

Brazilians Denounce Iraq Occupation As Threat to Sovereignty of Nations

by Lorenzo Carrasco

While the Brazilian government has demonstrated excessive caution in its condemnation of the barbarous Anglo-American occupation of Iraq, out of concern over the very likely economic reprisals which the country would suffer were the government to express its view honestly, differing political and diplomatic circles in Brazil have repudiated that occupation with unprecedented vehemence.

The Brazilian elite is concerned not only about the Iraq War's implications for world affairs, but also that the chicken-hawks who architected that war have parallel designs upon Ibero-America. These are promoted under the doctrine that re-establishing "effective sovereignty" over the "ungoverned areas" of the region requires supranational action, as stated explicitly by U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld during the November 2002 Fifth Defense Ministerial of the Americas, in Santiago, Chile.

The lead editorial in *Folha de São Paulo* on April 15 typifies the view of leading Brazilian circles. "No one will be safe . . . until Bush and his 'hawks' leave the White House," Brazil's most influential newspaper warned, in commenting upon the Bush Administration's threats to continue war with an attack on Syria. "Washington's 'hawks' have already proven that they will not be stopped by instruments such as diplomacy or international public opinion." Strictly speaking, there is no legal impediment that prohibits Syria from giving asylum to members of Saddam Hussein's government, nor to [its] possessing chemical weapons, as Syria is not a signatory to the convention against chemical weapons, the paper pointed out. But, "the United States has already run over international law in the case of Iraq, and there is no reason to believe that Law will stop them now or in the future. Washington appears to have decided to exercise its imperial calling."

Even more harsh was the article by Ambassador Rubens Ricupero, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), published in *Folha de São Paulo* on April 14. This top Brazilian diplomat compared the ravings of the chicken-hawks in power in Washington, to Mussolini's and Hitler's attacks on the League of Nations:

"To reject the reforms which would make the United Nations Organization effective, and at the same time scorn it because this rejection condemns it to irrelevance, is to repeat

the ill-fated farce of those who buried the League of Nations. One of those masters of cynicism and hypocrisy described the League as an 'academic organization, without life or importance,' adding that he did not believe 'in either the possibility or the usefulness of perpetual peace . . . , rejecting pacificism, which hides flight in the face of struggle, and cowardice in the face of sacrifice, [because] only war brings all the human energies to their point of maximum tension, and places the mark of nobility upon the peoples which have the courage to confront it.' Another of these unfortunate figures stated that peace would not be 'assured by waving olive branches, with tears in the eyes, by whining pacifists, but by the victorious sword of a people made up of gentlemen who put the entire world at the service of a superior civilization.'

"Does this sound familiar in spirit to recent statements?" Ricupero wrote. "The first quote is from one Benito Mussolini in his leading work, *Il Fascismo*. The second is from Adolf Hitler, in *Mein Kampf*."

Eurasian Land-Bridge the Target

A harsh warning was also sounded on the floor of the Chamber of Deputies in Brasilia on April 11, by Congressman Irapuan Teixeira, from Congressman Dr. Enéas Carneiro's Party for the Rebuilding of National Order (PRONA). Teixeira condemned the "the unilateral war which the George W. Bush government, captive of a group of neo-fascist ideologues coordinated by Vice President Dick Cheney, launched against Iraq."

What distinguished Congressman Teixeira's discussion of the war, however, was his precise identification of what drives the war party: to prevent the emergence of a global economic system that could replace the current financial system, which, the Congressman stressed, is now in its death throes. Teixeira told his fellow Congressmen that these neo-fascists seek nothing less than to unleash a Clash of Civilizations and "perpetual



Rubens Ricupero

war,” in order to destroy the great Eurasian Land-Bridge project which could provide the basis for world recovery.

Congressman Teixeira’s speech (see box), clearly drew upon the pamphlet published by the Brazilian branch of Lyndon LaRouche’s Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA), titled *Imperium Insanum*, which contains several of LaRouche’s analyses of the war. In less than a month, 26,000 copies of the pamphlet have been distributed by networks in every corner of Brazil.

Two weeks before Teixeira spoke, PRONA party head Dr. Enéas had addressed the Chamber of Deputies also, call-

ing upon President Lula da Silva to take the only action by which Brazil might change the current war-driven course of world affairs: Break with the International Monetary Fund system, declare a moratorium on its gigantic foreign debt, unpayable in any case, and ally with China, Russia, India, France, and Germany in the construction of a new economic system. (See *EIR*, April 11, 2003.)

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Fractures

One of the victims of the war against Iraq, is the nuclear weapons non-proliferation policy which the utopians of

Iraq War ‘Aimed Against The Eurasian Land-Bridge’

Speaking to the plenary of the Chamber of Deputies on April 11, Congressman Irapuan Teixeira, of the PRONA party, gave this briefing on the perpetual war strategy of those who launched war against Iraq.

... The Brazilian government did nothing at all against the unilateral war which the George W. Bush government, captive of a group of neo-fascist ideologues coordinated by Vice President Dick Cheney, launched against Iraq. . . . I celebrate the notable growth of the anti-war movement worldwide, even without sharing some of the analyses popular in it, the which disorient an understanding of the real cause of the bellicose obsession of Washington and London.

The war does not represent either the final phase of capitalism, nor a way of bringing about an economic recovery, for the simple reason that the United States no longer has the powerful industrial base upon which President Franklin Roosevelt could implement his famous New Deal and the economic mobilization for World War II, from which the country emerged as the greatest economic power in history.

On the contrary, throughout the last three decades, U.S. industry and economic infrastructure were ruined by the same liberal ideology inherited from Anglo-Dutch colonial practices, whose hegemony transformed the world economy into a speculative financial casino, provoking the systemic crisis which is today in the midst of its final death-rattle.

Similarly, we are not dealing with a simple war for the control of natural resources, such as the oil of the Middle East and the Caucasus, even if it is undeniable that the United States of America and its few allies—or better, only ally—could benefit from it in the short term.

These explanations minimize the global geopolitical interests of the Anglo-Americans and their allies in Israel. The Anglo-American assault against Iraq represents a watershed for all humanity, not only because of its openly unjust and illegitimate nature, but because of its destructive global effect on the very bases of international law and civilized coexistence among nations. The Anglo-American attack on Iraq could soon define a scenario of perpetual war, whose immediate consequence could be a conflict involving a desperate North Korea, and, later, other countries considered rebels—already even named by the Americans—against the imperialist designs of Washington and London.

Thus, the offensive against Iraq and the accusations against the regime of Saddam Hussein were merely pretexts to set in motion a Clash of Civilizations, a state of perpetual war, which would begin against the Islamic peoples, and would extend like a trail of gunpowder along the routes of Eurasian integration.

The destruction of the effort to establish a Eurasian Land-Bridge capable of triggering the urgent process of world economic recovery, is the primary objective of the imperial impulse.

In reality, the attack on Iraq has been planned for more than a decade by a group of supremacist ideologues and policymakers, such as Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Dick Cheney, Lewis Libby, and others who held various posts in the government of Bush’s father, and returned under Bush, Jr. Keeping in mind that we could go on at length analyzing these writings—the which a very intelligent critic, the journalist Lorenzo Carrasco [*EIR*’s correspondent—ed.] has at hand—the ease with which the United States took Iraq, surprises me. . . .

The Brazilian government must be alert not only on domestic, but also foreign policy, in order that we preserve the country for our children and grandchildren. The possibility that Brazil could be invaded as Iraq was, by bellicose governments that had not the least compassion for the people of that country, worries me.

Washington and London have cultivated obsessively since the end of World War II, both as a key instrument of their drive for world government, and as the means to impose “technological apartheid” upon developing nations. The irony of this development, is that one of the arguments used to justify the attack on Iraq was precisely that of blocking possible possession of nuclear weapons by the Baghdad regime. The war against Iraq, however, reopened the discussion in Brazil, over Brazil’s signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1998, under the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso.

The issue came up in last year’s national election campaign, when then-candidate Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva criticized the NPT as discriminatory, during a debate hosted by the Military Club in Rio de Janeiro. Later, Lula’s Minister of Science and Technology, Roberto Amaral, set off a storm when he said, just after assuming his post, that Brazil should again take up nuclear research for military purposes. He was immediately forced to issue a retraction.

Nonetheless, the explosion of the conflict in the Middle East, and the ostensibly different attitude of the Bush Administration toward Iraq and North Korea, have led to a rethinking of the Brazilian non-proliferation policy, as officials consider restructuring, re-equipping, and modernizing Brazil’s Armed Forces, in order to provide them with an effective deterrent capability against any foreign threat.

Sen. Roberto Saturnino Braga raised the issue on the Senate floor on March 26. If the United States’ pushing aside of the United Nations in its unilateral aggression against Iraq be allowed to stand without international sanction, “we would be obliged to rethink our position on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty,” the Senator declared. “If the argument is, that only force matters; if law no longer has any value; if the international bodies are worthless; if it is force and military power which matters; then all countries are obliged to arm themselves, and better their military position in relation to the rest of the countries of the world.” Braga reminded people that he had supported the signing of the NPT in 1998, but “there is no reason to remain . . . as a nation of fools, respecting the NPT, when what is proliferating is the force of arms, the use of brute force, the use of massive aggression on a scale never seen in the history of the world.”

Likewise, on April 6, *Jornal do Commercio* published an interview with the president of the Senate, former President of the Republic José Sarney, in which he said that the whole world is now asking what will happen after George Bush’s war. That war wrecked “the international system which had been built to ensure the coexistence among nations,” the which, for better or worse, was capable of controlling the Cold War for 50 years in the nuclear era. When the Iraq War concludes, we will find ourselves on unknown ground, “where the only thing that exists is the path of force. Everyone is going to want to arm themselves. It will generate a demand for nuclear arms,” Sarney warned.

As the case of North Korea shows, the nuclear arms race has begun again.

The same day, *Folha de Sao Paulo* published an interview with one of the grand old men of Brazil’s missile and aerospace programs, Air Force Brig. Gen. Hugo de Oliveira Piva. Brazil must take up its nuclear program again, even if it does not return specifically to the production of nuclear weapons, Piva said. He was categorical: “He who doesn’t have advanced technology, will become a vassal. He will have to submit to the feudal lord. The more a country advances technologically, the more able it is to make more precise and more powerful weapons. But Brazil is a peaceful country,” he said, and that pacific nature must serve as the guarantee for the international community.

Evidently the reaction in Brazil to the strategy of “preventive wars of aggression” worried Washington officials enough, that Undersecretary of State for Non-Proliferation John Stern Wolf deployed to Brasilia April 14-15, for consultations with the Brazilian government on the NPT’s upcoming fifth-year review. Wolf tried to gild the lily, declaring that “Brazil is the leader amongst developing nations, and in Latin America, an important partner of the United States, which did the right thing in the area of non-proliferation, when it renounced nuclear weapons and restrained the missile program. These were important decisions, which made Brazil into a successful example in the area of non-proliferation, and made the country important in international forums.”

Such propitiatory statements, however, will not allow the United States to change the institutional reaction of Brazil. Wolf seems to have forgotten the grave diplomatic incident provoked by the neo-conservative hitman John Bolton, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Matters, who succeeded in removing José Augusto Bustani as Director General of the United Nations Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in April 2002. Bustani, today Brazil’s Ambassador to London, is one of the principal diplomats responsible for the Brazilian non-proliferation policy so lauded by Wolf.

No to ‘Effective Sovereignty’

Along with this, the principal item in Brazil’s security concerns with the United States, is its opposition to the doctrine of “effective sovereignty” enunciated by Rumsfeld, according to which sovereignty is to be respected only in those areas where a state maintains a physical presence, the which leaves open the possibility of foreign interventions into areas dominated by organized crime, or underpopulated strategic regions of the continent, such as, for example, the Brazilian Amazon. Brazilians are aware, as former Defense Minister Geraldo Quintana told *Gazeta Mercantil* on April 15, that the doctrine of “effective sovereignty . . . is a derivative of the doctrine of preventive attacks followed by the government of George W. Bush.”