

infamous HSBC of Opium War heritage; the world's oldest bank, Italy's Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena; the Agnelli family's FIAT; Soros-associated Carlo De Benedetti, president of *Companie Industriali Riunite* (CIR); and Belgium's Generale Bank, with its Belgian Congo heritage of horror.

A fawning report in the May 26, 2004 issue of Brazil's *IstoE* magazine, describes the imperial trappings and discussions which took place at the lavish, three-day annual meeting of Brasilinvest's International Council that had just been held in London, under the direction of old Jacob Rothschild himself, and with lead speaker George H.W. Bush. It was there that Jacob called Garnero "my fourth son"; and there, that Britain's Prince Andrew announced that the Brazilians shall play "a strategic role in the new setting of international trade relations," with Garnero serving as an informal ambassador to the U.K. Andrew hailed Garnero as an example of "how Brazil could lead in bringing trade relations closer between the West and the new markets of the East."

Participating in that London confab, and serving still on the board of Brasilinvest, are two businessmen who are also key to the Rothschilds' BRIC operation: Russia's aluminum king and Nat Rothschild buddy, Oleg Deripaska; and Chinese real estate mogul and businessman, David Tang, of DWC Tang Development.

Rothschild agent Garnero first introduced Lula to Deripaska. And Garnero, before Lula's first trip to China as President, brought the head of the Chinese government investment fund, CITIC, to meet in Brasilia with President Lula, seven ministers, and other top government officials.

For his seven years in office, Lula's Brazil has been a plaything of the British magicians—as the carry trade looting attests, in cold numbers. Not surprisingly, Lula has been named "Man of the Year," by everyone from the Davos forum of international financial big-shots, to France's *Le Monde* newspaper, to Britain's own Royal Institute for International Affairs.

But no amount of awards, or smoke and mirrors, can perpetuate the carry trade illusion forever. Like every such Ponzi scheme throughout history, it will vanish in the magician's puff of smoke. The only issue is: Will it bring the entire planet's population down with it?

LaRouche Warned Brazil

Don't Play by British Rules of the Game!

by Gretchen Small

The past seven years of looting suffered by Brazil at the hands of the British Empire from which it has yet to win independence, did not have to happen. Brazil had a choice.

In June 2002, Lyndon LaRouche and his wife, German political leader Helga Zepp-LaRouche, were welcomed in Brazil to discuss the alternative: common action by the United States, Brazil, and other nations, to put the international monetary system through bankruptcy reorganization, and replace failed British free trade with Hamiltonian American System policies.

Brazil's elites were in turmoil. Looting of Argentina had driven their neighbor into official bankruptcy in December 2001; its banking system had imploded, and the country itself was disintegrating. Brazil faced Presidential elections in October, and its own financial system was blowing up. Qualified reports were circulating privately, pointing to a total debt blowout for Brazil, no later than the first quarter of 2003.

Brazilian leaders had, by and large, bought into the lie, that there would be a seat for Brazil at globalization's table. Other nations might go down, but they would survive. At the time of LaRouche's visit, that assumption was crumbling under the onslaught of the global breakdown crisis, and the realization that the IMF system *intended* to let Argentina disintegrate and die.

LaRouche was invited to Brazil by the São Paulo City Council, to be awarded honorary citizenship of the city, at the initiative of the PRONA Party of the fierce nationalist, Dr. Eneas Carneiro. São Paulo would elect Dr. Eneas to the Chamber of Deputies the following October with over a million votes, more than any politician had received in Brazil's history.

Other Brazilian institutions jumped at the opportu-



In 2002, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche travelled to São Paulo to propose an alternative to British looting of Brazil. LaRouche is shown here with Brazilian nationalist political leader Dr. Eneas Carneiro at an event at the São Paulo City Council.

EIRNS/Steve Meyer

nity to hold first-hand discussions with the American statesman respected worldwide as the leading opponent of globalization, and true American patriot. LaRouche addressed leading representatives of Brazil’s economic, military, and political institutions, in private meetings, and in four public speeches.

LaRouche centered his public presentations on his Triple Curve forecasting method, driving home the reality that globalization is finished, requiring a change in thinking, away from the crippling pragmatism which has kept Brazil in the clutches of the oligarchy since its independence. Brazil’s scientific and technological potential is without question; but when will the leadership step forward to fight to develop its vast undeveloped regions and peoples?

In an address to a forum sponsored by the Alumni Association of the Superior War College (ADESG) on June 11, 2002, LaRouche warned:

“You’re not going to find solutions in a system which has shown that the definitions, axioms, and postulates of the system ensure destruction! But people say, you’ve got to play by the rules! What are the rules? They are precisely the definitions, axioms, and postulates which have destroyed us!

“Why can’t we change the rules? Aren’t we human beings? Don’t we represent nations?... Sovereignty

means the power to make the rules by means of which we survive. That doesn’t mean that we can make anything we want to. It means we have to have responsibility and competence for this. We have the right to deliberate....

“What I’ve outlined for you today, is the case: Can we survive? Can civilization survive? Can Brazil survive? Isn’t that the question here? Can Brazil survive? You see what is happening in Argentina? Can Brazil survive? And how? And where can you find the leaders who will avoid denial? To look the ugly truth in the eye, look at the dangerous truth in the eye, and say, ‘I am going to do whatever is necessary to save this nation, and civilization, this nation being my immediate responsibility.’”¹

Falling into the Trap

Here is an excerpt of a discussion between LaRouche and leading representatives of São Paulo’s business interests, at a luncheon sponsored by the São Paulo Commercial Association on June 13, 2002; it exemplifies the flaw in the Brazilian elite’s thinking, which opened the door to their capitulation, later that year, to

1. See “Turning Point in Economic Collapse Crisis: Lyndon LaRouche’s Visit to Brazil June 11-15, 2002,” at www.larouche.pub.com.

the British empire's proffers of "walls of money," channeled through Rothschild's agents Mario Garnero and Banco Santander.

LaRouche: There is only one solution. Governments must act to put the system into bankruptcy reorganization. If you do not do it, you have the worst possible result. . . .

Don't wait for chaos; it may be too late. France could have been saved before July 14, 1789. The constitution of Bailly and Lafayette, had the king not rejected it, would have meant a great revival of France. As a result of the failure to enact that constitution, July 14, since 1789, has been celebrated in France.

I believe that people here, in Brazil, are thinking about the same thing. So don't wait for July 14, 1789 to hit Brazil. Therefore, the time to act, is as soon as possible. But, you have to wait for that hot moment where the response will be forthcoming, but don't wait beyond that.

Then, who can lead? What can you and the people you typify or represent do, in terms of leadership? If the people of Brazil, or a significant number of them, smell a disaster now coming across the border from Argentina towards Brazil, and say: "What do we do?" Someone has to answer. *You*, and people you know, must undertake the responsibility of educating yourselves and the people you know, in the practical aspects of this problem. If the people trust you, if they believe in those ideas, then, under those conditions of crisis, you can be victorious. That's the lesson of history, repeatedly. . . .

Therefore, my being here, for example, in Brazil—Brazil is the key country of all South America, strategically. It's extremely important that I state here the same thing that I'm saying in other countries, so that people in Brazil know what I'm saying; so you can react to what I am saying. How you react to what I am saying is very important to people in the United States and elsewhere.

We are engaged in a true conspiracy. Not those nutty drawings that they make of conspiracy, but a real one. We discuss the situation. We discuss the ideas. We consider the possibility of agreement on ideas. We assess interests. We try to come to a common thing we agree on. I'm in the process of trying to push that kind of discussion internationally. . . .

The danger now, is we're not discussing what we should be doing. We are discussing how to try to keep

this system from collapsing. How to work within the sinking ship, instead of saying: "The ship is going to sink, let's get off it and pick a new ship."

That is the great danger: that we're not discussing the alternatives adequately. And people scream. You say, "Go back to the original Bretton Woods agreement. This ship is sinking. let's try the other one; at least it worked. . . ."

So, if we can come to an agreement on ideas, as a result of discussion, then we can discuss internationally, we can act in concert to cause governments to change their opinion.

Permit me to be very delicate, as delicate as necessary. You have a movement of chaos loose on this planet—it's called anti-globalization. It officially is led by a British agent, Teddy Goldsmith, who led a conference at Porto Alegre some months ago. That is the palpable, major internal danger to Brazil right now. And when I talk to people in Brazil, I find this subject comes up. And I say: "Well, what are you worried about? He's a globalizer, to globalize the non-existence of the nation-state, using Jacobin terror methods."

Why is he able to attract people? As long as you say, "We've got to go with globalization," how can you fight him? How can you? You have no credibility. A question was asked of me in the discussion earlier: How do you deal with the people, and their representatives? You have to know how to deal with people, and the people want to know what the alternative is to the misery which they see coming down upon them.

And this movement—that movement at Porto Alegre—has no right to claim to be the anti-globalization movement. I am the anti-globalization movement, to save the nation-state!

Moderator: It is said, that one can agree or disagree. But I believe that all of us agree that Mr. LaRouche is a man of courage. . . .

As he said: either we organize ourselves another boat, or we are going to have to fix the boat. I prefer to stay in the boat, and try to seek the best solution. And the best solution, evidently, will come not from what people wish, but from what people are able to achieve, when they make decisions. . . . And since all citizens are involved in these decisions, reflect upon Mr. LaRouche's words. Because one can analyze them, and there could be differences of analysis, but one should not ignore them. . . .