

Swift called them “yahoos”; we call them populists.

I explain that as my concluding argument.

The crucial systemic issue of government, is leadership. Good government is built as a great scientist is developed, through the development and refinement of cognitive powers of decision-making. The depraved person, such as the populist, argues that a minimum of good government is the best choice, something close to the anarchy which every feral beast prefers. The populist insists, with the slyness of a predatory fox eyeing the chicken coop, that it is “interference” with his feral whims, by government, which is the chief evil to be opposed. Purely and simply, his essential principle is that he is opposed to rule by reason.

Perhaps the most efficient short illustration of that point, is a reflection on the fact, that much of the leading argument in Adam Smith’s British East India Company polemic against the North American independence movement of that time, his *Wealth of Nations*, was plagiarized from the work of Physiocratic followers of the notorious Dr. François Quesnay. Quesnay states rather precisely the true motives for Smith’s term “free trade.” Quesnay called it *laissez-faire*. Quesnay’s argument was, that since the serfs of the feudal state are merely human cattle, it would be indecent to suggest that they produce anything more than the food and clothing needed to keep them either in the field, or breeding as much of their type of livestock as future pleasure of the landlord might require. *Therefore*, Quesnay’s argument runs, since the landlord does not actually produce anything useful, the profit of the estate must come solely from the magical powers inhering in the aristocratic title to that estate!

The same argument is sometimes met as the anti-semitic libel, that “Jews secrete money” as cows secrete milk. The same argument is that of the Cathars, known in English slang as “the buggers,” that it is “the elect” who are favored by those little green men under the floorboards, who influence the dice to make some men rich, and others poor. In the lexicon of the fascist U.S. Justice Antonin Scalia, that same traditionally gnostic dogma bears the name of “shareholder value.”

Contrary to the “bugger”-like logic of the Mont Pelerin Society’s and American Enterprise Institute’s gnostic priesthood, the effectiveness of individual private enterprise lies in the fostering of scientific and technological progress, the development and maintenance of basic public economic infrastructure, and imposing rationality through the regulation of trade. It is to this that the feral Physiocrat and other populist fanatics object.

The implication of populism is, that by denying the existence of the good, the better, and the best in human behavior, as either individuals, or societies, they not only denying the existence of that which distinguishes man from ape, but are insisting that, were such qualities to appear, provision must be made in advance to stamp them out. That is why they often seem to be crocodiles.

## Brazil, Mexico Deluded By ‘New Atlanticism’

by Silvia Palacios and Lorenzo Carrasco

Following the attacks in the United States on Sept. 11, and with the collapse of the world financial system as backdrop, the Anglo-American oligarchy’s policy-making centers have raised the idea that a “new Atlanticism” is required to pull Brazil and Mexico into their utopian plans for a “new imperialism,” to be erected over the ashes of the world’s nation-states. These two nations are promised a brilliant role in the world, in exchange for abdicating whatever remnants of political or economic sovereignty and independence they have managed to retain, while submitting to the “rule of global law,” a synonym for world government. This was made public by Dr. Dennis MacShane, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs and the British Commonwealth responsible for British policy for Latin America, during a Feb. 13 conference at London’s Chatham House, home base for the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Also speaking for this “new Atlanticism” was Inter-American Dialogue President Peter Hakim, in the pages of *Foreign Affairs*, house organ of the New York Council on Foreign Affairs, the U.S. counterpart of England’s Chatham House, in its first quarter 2002 edition.

At the Chatham House conference, MacShane explained that there exists a “renewed interest in foreign policy and international relations” that is leading to what he called “the rule of global law.” “Above all, the post-Sept. 11 world has to accept two key principles,” he said. “First, the need for post-national cooperation, whether through the United Nations, regionally in groupings like the European Union [EU], or in different bi-, tri-, or multilateral coalitions, to tackle [former Yugoslav President Slobodan] Milosevic or the Taliban, or to promote peaceful economic or political development. There is a new Atlanticist triangulation between the United States, Europe, and leading Latin American nations like Brazil and Mexico, with the latter seeking to join fully the top table of international decision-making. But this will also mean accepting international security and peace-keeping obligations.”

“Second,” MacShane continued, “there is a growing acceptance that international rule of law must have primacy. China has joined the WTO [World Trade Organization], thus embracing the rule of law in the commercial field. The EU represents the boldest experiment in sharing sovereignty to



*Mexico's President Vicente Fox's act as a "North American President," a junior Bush, assumed that Mexican nationalism was asleep. But the Congress woke up on April 9 and forbade Fox to travel to the United States, showing the popular anger over Mexico's economy. No Mexican Congress has ever used this power before.*

create post-national rule of law across a range of areas, long jealously guarded as national prerogatives. The creation of the International Criminal Court, the successful work to convert Kyoto [the environmental protocol] into global law, and other UN-sponsored measures, all are gently nudging the world in the direction of post-national rule of law necessary to allow nations to grow together. . . . I estimate the developed world has about two generations—say four decades—to get in place effective systems of global rules of law.”

### **The World Social Forum and Social Imperialism**

The other face of the “rule of international law” is, for MacShane, the World Social Forum (WSF), which has been exposed in *EIR* as an “anti-globlist” insurrectionary front for the globalizers. “The moral purpose that brought 50,000 people to Pôrto Alegre [Brazil] earlier this month to discuss how the world economy can be made to work for the poor, should not be dismissed or scorned,” he said. That new foreign policy has to respond to two questions simultaneously—“how can there be development and security”—and the answer is to be sought in combining “Adam Smith with William Wilberforce.”

Wilberforce was a member of the British royal caste, founder in 1787 of Anti-Slavery International (ASI), supposedly dedicated to promoting the cause of abolition. Today, the organization has on its board of directors important members of the British nobility, such as the Buxton family, which helped to found Prince Philip’s World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). The ASI promotes various insurrectionary movements of the “global” era, among them the Landless Movement (MST) of Brazil.

The WSF ties in, in that it states that it wants to continue with globalist economics, but with some “social” or “philanthropic” modifications. Thus, in its second meeting in Pôrto Alegre, the WSF declared itself “solidary globalists.” And so the WSF agitates for certain social reforms of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, but continues in its efforts to put an end to sovereignty.

In this sense, the WSF has begun to address security issues, as with its “Manifesto for a World Without War,” in which it proposes that a “democratized” UN Security Council be the supranational entity responsible for intervening in conflicts, ranging from Chiapas, Mexico, to Colombia, to Palestine.

This idea of incorporating the WSF into a new scheme of world government was also expressed by special adviser on terrorism for the British government of Tony Blair, Robert Cooper. Known as the “prophet of new imperialism,” Cooper has respectfully referred to *Empire*, a book by Italian terrorist Antonio Negri, as the bible of the WSF.

### **Seductive Diplomacy Toward Brazil**

Behind the seductive proposals that Brazil form part of this “new Atlanticism,” is the growing concern of the Anglo-American oligarchy over Brazil’s resistance to joining the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), which is the condition *sine qua non* of the Atlanticist proposal. Brazil has launched several initiatives for building a South American economic bloc that would allow for independent economic policies and trade relations, especially with the highly populated principal nations of Asia, which see South America as a potentially secure food source. This independent perspective first surfaced at the South American Presidential summit, in Brasilia in August-September 2000, when Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori surprised many with his call for the creation of a United States of South America.

More recently, Brazil’s Foreign Ministry, Itamaraty, undertook an initiative to promote integration among Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, and to expand it still further toward Venezuela and Colombia, which could eventually become a “Merconorte” and join with an expanded Mercosur, thereby giving shape to a fully integrated South America. The key missing element in this project would be Mexico. This is a key step, and one which the globalists fear, because it would constitute the central axis of Ibero-American integration, which would give more economic and political force to the initiative. At the same time, diplomatic and trade agreements with Russia, China, and India have intensified, which could provide Brazil, in particular, with state-of-the-art technology, something which the Anglo-American oligarchy has denied them.

The Anglo-American diplomacy of the Wall Street and London banking crowd has been dedicated to sabotaging Brazil’s policy toward Mercosur, specifically to shatter Brazilian-

Argentine relations. This very policy was discussed, for example, at the last annual meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank, in Fortaleza, Brazil. ABN Amro Securities Managing Director Arturo Porzecanski summarized this message to Brazil succinctly: “The option is between playing in the third division, with Mercosur, or in the first, with the United States or Europe. Either one remains forever lamenting that the world is unjust, or one joins the club.”

It is perhaps true that if Brazil were to abandon Mercosur and join FTAA, it would gain a bit more time and money, at least in the short term. But its role as diplomatic leader of South America would crumble, causing its own isolation, and paving the way for the moment in which the oligarchy would treat it to the humiliations which Argentina is suffering today.

To control Brazil on the issue of free trade was also the intent of U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick, during a March 13 speech to the American Chamber of Commerce in São Paulo. Visibly uncomfortable about the protectionist policy on steel taken by his own government, which he opposes, he suggested that the United States and Brazil forge a new alliance based on free trade and democracy. In Kissingerian style, Zoellick stated that this alliance would be based on the historic ties that were forged in the early 20th Century by Teddy Roosevelt’s Anglophile Secretary of State Elihu Root, and by his equally Anglophile contemporary, Brazilian Foreign Minister Baron de Rio Branco.

### **Sovereignty, But Not as a Museum Artifact**

Another policy shaper of the Anglo-American oligarchy, Inter-American Dialogue President Hakim of Washington, D.C., joined the debate through a commentary in the Spring 2002 Spanish edition of *Foreign Affairs*. Entitled “The Different Paths of Mexico and Brazil,” Hakim writes that “for the first time in their history, the two Latin American giants, Brazil and Mexico, aspire to play significant international roles. It is nonetheless notable how different are the two paths that each has chosen for achieving that goal. Mexico has joined its destiny to the United States. Brazil, on the other hand, maintains a relatively closed internal economy and is trying to develop an independent leadership in South America, and on certain questions, the U.S. sees it as an opponent.”

In comparing the two countries, Hakim lauds the Mexican government, but demands that it give the *coup de grâce* to sovereignty. “President [Vicente] Fox and his foreign minister Jorge Castañeda have undertaken a new international role for their country. Mexico has become a promoter of human rights and democracy, issues from which [Mexico] had previously kept its distance because of its historic veneration of national sovereignty.”

Hakim’s euphoria over Castañeda’s foreign policy is understandable. Castañeda was trained at Princeton and the University of Paris, and was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley prior to being named foreign minister. He

also serves as an intersection point between Washington’s Inter-American Dialogue and the World Social Forum. His project is to surrender Mexican sovereignty to the new imperialism. His poor colonized mind cannot express an original idea. When his mouth opens, it is only to adjust his native language to the dictates of power of the venerated.

Not in agreement with Mexico’s economic surrender to the United States, as consecrated in the North American Free Trade Agreement, Castañeda is now preparing to create permanent institutions, as he stated on Feb. 24 to the Mexican newspaper *Reforma*: “We seek to encourage a new combination of permanent institutions in North America, that will allow for the free movement of capital, goods, services, and people, and to create permanent institutions that can regulate this process of integration among the three countries.” For this, he asks that “that notion of sovereignty be brought up to date. . . . We are convinced that in its own interest, Mexico should adapt to the new international system which is emerging, based on rules and norms of universal jurisdiction, and for that reason, we support the argument that certain principles are universal and applicable over and above state sovereignty.”

To bring this colonial mandate to fruition, it is necessary—as Castañeda demands—that neither the Mexican Congress nor the country as a whole dare conduct an historic debate over the sovereignty question. Nothing that could inspire an upsurge of nationalism is permitted, and so a kind of Orwellian amnesia has set in, compatible with the words of MacShane who, in the height of cynicism, stated that the “rule of international law” is being gently applied. This is the “fascism with a democratic face” of the New Atlanticists.

### **Military Annexation of Mexico**

Although such formulations would appear absurd—that is, “utopian”—to any rational person, this is no mere word-play from the likes of MacShane, but a policy in the process of being carried out. In the case of Mexico, redefinitions of crucial security matters are being formulated, among other places, by that U.S. center of strategy design, the Brookings Institution. Its vice president, James B. Steinberg, was recently in Mexico to propose the creation of a joint Mexico-U.S.-Canada military command, a “Northcom.” At a conference at the Universidad de las Américas in Puebla, Mexico, entitled “After Sept. 11,” Steinberg explained: “The Bush government is pondering the creation of a super security agency and North American military command, with theaters of operation based in Canada, the U.S., and Mexico. In the near future, decisions will be made in this regard, and will lead to a Northern Command, or Northcom.”

As MacShane indicated, countries will have to adapt their domestic policy to their foreign policy, making whatever changes are necessary—in other words, sovereignty is to become a thing of the past.