

LaRauche

'Continental integration was the dream of our forefathers'

The following interview was granted to EIR correspondents Dennis Small and Gretchen Small by Capt. Gustavo Breide Obeid, from Caseros prison, Aug. 14, 1991.

EIR: The central theme of your Aug. 8 testimony was, "I assume responsibility." What is the responsibility of the military man, in general, with respect to society and the nation? How is this carried out in today's Argentina?

Breide: That the central theme of my testimony was "I assume responsibility" only attracts attention due to the fact that we find ourselves in special circumstances in our country and in our society, where no one takes responsibility.

You ask about the role of the Armed Forces in Argentina. This is clearly defined in the Constitution, which states that they must "safeguard the highest interests of the nation" and must "be the military arm of the Fatherland." That mission is not easy to carry out in Argentina today, for various reasons which I'll outline.

In the first place, there is a shared responsibility of the military and Argentina's political leadership. The Armed Forces, and more specifically the Argentine Army, was born with the nation itself and participated in all the most crucial developments of Argentine history. In recent decades, we committed the error of wanting to participate directly in the political life of the country. This is because the Armed Forces were not integrated into a national political project, with a pre-established role, and thus became isolated from society. If you add to this the political leadership's manifest incapacity to govern, you get a dangerous equation. An isolated armed forces, lacking in commitment, and an incompetent political leadership, equals a coup d'état.

In the second place, we must take into account the the U.S. government's disposition toward the Armed Forces of the Latin American countries. Undoubtedly, there is a clash between the American project and the need for countries like ours to have sufficiently strong armed forces to maintain their independence in terms of sovereign decisions that must be made for us to continue being a nation. The United States, through the Bush administration is, on the contrary, pressuring our countries' weak-kneed political leaders to diminish the armed forces, to ultimately reduce them to a national guard, thereby modifying their mission and role in society.

EIR: There are those who say there is an unbridgeable gap between the Argentine military and civilian society, as the result of the internal war fought from 1976 onward. Is this true? What is the *carapintadas*' message to civil society?

Breide: The gap between military and civilian society is real, but by no means unbridgeable. The war of the '70s carried off the best of a generation of Argentines and sent them to their deaths. The ideologues of that war on both sides negotiated behind the backs of those who did the fighting. This pact, which on the one hand saved the lives of those truly responsible, on the other hand led to the historic condemnation of the armed services institutions. Dr. Alfonsín cunningly raised the banner of human rights, not to uncover the truth of what had happened but only for the purpose of deriving personal political benefit.

The Armed Forces should not and cannot be separated from society. If this has occurred, it was due more to external reasons which deliberately sought—and seek—to separate the people from their Army than to the mistakes undoubtedly committed by the military.

The question that unavoidably comes to mind is how to avoid such separation, and this has but one answer: that we understand that we can never again be used as instruments of repression against our own people. At the same time, the political leadership must understand that the integration of the Army with society is indispensable, and that this can only be accomplished through a serious national project, which serves the true interests of the nation.

EIR: How do you analyze the problem of the foreign debt, of the International Monetary Fund? How should the Argentine government approach this problem?

Breide: The problem of the foreign debt and of the IMF is not exclusive to our republic.

The policy of the IMF must be analyzed in a global context, since this policy of indebtedness was not designed only for our country. The Argentine government should approach this problem, from two different perspectives.

First, it should attempt to form a debtors' club with the rest of the Latin American countries, since common problems require common solutions; and only through unity can the rapaciousness of IMF policy be confronted.

Second, the context in which the debt was acquired, and a look at who contracted it, should be analyzed, since during that era of indebtedness, the country witnessed an impressive number of indebted and bankrupted industries; but there were only a few industrialists and businessmen who actually went broke. This can only be explained by the fact that these individuals went and got loans, looted their companies and exported the capital.

Finally, the finance ministers should be at the service of the national interest, and not of the foreign multinationals. As an example, just look at the career of the current [Finance] Minister Cavallo, who was president of the central bank during the military government and in that capacity was the one who transferred the private debt to the state.

One thing should be clear: The debt and its interest should not be paid to the IMF at the cost of the marginalization and social backwardness of an entire people.

EIR: What do you think of Ibero-American integration? Is it necessary, or is it an illusion?

Breide: Ibero-American integration is not an illusion, but on the contrary is essential. All the necessary elements to achieve that integration exist: a common history, the same language, the same religion, and unfortunately, the same problems and needs. It is essential that this integration be achieved in every area: social, economic, political and military.

Only through a common strategy, which has integration as its point of departure, can we confront the sinister plan of the major powers, which seek through their policies toward Ibero-America, to Africanize our countries and steal the resources they need for their industrial development.

Integration is not something new. It was the dream of our forefathers who, with much greater vision and patriotism than the current ruling classes, sought to achieve it by every means.

EIR: Henry Kissinger has spoken of a possible "Lebanonization" or dismemberment of the Argentine nation. Is this a real danger? Are there interests which favor such a project?

Breide: The problem of the Lebanonization or dismemberment of the Argentine nation is real. Unfortunately the same person who says this is one of those responsible for that plan of national disintegration.

The policy imposed by world power centers, to which Kissinger belongs, presents us with the dilemma of either accepting their conditions, or facing Lebanonization or dismemberment.

This plan—which is by no means limited to Argentina, but is intended for all the Latin American countries—is based on increasing the socio-economic imbalances, destroying national industry and productive capacity, dismantling national defense production capabilities, internationalizing natural resources—look at the case of the Brazilian Amazon—and, finally, weakening society's basic institutions for the purpose

of weakening the very concept of the nation-state.

Any resistance to this plan, which is already being carried out with the complicity of a treasonous political leadership, would provoke the direct or indirect intervention of world power centers. The only possibility of avoiding this dilemma is to achieve Ibero-American unity. Only a joint and simultaneous resistance of the continent's political and military leadership could halt such a sinister plan.

EIR: What is the meaning of the war against Iraq, especially the United Nations' role?

Breide: In the case of Iraq, the U.N. simply confirmed its lack of independence in the decisions it makes.

It doesn't serve the interests of its member-nations, but rather those of the great powers which, through waging war on Iraq, sought to show that any country that resists their policies, will get the same treatment.

The hypocritical policy of condemning some countries, and not others who have the same attitude, shows us very clearly that the U.N. doesn't adhere to the guiding principles outlined in its founding Charter. The war against Iraq, which was genocide with 300,000 civilians killed, served the economic and geopolitical interests of the Bush administration. The United States once again seeks to assume the role of democracy's worldwide custodian, while hiding its real motives, which are nothing more than to implacably and inexorably carry out the plan I have described above.

In Defense Policy and as a Military Phenomenon

Modern Irregular Warfare

by Professor
Friedrich August
Frhr. von der Heydte

Order from:

Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.
27 South King St.
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$9.95 plus shipping
(\$1.50 for first book,
\$.50 for each
additional book.)
Bulk rates available.

