has formally raised the proposal yet at the negotiating table, but participants say they expect the park proposal to be pulled out ‘when it’s time to break the logjam.’

“Differing versions of the proposal for a ‘joint, ecological park’ have been discussed by [the Kissingerian former U.S. State Department official and now consultant Luigi] Einaudi’s team. Some say that, to ever be accepted, a border down the middle of such a park would have to be agreed on and delineated; others argue that the full IUCN program—using the park to eliminate the border altogether—should be stuck to. All the park proponents agree, however, that ‘the authority of the state will be truncated’ at the park. The key, said one former member of Einaudi’s interagency task force, is that ‘all agree that this would be non-military. . . . No armies, and have it demilitarized.’ ”

The attitude of being a bearer of British imperial policy on the continent, can only serve to strip Brazilian diplomacy of whatever shreds of credibility it still retains in the region.

Sudden conversions

On the other hand, there are serious disagreements being expressed, which reveal the internal fissures within Itamaraty, especially as reflected in the views of Ambassador Rubens Ricupero, the secretary general of UNCTAD and one of the most important “intellectuals” of Brazil’s diplomatic establishment. In an article in the May 30 *Folha de São Paulo*, Ricupero criticized globalization, asking: “Did the United States, France, Germany, and Japan industrialize because they followed the free-trade advice preached to them by England?” Answering his own question, he said: “On the contrary, the first policy of industrial protection dates back to 1791 and carries the signature of then-Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. Up until World War I, the United States imposed an average tariff of 33%, three times greater than Germany’s and nine times that of England.”

Ricupero presented China as the example that Brazil should follow today. “At the IMF [International Monetary Fund] meeting in Hong Kong, I was present at the notable speech delivered by the then-Economics Minister and today Prime Minister of China [Zhu Rongji]. Impeccable, amiable, and correct in form. In substance, of great authority and independence. His message was the following: ‘If you want to give us advice, we will listen to it politely, but will not follow any of it. We have a complex country, virtually a universe. For every problem, we will first test out the solution locally. If it works, we will gradually implement it to be sure that it can be applied nationally. China is China, and the rest is the rest.’ He was given a standing ovation, by all those who say the opposite, that globalization imposed its rules on China, and not the other way around. The explanation? The minister repeated, using the same words, the song which became Frank Sinatra’s theme, ‘My Way.’ Like it or not, I’ll do it my way, follow my own path, live my own reality. Why would it be impossible for us to do the same thing?”

Also on May 30, Minister for Strategic Affairs Ronaldo Sardemberg, another of the Itamaraty “intellectuals,” in an article in *O Estado de São Paulo* headlined “The Asian Instability and Its Consequences,” reported on his recent visit to Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, and warned of the gravity of the situation there for Brazil. “Pure and simple optimism today sounds ingenuous,” he said.

Speaking of India and Pakistan’s nuclear tests, Sardemberg admitted that “the tests upset the nuclear status quo, and call into question the international nuclear non-proliferation framework which Brazil, in various ways, has adhered to and lent its support.”

In short, a sign of the times: conversions of those who only yesterday proclaimed the final triumph of liberalism.