

Who Is Mr. LaRouche?

The following excerpts are taken from a “Salute to Mr. Lyndon LaRouche” which was delivered by Dr. Enéas Carneiro, head of Brazil’s PRONA Party, at the June 12, 2002 ceremony awarding LaRouche honorary citizenship in the city of São Paulo. Subheads have been added.

Who is Mr. LaRouche?

Until 1994, I knew of him only as a great political leader. I could also see the convergence of our thinking, but I had no idea at all of his immense and extraordinary culture in almost every field of human knowledge....

Reading Mr. LaRouche’s articles in *EIR* and later on in *Fidelio* and *21st Century* magazines, I became increasingly astonished and deeply curious to know more and more about that man.

Who really is he?

Recently, reading an article appearing in the May 10, 2002 issue of *EIR*, I was struck by Mr. LaRouche’s deep philosophical and technical analysis on the catenary, and I recalled my classes as a university physics student 40 years ago....

The catenary is the curve describing the form taken by a uniform chain when it is suspended from its endpoints. Any freely hanging cable or rope assumes this shape.

The catenary represents the constant search of nature for a state of order, with a minimum expenditure of energy. That is a universal principle, which, like many others, Mr. LaRouche explains magnificently in his writings.

But, let’s stop for a moment and think: What Presidential candidate in Brazil, or in the United States, for that matter, has ever heard of a catenary?

Imagine someone showing Mr. Bush in the United States, or [Presidential candidates] Mr. Lula [Luís Inacio Da Silva] or Mr. [Antonio] Garotinho in Brazil, an hyperbolic function or an integral. Any one of them, at the sight of an integral, would immediately think of a rattlesnake ready to bite him. None of them, in their absolute ignorance of the scientific principles governing nature, has the slightest idea of the importance of scientific knowledge to the statesman who would lead a nation.

Besides being a mathematical philosopher, Mr. LaRouche has a keen intelligence and exceptional fluency in matters of the physical world, speaking with intimacy and profundity about the ideas of Gauss, Ampère, Oersted, and Kepler, and many other mainstays of physics.

Regarding philosophy as such, Mr. LaRouche is really a scholar. From Plato to Leibniz, from St. Augustine to St. Thomas Aquinas, or Descartes, Spinoza, and many others, the

depth of his reasoning and wise analysis is, for me, breathtaking.

He speaks about ancient history as if he were there, at the same table, on the same sofa, at Plato's *Symposium*, the "Banquet of Love." He who reads Mr. LaRouche's articles receives a refreshing shower of science, fine arts, and philosophy.

The Fight for the General Welfare

But, beyond such incontestable knowledge, what most impresses me about Mr. LaRouche is his concern for social questions, poverty, and the destiny of humanity.

Mr. LaRouche defends, in the United States and the world, the same ideas which we, of PRONA, defend here in Brazil.

He fights for the existence and presence of the sovereign nation-state. In one of his speeches, he said: "We want no empire. We want no hegemony. We want the general welfare. We want to protect and to promote national sovereignty. That is the cornerstone."

He condemns economic globalization, so dear to the rotten press, the corrupted media which do not allow ordinary people to know what is the reality hidden behind those sweet words, such as "privatization," "the minimal state," "economic globalization," and so forth and so on. In reality, all of this is a lie; what exists, in fact, is neo-colonialism.

I became aware in 1989—but Mr. LaRouche had seen it much earlier than I—that a diabolical plan of destruction was under way, and accelerating with incredible velocity, to destroy our moral values—all that was handed down to us by our forefathers, and which makes us a sovereign nation.

With the establishment of the free-market empire, with the neoliberal wind blowing in almost every quarter of the planet, it followed naturally that our country would also be engulfed by this wave of destruction.

The floodgates of our economy were intentionally opened. Our nation was flooded with junk and trash from around the world. The barriers against imports of all industrial products were taken down, in such a disastrous manner that our national industry was almost destroyed.

But, the whole process did not stop there. With no subsidies, with almost no lending by the Banco do Brasil to small and medium-sized farmers, bankruptcy also struck the countryside. Thus, they destroyed agriculture, too.

Millions of unemployed were thrown onto the streets. Today, a shocking 20% of the economically active population is unemployed. They wander hopelessly, hungry, desperate, joining those already in the informal economy, selling imported products at traffic lights on the streets, doing anything to survive, and a considerable number of those unfortunate people finally end up in criminal marginality.

Criminality, in turn, is reaching terrifying levels, reaching as high as one murder every hour in the Rio-São Paulo region, as stated quite correctly by Dr. Havanir, president of PRONA

in São Paulo.

They destroyed the fundamentals of Classical education. They destroyed respect for the nation, for religion, for the family, as well as respect for life. And, with that, death became just a banality. They transformed human beings into machines.

With complete freedom for speculation, with capital flowing from one point of the planet to another, without any restrictions, it was natural that the big monied interests wished to increase—doubling, tripling, quadrupling their fortunes—simply by speculation in the financial market.

The world economy became a no-man's-land, with no relationship between real wealth and the amount of money in circulation.

Money is no longer a symbol of wealth. It has become wealth itself. I say that, because there is no correspondence between the money that circulates and the real wealth of nations, as Mr. LaRouche has so brilliantly proven in his analyses, repeatedly presented in the four corners of the planet.

We have come to live under the Empire of Money, the Empire of Fake Money, the Empire of Painted Paper.

Brazil, in 2001, paid the fabulous amount of some \$60 billion in service on the public debt alone, including the interest on domestic and foreign public debts. And the domestic debt jumped from \$50 billion in 1994 (at a dollar-to-real ratio of 1:1), to about \$240 billion, the equivalent of a stunning 600 billion reals at today's exchange rate. . . .

There is no saving this model, unless there is a joint statement, issued by the governments of the major countries of the world, that the current international financial system is insolvent; and calling for the establishment of a new accord between nations, with the creation of a New Bretton Woods agreement. . . .

Thank you very much, Mr. LaRouche, for your presence here in Brazil, and for all that you represent for all mankind.

LaRouche's New Bretton Woods Is 'Sensational'

Dr. Enéas Carneiro granted this telephone interview to Dennis Small—Ibero-American editor for EIR—on Feb. 9, 2004, from which the following excerpts are taken.

EIR: You are known throughout Brazil for your famous phrase during your first Presidential campaign: "My name is Enéas." But there is another expression, which is almost as well-known, which people identify with you: "Rupture, now!" Why do you say that a rupture with the International Monetary Fund system is necessary?

Enéas: I have said—and I know you have heard me say this on several occasions—that I see no way out under the current

model. Let's look at the government's official figures.

According to the official numbers for 2003, government spending averaged some 12.5 billion reais a month [on interest payments], which comes to about 150 billion reais a year. That is nearly half the Federal budget. That is absurd; it is unthinkable. There will be no money left for *anything*—not for public schools, hospitals. So, there is no way out.

And there is no end to these interest payments. After paying all that interest, one need only look at the public debt, which kept growing, under the government of Mr. Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva. The publicly-held domestic debt, alone, which are the bonds held by the market, which they say are held by the public, totalled 50 billion reais when Fernando Henrique Cardoso took office in 1994. When he left office in 2002, it was a little over 700 billion.

So, the interest is paid, and the debt increases, because it is impossible to pay all the interest, and a part is of it transformed again into increases in the debt. . . .

Real joblessness—I have a serious, careful study of this—I can prove that real unemployment is 25% of the EAP [Economically Active Population]. That is, one out of every four people in the EAP are unemployed. It is the rare family where no one is unemployed—whether the family is middle class, lower middle class, or poor. It is a truly distressing situation. There is desperation.

And now, when the pensioners, in just a few months, begin to have 11% deducted from their benefits—the pensioners!—begin to pay taxes, since the retiree helps out the young people who are unemployed in the family—they always help—then things are going to get worse. It seems to me that the government is now starting to deteriorate, despite all the optimistic speeches by Brazilian officials, speeches which are no different from those in other countries.

EIR: Dr. Enéas, in mid-2002, you invited Lyndon LaRouche to São Paulo, Brazil, so that the City Council there could make him an honorary citizen of São Paulo, and so that he could speak about his solutions and his proposal for a New Bretton Woods—which also involves breaking with the IMF. What do you think of those ideas that LaRouche raised, and the alternatives available to the world at this time?

Enéas: The idea is excellent—the idea that all countries should sit down at the table, led by some countries, such as Russia, and reach a healthy consensus. . . . To the extent this were accepted, it would be beautiful. I have my doubts that this will come to be accepted.

That is why I propose a rupture, not just with the IMF, but also with the World Bank. Look how the World Bank, over the last five years, for every dollar that they placed here, got 1.4 dollars back. What interest do we have in such “help” from these organizations, to which we already owe so much? The truth is that they don't give any help at all.

So that is why I propose rupture: because of that. We will

face a period of difficulties, a period in which we would not be able to import computer chips, perhaps; but we have our own quartz. It would be a difficult period, but there would be light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. LaRouche's idea is sensational . . . from a theoretical standpoint, it is the best way, what should be done . . . a new financial architecture is the way to go. The problem is, and it is the problem before us now, how to bring about that architecture? How? What *de facto* power do we have to be able to impose this on Wall Street and the City of London?

EIR: In this international context of such a serious crisis and of growing opposition to the current system, what role should Brazil play in international politics? Who should be your strategic allies? What can be done with other countries, including the United States? . . .

Enéas: I think, for example, that contact with Russia is fundamental; contact with China (which I haven't yet visited); with the Malaysia of Dr. Mahathir. That is, a unity of these persons around a common idea could, I want to believe, at a certain point, unleash some kind of international movement that *could* catch on. I am not saying that it *will* catch on. . . .

To sum up, I think that that movement of unity could bear fruit: a union with Russia, and perhaps, who knows, with some forces that even exist in the United States. You are there; I want to believe that you are not all alone. If you were alone, you wouldn't be able to have that movement. Some groups in the world have been able to reach agreements. . . .

The moment Brazil kicks over the chessboard, it would be followed by an enormous number of countries. But it is necessary for Brazil to issue its cry of independence. . . .

EIR: Mr. LaRouche is building a youth movement, which is causing a political and scientific explosion in the country and in the world. . . . What do you think, philosophically, about this question of the role of youth, and truth, in politics?

Enéas: I am an enthusiast for this, an *enthusiast!* I have some difficulties, for now, putting that into practice—difficulties of a financial nature, and other sorts. But I agree fully. Because young people—of course, we are talking about youth who have had access to education, who are in a position to understand that message. We can't talk about our young people who sadly are still floundering at the primary or pre-primary level of instruction. You know that education in Brazil is in terrible, terrible, terrible shape.

But I fully agree. Further ahead, I have to participate in a process similar to that. Once thinking leaders move the multitudes—because the masses never made a revolution, they were always led. I want to believe that leaders will emerge from that collection of youth. I fully agree with the ideas and the articles and magazines you have sent me.

I am not yet able to do that; I lack the resources. But further ahead, I will do so.