

Sovereignty is non-negotiable, Brazilian Army tells superpowers

by Lorenzo Carrasco and Cynthia Rush

In early April of this year, Brazil's Superior War College (ESG), which represents the institution of the Armed Forces, issued a document entitled *1990-2000: The Vital Decade*. It puts forward a nation-building perspective for the next ten years, while identifying the obstacles—particularly in the international arena—to Brazil becoming a sovereign, industrial giant. Presented on April 5 by retiring Gen. Oswaldo Muniz Oliva, the document takes as its starting point Brazil's status as the tenth-largest economy in the world, the fifth-largest country in terms of territory, and its enormous potential to achieve "a new economic level" based on returning to its "historic trajectory of growth on the order of 7% of GNP per year."

But, beyond its economic proposals, the ESG document states the Army's readiness to declare a "state of war" in defense of the Amazon basin area, defying the superpowers and their agents who are devising ways to impose *limited sovereignty* on Brazil, grabbing the region under the guise of "defending the environment," preventing "excessive population growth," or saving "indigenous peoples."

In effect, Brazil's Army says that continued preying on the Amazon would be seen as the moral equivalent of the U.S. invasion of Panama. The Amazon "continues to be a target of international avarice, which wears several layers of sheepskin to hide its wolfish intentions," *Vital Decade* asserts, and compares ecologist pressures to contraband and the drug trade, since together they represent obstacles to "the integration of the Amazon into the nucleus of Brazilian national power." It also identifies the power-sharing deals struck by the two superpowers which intend to 'freeze' nations like Brazil in a status of permanent underdevelopment, denied access to advanced technology or scientific capabilities.

No 'easing of tensions' in sight

Vital Decade asserts that national sovereignty will not be preserved, nor pressures concerning the Amazon and Brazilian technological development reduced, through any negotiations with this superpower condominium. It emphasizes that "there is no indication . . . that the easing of East-West tensions will have as its immediate consequences, the democratization of the world political or economic order." The weakest countries, it reports, will have to "continue to fight in order to be heard on matters which directly or indirectly

affect their equally legitimate political or economic interests."

The ESG document identifies the ongoing efforts of this world condominium as a continuation of Henry Kissinger's 1970s policies, with his "pentagramic" vision which saw a new world economic order based on the "five power centers": the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Japan, and Western Europe. The document also charges that the condominium is linked conceptually "to modes of European thought from the first decades of the 19th century"—i.e., the Congress of Vienna and the Holy Alliance.

The document is a strategic broadside against the pagan, international ecology movement led by Britain's Prince Philip and Prince Charles, and backed by circles in Washington and Moscow, who constitute the leading edge of the oligarchy's assault on Christianity, as well as Western culture and industry today. The ESG document, which has circulated privately inside Brazil, was leaked to the media as a means of expressing the widespread discontent of the Armed Forces and other state sectors with President Collor de Mello's willingness to accept the naming of cultist Jose Lutzemberger to the newly created Environment Department, and of Jose Goldemberg to the Science and Technology Department. Reliable sources told *EIR* that these appointments were proposed first by Prince Charles, and second by the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Nervous reaction from London

The document's discussion of the Amazon has unnerved some members of the international oligarchy. An article signed by one Jan Rocha in the May 30 issue of the *London Guardian* ridiculed *Vital Decade's* opposition to ecologism and the way the report equates certain non-governmental organizations with drug traffickers, seeing them as a threat to the Amazon, against whom "the extreme recourse to war" will be waged.

On the other side, an editorial in the May 1990 issue of *Ombro a Ombro*, the newspaper of Brazil's retired Army officers, suggests that *Vital Decade* could become the body of principles for a national movement capable of transforming Brazil into a world power (see *Documentation*), and recalls Pope John Paul II's rejection of liberal capitalism and Marxist collectivism in his encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*.

'No to U.S.-Soviet supersovereignty'

Below are excerpts from a chapter entitled "Policies and Strategies for the Amazon," from Brazil's Superior War College policy study, Vital Decade. Subheadings have been added by the editors.

Impediments are all varieties of obstacles which impede or make it difficult to win and maintain our National Objectives. They could be adverse or antagonistic factors. The former are derived from challenges generally derived from actions or manifestations of deliberate and challenging postures, of volitional origin, which counterposes itself to the conquest and preserving of Permanent National Objectives (PNO).

If the *antagonism* has power—that is, if deliberate will to go against the national community's efforts also has some capacity to obtain effects by any means (force, threats, ruses) which impede the conquest and preservation of the PNO—this antagonism is called *pressure*.

Pressures can be *direct* or *indirect*; they can appear manifest or latent, and thus mean *potential* or *actual danger*. It follows that pressures are antagonisms in which the will to challenge appears with the capability to go against the winning and preservation of the PNO.

Overcoming dominant pressures *requires special measures*, outside the bounds of normal national life. Because of them, the state could go to *the extreme of resorting to war*, once its efforts to eliminate them or reduce them by other means proved fruitless. . . .

The eco-fascist threat

The following impediments are identified as pressures:

Contraband brings a decrease in state authority where it takes place, as well as negating the entry of customs revenues into the vaults of the National Treasury.

Narcotics trafficking is the natural partner of a state of non-compliance of the law and of corruption of those authorities who accept it or tolerate it either of on their own will or under coercion from the armed power of the narcotics traffickers, who impose their law in the places in which drugs are grown, processed, and traded. If it is partners with guerrillas in insurrection against the government and internation-

ally linked with bordering countries and others, the impediment becomes much worse, since its power grows.

Self-government in Indian areas. This is a permanent foreign attempt to internationalize parts of the Amazon, beginning with the Indian enclaves, utilized by the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) as spearheads in the discussion of Amazon questions, certainly with at least the acquiescence of the governments of the central or almost central countries of the ideological-patrimonial area of the United States of America, Europe, and Japan, where these organizations are headquartered. There is a certain amount of support from the national press and part of the national artistic and intellectual area, as well as from sectors of the Church and from multinational companies for these NGO complaints which, minimally, are very useful in strengthening the impediment and injury to Brazil's interests.

Conservationist activism. This general idea groups together varied individuals and sectors of national and international society around international ecological or conservationist movements generally engendered by Non-Governmental Organizations, which are echoed in the intellectuality and the faddism of Brazil's opinion-makers. There is a natural mixing of interests, in which the purity and innocence of certain idealists is taken advantage of in order to keep dormant the Brazilian Amazon's potential. The psycho-social corrosion caused by this pressure directly contributes to reducing the country's freedom of action in dealing with Amazon problems, since there exists a conservationist idea that resources are almost untouchable, arguing that Amazonian flora and fauna would otherwise be irreversibly damaged. It is clear that if this pressure were allowed to grow, it would rapidly become a dominant pressure *capable of threatening Permanent National Objectives* which must be protected.

The following impediments are identified as *dominant pressures*:

The plot to steal the Amazon basin

1) *Denationalization of what is Brazilian* attacks the permanent national objectives (PNO), national integration, sovereignty, and thus, indirectly, the integrity of the national patrimony. There is a diffuse international movement which cannot *a priori* be attributed to orchestration or conspiracy by the already-developed countries, but which produces results as if this were the case, promoting the idea of internationalizing the Amazon, beginning by creating areas where its current inhabitants would no longer be subject to the Brazilian state's control and action, and would be denationalized as citizens of the fatherland, as a first step toward the acceptance of "areas politically liberated" from Brazil with international support, including that derived from deliberate initial actions by the NGOs. If such *political beachheads* were allowed to be established, their elimination would demand a huge Brazilian effort, *probably having to resort to war*. . . .

2) *Radical preservation of Indian cultures, accepting*

their incrustation in the national territory. This pressure is quite similar to the pressure of the previously discussed conservationist activism and could produce similarly perverse effects by means of applied anthropology, where the intent is for international interests to prevail over the permanent national objectives of national integration, sovereignty, and progress. Starting with the anthropological incrustations, which international pressures are trying to impose on the country, it would later be possible to impose global sanctions on Brazil, with backing from an international legal system which would deem the country a non-preserver of "Indian groups threatened with extinction." These external actions would perturb the PNO of social peace, would tend to negate our sovereignty; to eliminate them, it may be necessary to accept the evolution of the conflictive question into a state of war.

Against U.S.-Soviet 'co-presidency'

From the chapter entitled "Brazilian Foreign Policy for the 1990s":

Brazil is a rising power. To the degree that Brazil grows, conflicts of interest appear on the international level. . . . They are precise indicators of our expansion, of the changes in our political and economic structures, of recognition of what we already represent in the concert of nations and of the broadening of our participation in international relations. . . .

The understanding between the two superpowers, in everything considered to be of extreme importance . . . was known conceptually in the decade of the 1970s, as "co-presidency"—an allusion to the superpowers' singular co-rule of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva, representing a tendency by the superpowers to establish between themselves a process of conciliation, of partitioning spheres of influence to ease their own conflicts. . . .

Nonetheless, no one should commit the serious mistake of falsely concluding that the basic conflict of interest between the two superpowers has somehow disappeared, replaced by a legitimate, continuous, and lasting understanding. . . . It is not by this path that true peace will be achieved. At best, a provisional immobilization of naturally antagonistic forces will be arrived at.

It would be foolish to believe this "power freeze" seeks to antagonize those countries which attempt to break the chains of economic dependency and develop themselves. But in practice, the result is the same, and it is not in our interest, especially because it is not limited to the visible expression of power (military force), but extends to less apparent, but no less important areas, such as trade and economic relations in general. Thus, it is necessary to persist in seeking to transform international structures, to change the terms of international trade, which always favor the developed countries to the detriment of the weakest, and especially to alter world distribution of scientific and technological progress. . . .

Third World needs advanced technology

With the accelerated development of technology and its effects on the organization of the international system, the strengthening of each country's position in the concert of nations would be increasingly conditioned by its capacity to generate, absorb, develop, and apply new and advanced technologies, leaving on the sidelines those who are unable to participate in the process. . . . This is useless for Brazil, and we reject any effort, on any pretext, to freeze our condition of inferiority, at restoring spheres of influence and of imposing one country's or a group of countries' political will on others. And the battlefield of this struggle will have to be carried to antagonistic positions. . . .

Brazil's international duty is to fight for the withdrawal of all external factors susceptible to impeding the free and unobstructed expansion of its national power. "Interdependence" is a valid and legitimate objective for the evolution of international relations, but, to be real and effective and not merely a disguised modality of *dependency*, it presupposes a prior epoch of independence and sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty cannot be declared obsolete before it is fully affirmed in the political and economic spheres. The big nuclear powers can obviously allow themselves the luxury of making semantic concessions on the issue of sovereignty and become champions of such "interdependence." . . .

What we cannot accept is that the superpowers arrogate to themselves a "supersovereignty" at the same time as they tell the remaining countries resolutely embarked on the road to "independence" that they should switch to "interdependence."

There are two other specific points showing a tendency toward a "freeze":

1) the insistence on the need to recognize international responsibility in *environmental conservation*, with possible limitations on *the sovereign right* to rational and ecologically

'From the prison in which the politician's career expires, the influence of the statesman is raised toward the summits of his life's providential course. Since Solon, the Socratic method has become the mark of the great Western statesman. Without the reemergence of that leadership, our imperiled civilization will not survive this century's waning years.'

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

IN DEFENSE OF COMMON SENSE by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Available for \$5 from:
Ben Franklin Booksellers, 27 S. King St., Leesburg, Va.
22075. Telephone (703) 777-3661.

Postage & Shipping: U.S. Mail: \$1.50 + \$.50 each additional book.
UPS: \$3 + \$1 each additional book.

balanced exploration and use of natural resources; and

2) an excessive emphasis on the dangers of *the population explosion*, which [supposedly] poses risks and dangers as great as the atomic bomb. Brazil's point is that the environment must be saved by action—not inaction or inertia—and there is no reason for certain areas to be reserved as “green areas” under some sort of universal “zoning,” as though there were a scientific basis to “lungs of humanity” demagoguery. . . .

Brazil also insists on preserving total and unrestricted freedom to establish its own *population policy*, on whatever basis it considers proper and adequate for its development needs and in order to effectively occupy its immense territory. In all these matters, Brazil prefers to preserve the broadest

freedom to discuss and to act, as the adult and responsible country it is, without accepting norms or precepts imposed by countries or groups of countries or by supernational organs or entities.

The world powers appear to be contemplating a new neocolonialist and protective world order based on and organized around power centers; they show a tendency to circumscribe consideration of solutions to international problems to an ever-smaller circle of interlocutors, whose will will be imposed on that of other nations. This “policy of freezing of the structures of world power” cannot be ours in the current stage of our development, when we still have so much uncharted territory ahead of us.

‘Vital decade’ is outline for Pope John Paul II’s ‘third way’

Following are excerpts from the May 1990 Ombro a Ombro, a journal published by Brazil’s retired Army officers. The article appeared under the headline “‘Vital Decade:’ The Third Way.”

The bankruptcy of the communist regimes and the failure of the liberal wave makes the order of the day the search for a *third way* which reconciles economic development with the principles of the common good and social justice, values inherent to our Western Christian culture. The past decade especially has brought to light how Marxist collectivism and savage liberal capitalism sustain themselves through constant violation of the inalienable rights of man, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—rights which were not granted to man by other men, but by God.

The proposal for this *third way* is supported by the words of Pope John Paul II—the true promoter of the revolutions in the East—in his encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, where he characterizes Marxist collectivism and liberal capitalism as part of the “structures of sin,” given that both systems, due to a desire either for power or money, negate any moral objective such as love of God or one’s brother, in favor of political or ideological interests, advocating utopias which are very quickly discovered to be profoundly cruel. Even more dangerous is the fact that these two hegemonies intend to maintain their domination through the artifice of a condominium of power, to which Brazil cannot submit.

We quote John Paul II’s words just at the moment when the document *1990-2000: The Vital Decade*, a study by the Superior War College (ESG), has come to light . . . providing Brazilians with a body of principles capable of guaranteeing the restarting of our growth. . . .

The ESG document states: “In the historical period just ended, two synthesis-values must be emphasized, the common good and social justice, as beacons to illuminate the entire decision-making process. . . . Greater equality cannot be obtained by sacrificing freedom, nor is freedom preserved within extreme inequality. There are two extremes, then, to be avoided: the perverse utopia of socialist paradise, and the inequity of savage capitalism. Rather, it is possible and necessary to find, dynamically, in growth, the path to social justice . . . and, in the spirit of modern *social capitalism*, promote the conciliation of freedom with equality of opportunity.” . . .

Vital Decade emphasizes: “It is therefore necessary to seek, in our national organization, *the conciliation of efficiency, freedom, and equality*, which translate into growth, pluralism, and equity—or, in other words, in development with social justice. . . . And in Brazil, the state came before society. We were a state before becoming a nation. We were an empire before becoming a people. For years now, we have been a republic but we do not yet have a democracy. . . .

This study, available to those who, on the various political and administrative levels are responsible for determining Brazil’s future, could become the body of principles for a national movement which guarantees the emergence of our country as a power capable of occupying the place it deserves in the concert of nations. It was written by those who recognize that:

“The 19th century was Great Britain’s; the 20th century belonged to the United States; and we firmly believe that the 21st century will belong to the great nation of the tropics—*Brazil*.”