elements in a FASCIST relationship

Uruguay, a small country of 186,926 km² located in what is called the southern cone of the South American continent, flanked by Brazil and Argentina and with extensive borders along the Plata River, is suffering under an overtly fascist regime today.

From 1971, when Juan Maria Bordaberry ascended to the presidency as the follower of a repressive line begun back in 1968, the country's whole political, economic and social situation worsened until it culminated in the golpe de estado of June 27, 1973.

That golpe confirmed as dictator the formerly constitutional president, Juan Maria Bordaberry.

On that date, the Republic's parliament was dissolved and the outlawing of various political parties continued while the others were prevented from functioning; the National Convention of Workers (CNT) and the Federation of University Students were declared illegal, the opposition press was closed down and individual and public rights were wiped out.

The economic policy can be summed up in the statement by the Minister of Economics that "legislation must be blind and neutral toward foreign capital... and practice no distinction between it and domestic capital."

Parallel to this policy of selling the country to foreign investors is the policy of repression, assassination and torture designed to silence forever by physical elimination, the voices that accuse the dictatorship.

The country's foreign debt is approximately $1.3 billion, one of the highest in the world.
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The number of prisoners in Uruguay is now close to 7000, including women and children. The most modern refinements of technology have been placed at the service of torture and assassination in Uruguay. Hundreds of individuals are in jail, thousands have been held for long periods without trial, and brutally tortured. International organizations such as Amnesty International, have established more than 22 assassinations by the Bordaberry dictatorship. This repressive policy was also denounced by a Commission of Catholic Jurists who visited Montevideo in February, 1976, and noted the general nature of the repression from which no sector of Uruguayan society, even the Catholic Church, is free.

To this picture, stained with the blood of a people who struggle determinedly and unfailingly for their final liberation, is added the kidnapping of three Uruguayan leaders and the subsequent murder of two of them which took place on May 22 in Buenos Aires. The Uruguayan fascist regime is not isolated from these deeds.

This policy of internal aggression is expressed in an international policy of attack against the most progressive world sectors, against the UN, and in alliances with the fascist regimes of Chile, Paraguay, Brazil and lately with South Africa.

At the very moment when the UN warned Uruguay about its relationship with the Pretoria government, Bordaberry's regime prepared the groundwork for the arrival of that country's Prime Minister in Uruguay.

The Special Committee against Apartheid, at its meeting held on April 2, 1975, examined several press reports according to which the President of Uruguay proposed visiting South Africa. On April 10, a letter was sent to the Uruguayan representative to the United Nations, urging him to request the Uruguayan government to reconsider the projected visit of the head of state to that country, as well as the diplomatic and consular relations it maintained with the South African regime, under the terms of the pertinent General Assembly resolutions.

In his reply of August 7, 1975, the Uruguayan representative indicated that his country had maintained diplomatic and consular relations with South Africa for several years.

The President of Uruguay did not visit South Africa, but Prime Minister Vorster visited Uruguay, in August, 1975.

Shortly before that, a high-level South African trade mission visited Montevideo and offered the Uruguayan government technical and financial collaboration in important branches of the Uruguayan economy.

During Vorster's visit, while he was meeting with the dictator Bordaberry, the trade and financial experts who accompanied him met with their Uruguayan colleagues.

At the end of his visit, Vorster said, referring to Bordaberry: "We're the same type of men."

The week before, Bordaberry signed a resolution authorizing the National Administration of Fuel, Alcohol and Portland (ANCAP) to make an agreement with the Industrial Development Corporation of South Africa, Ltd. for $15 million credit and technical-financial aid for its Portland-type cement plant in the city of Paysandú.

The South African regime had previously invested several million dollars in Treasury Bonds, in the foreign series issued by the Uruguayan government at the end of 1974.

URUGUAY BECOMES A BASE OF PENETRATION FOR THE REGIME IN THE SOUTHERN CONE OF THE CONTINENT

According to reports dated February 16 of this year in the daily El País, official spokesman for the Bordaberry dictatorship, samples of Uruguayan coal were being tested in South Africa to see whether South African technicians would undertake mining coal in Uruguay. The samples had been collected by the subdirector of the Geological Service of Pretoria, on his recent visit to Uruguay.

On February 18, 1976, El País published the following:

Dr. Piet J. Hugo, Assistant Director and Sub-Director of the Geological Service of Pretoria in South Africa, was in Uruguay on the basis of a technical aid project. Technical
cooperation in this branch may be extended with the arrival of a hydrologist. This in­
vestigation is being madP. because of the possibility that there may be coal deposits in
Uruguay whose exploitation would be handled by South Africa.

On May 4 this year, there was news of a South African mission visiting Montevideo,
to negotiate construction and financing of two refrigeration plants for the National Refrig­
eration Service and the establishment of a refrigeration plant in Cerro. According to
the publication, the delegation held interviews with the Director for Economic and Com­
mmercial Affairs of the Uruguayan Foreign Office and with various commercial and indus­
trial groups.

On April 8, this newspaper, voice of the dictatorship, under the headline “Pseudo­
emancipation of the African colonies” published a series of considerations making clear
the objectives and nature of the fascist regime of Bordaberry and its relations with the
racist government of South Africa.

According to the editorial, “almost none of the liberated peoples of Africa have
improved their material or moral status or elevated their living standard or regained
their rights and liberties.”

Later it goes on to say:

The European colonizers did not always act out of humanitarian motives, nor
were they made up exclusively of missionaries and evangelizers... but it can­
not be denied that they imposed peace and progress on uncivilized territories
devastated by tribal barbarism, organized the exploitation of natural resources
and carried out a work of tremendous scope in terms of health, education, hous­
ing, land and sea communications and hydroelectricification,

which means defending such hateful systems as colonialism.

The editorial’s intent is clarified still further when it says: “Racism, imputed to more
than a few colonizers, originated in Africa...” and continues “with decolonization, racism
did not disappear but rather returned to its more barbarous forms.”

It ends by referring to the South African nation as “particularly worthy of maximum
consideration, as one of the most advanced nations in the world spiritually, intellectually
and materially.”

This, in summary, is the ideology of a system sustained on the bloody backs of a
people who wage daily battle to end this situation, confident and certain that the future
will be without apartheid, without colonialism and without any other form of man’s
exploitation of man.