

that Club of Rome-type theses, which are nothing but a reproduction of old Malthusianism, are contradicted by science, contradicted by experience. They are cover-up ideologies to mask the defenders of the status quo, who during the last few years have evolved novel forms of financial dependency, and who have ended up like the snake which bit its own tail and became unable to move forward.

**Small:** We in the United States fought a revolution in 1776 against precisely such theories, and we established the American System to combat this ideology of the British System of economics. But many people here are not aware that in Latin America there were also such schools of thought. Could you tell us a bit about these tendencies in Argentina, which shared the thinking of America's founding fathers like Washington, Hamilton, and others?

**Camili6n:** Yes, gladly. Speaking of Hamilton, I would like to tell you a short anecdote. When I was a youth of 18, I so admired Hamilton that I used his name as my pseudonym on journalistic articles—rather presumptuously, I admit. Hamilton is a person whom I especially admire.

In the course of the last decade of the 19th Century, there was a great debate in Argentina which was unfortunately not won by the Hamiltonians. Carlos Pellegrini, Rafael Hernandez dez, and Vicente L6pez were the three great figures who advocated Hamiltonian-style industrial development in Argentina, and their views are perfectly applicable today.

Carlos Pellegrini had the vision to understand that a country which did not develop its own manufacturing capabilities would inexorably be condemned, over the long term, to backwardness. Thirty years later, during the great world crisis, it became evident that those countries which had not adopted a model of industrial development, which had not established the basis of their own industrial growth, which had fallen into the trap of "the international division of labor" and of the supposed "natural destiny" of nations to be mining or agricultural countries only, that these nations of course at a certain point stopped growing and began to collapse.

**Small:** What do you recommend that Latin America do today to support Mexico?

**Camili6n:** It is absolutely necessary that no one try to make of Mexico an "object lesson," which is something I would fear for any country in Latin America. Mexico has made a decision, it has exercised its rights as a sovereign nation. Given that decision, I believe it is essential to ensure that Mexico not be adopted or chosen as a target now for some kind of mechanism of sanctions. Because, of course, if the Mexican situation were to break, it would be the death-knell that would announce "the hour of heaven or hell," as Macbeth said, for the rest of the nations of Latin America.

At this time, what is fundamental is to support the sovereignty of a Latin American nation, in the face of any threat which might be posed to it by those sectors that might consider themselves adversely affected.

## Gilberto Avila Bottia

---

# 'A development bank modern agriculture

*The following are excerpts from an interview conducted Sept. 2 in Bogota, Colombia by EIR's Ibero-America Editor Robyn Quijano with the outgoing president of the Latin American Parliament, Gilberto Avila Bottia. Avila Bottia is Minister without Portfolio and adviser on parliamentary affairs to newly-elected Colombian President Belisario Betancur.*

**Quijano:** The important presentation you made to the last session of the Latin American Parliament has stirred tremendous interest in the new role that Colombia intends to play in the inter-American system. What are the plans of the Betancur government in this regard?

**Avila:** In terms of its international relations, the country is going to substantially alter its position in Latin America. . . . Colombia's new administration has fully aligned itself with the Latin American family. We do not think it is useful to destroy the Organization of American States, because we need an interlocutor. That interlocutor is the United States, and the forum through which to speak to it is the OAS.

But we nonetheless also need to organize a purely Latin American mechanism for conducting international relations, including the Caribbean, those that speak Portuguese, possibly those that speak English and those purely Hispano-American. We need to form a so-called bloc, to have continent-wide coordination, because we can see that none of our countries by themselves can defend themselves from the aggression of the superpowers. We need a Latin American organization to make common policies, a defensive policy and a policy to both cooperate with world peace and to stimulate the development of Third World peoples.

This does not signify aggression against the United States, but there does exist a spiritual rupture; there is no Pan-Americanism on our continent.

Colombia has summarized its political thoughts on this on an international level by inviting all the presidents of the Southern Hemisphere to study, to re-analyze the various mechanisms—both economic and political—with which it conducts its international relations. . . .

**Quijano:** The British invasion of the Malvinas demonstrated that NATO plans to unleash colonial wars; today in the Malvinas, tomorrow to guarantee payment of the debt. Yesterday, with the nationalization of the Mexican banks, the question of defending national sovereignty came to the fore-

# could promote and industrialization'

front on a continental level. Under such circumstances, what shape do you see this continental solidarity taking?

**Avila:** One of the aspirations of the Latin American nations is to form a common market. . . . The planned presidential summit meeting should agree to substitute, or at least to study, a multilateral treaty which would not only encompass questions of political and military defense, but also the creation of mechanisms of economic defense. One of these mechanisms of economic defense would involve attempting economic integration—if not regionally, at least subregionally.

**Quijano:** The U.S. politician Lyndon LaRouche, founder of this magazine, has detailed a plan for just such a Latin American Common Market. . . .

**Avila:** For a Latin America-wide development plan, we don't need private capital but public capital under acceptable economic conditions: that is, long-term, low-interest credit. The first thought of a Latin American politician would be to look to the United States, but we know that this would be like attempting to plow the ocean, given what the U.S. achieved with the Marshall Plan, and the development plans it put into practice in India and Afghanistan, and who knows where else, but never holding out a hand to the Latin American nations.

Of course, there is the other superpower, the U.S.S.R., which has sporadically made its presence felt in the Third World, such as in the case of the Aswan Dam. But the nature of Latin America, its links . . . to Western civilization, its conception of man and of certain values will not allow this. Ours is not a fertile land for Marxism to take hold of the Latin American soul in place of a development program.

Thus, we maintain more or less cordial relations with the European Community. We know that the EC does not have the financial power of the United States, but they nonetheless at least provide us with technology transfer; they could give us the knowledge they acquired after World War II for Europe's economic recovery, so that we could promote industry and industrialize agriculture. This technological support would of course provide us with a foundation.

So now, how do you carry out a development program? None of our countries have the financial resources to finance such a program; thus, we need international credit. But one is speaking here of a world financial oligarchy, and this

financial oligarchy, or elite, could take the form of OPEC, or the more active presence of Japan, I don't know. It could also emerge through the efforts of each one of our countries to found an investment bank to replace the Interamerican Development Bank; our own bank, in which each of our countries would contribute a quota, proportional to its internal development, to organize a great mechanism of financial development for Latin America.

**Quijano:** President Betancur has recently announced his proposal that Colombia join the Non-Aligned movement. Could you briefly explain the reason for this decision and what results you expect to come of it?

**Avila:** We don't know all the fundamental reasoning upon which this decision is to be made, but we Colombians know of the dialogue that took place between Vice-President Bush and the Colombian President on the day of [Betancur's] inauguration Aug. 7, when the Vice-President asked the same question. Our President said, ". . . I will graphically summarize the sentiment of Latin America: before the Malvinas conflict, the prestige of the U.S. was ground level; after the conflict, it was in the basement." As a result, my country will leave the political orbit of the United States—nor will it be part of the Russian orbit—and will join with other countries in conditions similar to our own, the Non-Aligned nations.

**Quijano:** From what I have seen of the national situation, there is a remoralization of the country with this new government. What is going to be done now regarding the drug problem?

**Avila:** The current government has said that it will be ruthless in persecuting these elements and these crops. We are aware of the immense damage that will be done to our nation if we give free passage to the consumption of marijuana and cocaine. But in a way we feel impotent, not so much in dealing with our own, but because of the financial organization that the United States has along its Florida coasts, because it is there that the ships and planes piloted by North Americans arrive; it is they who bring the dollars and who are feeding this traffic with drugs from the Colombian jungles.

If the U.S. were to do something to reduce consumption, logically the Colombian drug traffickers would lose a good part of their market. But at bottom what exists is a unilateral policy; Colombia is looked at, but the United States doesn't look at itself. Thus, when a North American arrives here, the most intelligent question to ask is "What are **you** going to do with marijuana?" But we are never told what the North Americans are going to do with their consumers and their traffickers. I think that what is lacking is an anti-drug crackdown by the United States on its citizens, its banks, and its businesses. That is why, in a certain way, we are unable to resolve the problem in Colombia—because it is the financial force of the United States which is fiercely aggravating the problem inside Colombia.