
Brazil

Haig loses the U.S. a traditional ally

by Mark Sonnenblick

The Reagan administration's overt support for Britain's economic and military warfare against Argentina has cost the United States the loss of one of its stronger allies in South America: Brazil.

That message was conveyed to President Ronald Reagan by visiting Brazilian President João Figueiredo during their two-hour meeting in Washington on May 12, according to Rio de Janeiro's *O Globo*. General Figueiredo's visit had been arranged to patch up the smoldering resentments between the two countries ignited by Jimmy Carter's 1977 crusade against Brazil's nuclear energy program and so-called human rights policies. "If the Carter administration began the deterioration of U.S.-Brazilian military relations, the Reagan administration has accelerated it," concluded the Rio daily *Jornal do Brasil*, May 9.

This belies the State Department's assurances that Brazil's lack of enthusiasm for Argentina's seizure of the Malvinas meant Washington could support the British without harming our relations with Brazil.

For most of the past 80 years, Brazil has been "automatically aligned" with the United States—for better or for worse. In 1902, the Morgan banking family and other British holders of Brazil's debt arranged for the "special relationship" Brazil had had with London to be transferred to Teddy Roosevelt's Washington. President Figueiredo fought with the heroic Brazilian Expeditionary Force which took Monte Cassino in Italy during World War II, while the Brazilian and U.S. navies jointly secured the South Atlantic trade routes. "We Brazilians pulled President Lyndon Johnson's chestnuts out of the fire," a Brazilian commander of the Inter-American Peace Force, which took the brunt of the ill-advised 1965 Santo Domingo invasion, confided in a recent interview.

If the Brazilians were annoyed by Carter's antics in 1977, they now feel betrayed by what Secretary of State Alexander Haig has done in the service of England. "The United States must no longer be seen as our traditional ally," *Jornal* quotes an army officer, "since instead of taking a neutral position in this specific case [the Malvinas crisis], the United States showed the Latin American countries that its alliance with NATO is stronger and more important to it than that of TIAR," the Inter-

American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, or Rio Treaty, which pledges all American republics to defend the Americas from outside aggression.

No more automatic alignment

No one has expressed Brazil's anger over the U.S. "treason" toward hemispheric defense obligations more starkly than the chief of the air force, Brigadier Délio Jardim de Mattos. In his "Orders of the Day" to the troops on the May 8 anniversary of the allied victory over Nazism in Europe, Jardim de Mattos alluded to Haig's shredding of TIAR, other treaty commitments, and the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. He denounced "'automatic alignments,' which are as insecure and deceiving as the times have shown us; . . . history teaches us that the expression 'traditional allies' is a mere rhetorical figure." (See page 38.)

What makes the air force chief's analysis particularly striking is that he is a leader of the pro-American tendency within the Brazilian military which has historically argued that Brazil's military, economic, and political interests could best be served through close harmony with the United States. President Figueiredo shares that pro-American orientation.

Jardim drew the logical conclusion from Haig's acts, which is that staunchly pro-Western Brazil could no longer count on its "traditional ally" to defend it from hostile powers among the developed Western countries. Therefore, he told *Jornal do Brasil* May 9, Brazil was reformulating its entire national defense strategy, to prepare to defend itself without U.S. support. The navy is demanding \$15 billion over 10 years for long-delayed modernization. This newly-credible requirement wreaks havoc with Brazil's already austere spending plans.

The State Department crassly tried to take advantage of the problem it had created by sending Deputy Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci down to Brazil April 26 on what one American expert called "a fool's errand." Carlucci offered Brazil the \$300 million financing needed to build a naval air station on Trinidad Island to guard Brazil's major trade routes. In return, Carlucci begged Brazil to take over the surrogate role in Central American counterinsurgency the Argentines had played for an ungrateful Washington. A prominent member of the Brazilian military elite informed *EIR*: "Not for \$300 million, nor for any price will we get involved in Central America. Carlucci was told so." The Brazil-U.S. military aid agreement Brazil abrogated in 1977 will not be restored.

A leading member of the Brazilian Army High Command lamented to *EIR* Latin America Editor Dennis Small during a late April meeting in Brasilia, "We have been trying to get the message through to the United States that we want to be your allies, but you act like you don't care. No one is listening."

A Brazilian comment on the Malvinas crisis

In an April 27 repartée with the press, Brazil's Air Force Minister, Brigadier Délio Jardim de Mattos answered a question on if the South Atlantic situation required Brazil to reinforce its military power by retorting, "A country can only be militarily rich when it is economically strong. We have always thought we should be powerful, but we are sacrificing ourselves to have the maximum of development with the minimum of security."

In the following "Orders of the Day" on the anniversary of V-E Day, Jardim de Mattos responded to General Haig's abandonment of hemispheric defense commitments. It was read to all the troops and printed in Folha de São Paulo May 8:

Comte de Chambrun rejects Anglo-American arguments

The following letter was sent May 6 by Comte Charles de Chambrun to a prominent American political figure. Comte de Chambrun is a descendent of the Marquis de Lafayette and a former minister of Charles de Gaulle. The letter was made available for publication in EIR.

Dear Sir:

Looking from France, and as a man who knows Latin America very well, as you do yourself, I would say that this Falkland business is a dramatic one for the American continents.

I think we should go back to President Monroe's invitation to my ancestor Lafayette to tour the United States. The obvious reason at that time was to help John Quincy Adams's election to the presidency. The real reason was Monroe's desire to have a president after him who was capable of enforcing the realities of the Monroe Doctrine against British imperialism.

This, by the way, helped the wars of liberation of

More important than the seriousness of the text of a treaty is the seriousness of the men who sign it; true alliances are forged in reciprocity of interests, common threats, shared risks, and similar concrete problems. History teaches us that the expression "traditional allies" is a mere rhetorical figure, capable of enchanting conference tables, but lacking any practical significance, especially when in reference to nations from different worlds.

Except in very special cases, alliances require equilibrium of economic or political power between the parties, since otherwise they would be nothing more than "automatic alignments," insecure and deceptive as the times have told us.

Today we commemorate with the pride of a participant, the day of Allied victory over Nazi fascism.

Though not wanting to deny the importance of that victory, the mark of a worldwide struggle against oppression and tyranny, I find myself frustrated in seeing how distant we are from the peace we fought to win, and not merely to live. What has changed is merely the combat fronts, the forms of pressure, the commitments and the motivations; but egoism, insensitivity, lack of trust, treason, and fear are still the sad realities of this end of the century. . . . That good sense will prevail is our hope.

General Bolivar, who was Lafayette's friend, and is written history to all Spanish-speaking countries of the South American continent. This is why, even though there has obviously been economic over-exploitation in the past of South America by North American interests, the sentiment prevailed of American solidarity and fraternity, in a way as a rival to European and especially British imperialism.

We all know that imperialism never dies. Look at Russia, look at the recent headlines in the English newspapers, look at French reverence for Napoleon. I think it is folly, whatever strategic or other reasons may exist, for America to take sides in the name of Anglo-Saxon solidarity. This is an English concept, but in no way should be American.

Russia is going to exploit this blunder to the hilt. Maybe today will mark the real start of the third world war, fought in a different way probably, but very destructive to our way of life.

Spain will not get into NATO now; at this stage the Russian aim in encouraging [Argentine President] Galtieri's move is crowned with success. For the time being they are still taken aback by the opportunities handed to them, which they had obviously not foreseen.

I do not know how Washington can reestablish its position in the Spanish-speaking countries, but it should try to quickly mend fences.

My best,

Charles, le Comte de Chambrun