

Enéas Carneiro: Brazil Loses a Patriot, The LaRouche Movement a Friend

by Dennis Small and Gretchen Small

Dr. Enéas Carneiro, Brazilian cardiologist and Congressman, died of leukemia on May 6 at the age of 68. Enéas, as he was known since he broke into national prominence in his first run for President of Brazil in 1989, was a fierce patriot and opponent of globalization, and an outspoken friend of the LaRouche movement. In 1998, when interviewed on national television during his third Presidential campaign, he cited the call of “the brilliant economist” LaRouche for a New Bretton Woods, and held up an *EIR*, which attacked George Soros on the cover.

In August 1998, he invited Helga Zepp-LaRouche to join him in speaking in São Paulo, and in June 2002, he organized an invitation for Lyndon LaRouche himself to visit Brazil to receive honorary citizenship from the São Paulo City Council. (Excerpts of Enéas’s remarks on that occasion are printed below.)

Five months later, Enéas was elected to Congress by the greatest number of votes received by any single candidate, before or since (over 1.57 million), in a campaign on which he spent, at most, \$22,000. In his first address on the floor of the Chamber of Deputies, in February 2003, Enéas called on President Lula da Silva to break with the IMF system, “this nauseating and infected model that sucks out the innards of the nation,” and pointed to LaRouche as the man whose ideas could save Brazil, and the world. Enéas explained:

“Fabulous fortunes on the order of \$1-2 trillion circulate daily from one point of the planet to another, by means of computer pulses. Of these, barely some 2-3% correspond to commercial transactions. The rest are *pure speculation*, with no correspondence with the physical world, as has been pointed out by the renowned American economist and thinker Mr. LaRouche, in the weekly *Executive Intelligence Review*. . . . Your Excellency has in your hands an opportunity without equal in the history of Brazil. . . . Order that, by unilateral rupture, no more interest payments will be made on the Public Debt, the which reached 114 billion reals in 2002. . . . Your Excellency will be followed by all the Brazilians who lifted you into your current position.”

Over subsequent months, the media blacked out Dr. Enéas’s speeches from the floor of Congress, despite their

significance. He nonetheless maintained his attacks on the IMF system. On Feb. 18, 2003, he stated that Brazil’s indebtedness “is the central question from which all others flow.” And on Aug. 21, 2003, he asserted that “the only solution is a rupture with the international financial system, but not a trade rupture. What I am proposing is a rupture with the IMF, with the World Bank. . . . Rupture! For that, you have to have courage. Courage which His Excellency, the President of the Republic, has not had. Only in that way can we think of being a free and sovereign nation, that can portend a better future for our children.”

Enéas was a totally unforgettable, unique individual. Perhaps five feet tall, with an enormous black beard, Enéas exploded on the national scene with a 1989 legendary Presidential campaign TV spot of less than a minute, which ended with what became his trademark: “*Meu nome é Enéas!*”—“My name is Enéas!” He rapidly gained folk hero status, as a fighter who just wouldn’t back down.

Enéas had a raucous sense of humor, which accompanied his brilliant intellect, and a fierce, polemical commitment to see justice done in the world. He was, above all else, a volunteer and a teacher.

Born on Nov. 5, 1938, and working from age nine to help support his family after his father’s death, Enéas became a mathematician, a physicist, and one of Brazil’s preeminent cardiologists. He authored a textbook on the electrocardiogram, and over 28,000 medical students took his legendary course on the electrocardiogram, which he continued to teach twice-weekly, even while he was a sitting congressman.

In 1989, he founded a political party, PRONA (Party for Rebuilding National Order), because he decided that only by changing the political and economic system, could the genocidal disregard for human life which he saw around him in his medical work be ended. PRONA’s ranks were filled with many of the doctors whom he had inspired with his love of science—and of Brazil.

His stunning election victory in 2002, which carried him into Congress with five other PRONA deputies in the same election in which Lula da Silva entered the Presidency, sent



EIRNS/Stephen Meyer

Enéas Carneiro insisted that “the only solution is a rupture ... with the IMF, with the World Bank.” Here he is shown (left) with Lyndon LaRouche, whom he invited to São Paulo, Brazil in 2002 to receive honorary citizenship in the city.

the financiers into a rage fit. The *New York Times* labeled Enéas a “neofascist.” Within eight months of the election, *EIR*’s office in Brazil broke with LaRouche, and went over openly to the international Synarchists, in part in a failed effort to sever Enéas’s active connection to his friend LaRouche. Over the next year, all but one of PRONA’s congressmen were “persuaded” to switch parties.

Undeterred, Enéas gave an interview to LaRouche’s *EIR* in February 2004, reiterating the urgency of changing the global financial system, as LaRouche proposes (see below for excerpts). Diagnosed with leukemia in early 2006, he came back to fight after his treatment, having lost only his beard, but none of his spunk. As he told the media at the time, with his contagious laugh: “With a beard or without a beard, my name is Enéas!”

He was re-elected to Congress in October 2006 with the new Republican Party, of which he was vice-chair. Enéas’s commitment to principle won him the respect of many in Congress. As the President of the Chamber of Deputies, Arlindo Chinaglia, stated after his death, Enéas was known for his “determination, which can be read also as courage, because he firmly maintained his ideological and political positions, no matter whom he was speaking to.”

Enéas will be replaced in Congress by his alternate, who is a 33-year-old woman dentist.

Documentation

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 Inácio 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 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.