

Statement by Lyndon LaRouche on Seineldín's action

The first four paragraphs of the following were issued as a formal statement by former U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., on Saturday evening, Dec. 3, 1988. They serve as a prologue to his further remarks, below, which were written particularly for North American and West European policymakers.

During the past two days, the military hero of the 1982 Malvinas War, Col. Mohamed Ali Seineldin, has moved into Argentina's Campo de Mayo military base to direct operations aimed to prevent the destruction of that nation's military forces. Although I was not privy to this action or its timing, I am aware of, and obliged to report the larger strategic considerations at stake in this action.

The action is situated within a series of recent Soviet-directed developments in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Argentina.

I should also stress, that whatever the outcome of the action in Argentina, Colonel Seineldin is the most effective combat commander currently active in the Americas, whose skills are those which great commanders such as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Frederick the Great, and Lazare Carnot would have praised as in keeping with their tradition. To the good colonel, there is no purpose in warfare but victory; although he is capable of the most terrifying exercise of military will when this is required of him, he is also a commander who has shown his excellence in achieving the required goals with the minimal expenditure of human life possible.

He is, above all, a devout Christian, who would never willingly undertake any action he deemed shameful in the eyes of the Creator.

1. The Soviet thrust for world empire

According to its own state of mind, the Soviet government has committed all its resources to the single primary purpose of establishing Moscow as the eternal capital of a Third Roman world empire before the close of the present century.

The most immediate objective of the Soviet strategic

operations, is the virtual dissolution of the mutual military commitments among the nations of Western Europe and the United States, and the self-weakening of the military capabilities, foreign deployments, and political strategic will of the United States. The prize most sought for this phase of the now-ongoing Soviet offensive, is the capture of the industrial and agricultural potential of Central Europe as part of the Soviet Empire's economic orbit and sphere of strategic political influence.

The political assimilation of West Germany into the Soviet sphere of influence is the principal short-term to medium-term target of all Soviet foreign-policy and related warfare exertions. All Soviet actions in every other geographic and topical dimension of global affairs are pivoted upon this Germany objective.

The Soviet strategic view continues to be, that if the industrial potential of Central Europe is brought into the Soviet zone of strategic influence, the balance of power shifts to the effect of making Moscow the dominant world-imperial power, and the U.S.A. a second- to third-rate power existing at Soviet pleasure. This was the view of V.I. Lenin during and following World War I; Moscow has never deviated from that strategic assessment during any time up to the present date.

Hence, all Soviet actions in every other part of the world, outside Central Europe, are defined as flanking operations relative to the pivot of the Soviet targeting of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Soviets' notable global strategic flanking theaters are: the Balkans, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, Northern Africa, the strategic mineral shield of southern Africa, the Asian subcontinent, the Asiatic Rim, New Zealand-Australia, and what post-1850s jargon identifies as "Latin America."

For historical reasons, related to the roles of such as M.N. Roy, Agnes Smedley, and the Soviet-controlled Frankfurt School's Richard Sorge, Soviet operations in Central and South America are coordinated through Evgeni Primakov's Soviet Oriental Institute. The Soviet strategy for operations upon the South American flank of the U.S.A. is what is known as the "Andean Spine" doctrine once echoed by Che Guevara. In this area Moscow continues to operate in collaboration and also competition with Beijing, as the case of Shining Path (*Sendero Luminoso*) illustrates this collaboration.

The key assets of Moscow-Beijing strategic operations against the United States in the Andean Spine region are 1) the narco-terrorist operations set into operation by KGB Director Yuri Andropov beginning 1967; 2) Socialist International operatives, including those of the ICFTU, who are the principal agents of influence of Moscow, on the ground, throughout South America today; 3) the "human rights" mafia of Amnesty International and allied lobbying interests, without whose assistance Shining Path and other Soviet and

Beijing terrorist insurgencies could not operate as they have done during recent years.

The key to the Andean Spine operation, otherwise, is the ethnic composition of the populations along the Andean Spine, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, most notably. Through complicit networks of sociologists, anthropologists and pseudo-Christian (gnostic) missionaries, the so-called "indigenous" and "mestizo" populations are targeted as potential recruits to an anti-Hispanic (i.e., anti-Catholic), paganist insurgency. Rural strata of such ethnic characteristics are targeted to serve as the environment in which narco-terrorist insurgency is developed to the level required for general destruction of governments based upon principles of Western European Judeo-Christian civilization.

At this moment, in South America, the principal battlefields on which ongoing major Soviet-directed operations of this type are in progress include Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Argentina. The Soviets are exploiting to the fullest the follies embedded in the policy-shaping processes of the United States, as the opportunity for destroying the governments of these nations to a degree beyond the means of the U.S. to reverse this by corrections of its own policy toward the nations of the region.

The tendency of the U.S. government, to address the problems of narco-terrorism and related Soviet insurgency by methods of "case by case" "crisis management," affords Moscow the widest opportunities for advancing toward its regional objectives within each of these nations.

If recent and present trends in U.S. policy were to be continued, within a few months the U.S. strategic flank throughout South America could be lost irreparably.

2. The role of Colonel Seineldín

Increasingly, beginning 1974, the author and his associates have been engaged in efforts to defeat this subversion. During the course of the 1980s, the author's friends working within this region have been toe-to-toe against Soviet forces to a degree the U.S. government and its intelligence services have in fact been muddling in nearly every instance.

There exists a network of military and other patriots throughout the Americas, each and all among us sharing the common purpose of defeating the Soviets' Andean Spine strategy, together with the broader, global purpose, of preserving the benefits of Western civilization as a trust, a precious gift intended for the benefit of all nations and individuals. Colonel Mohamed Ali Seineldín is an outstanding figure in these circles.

There is nothing "darkly conspiratorial" in the existence of this network. The most famous precedent is that Transatlantic network, associated with figures such as America's Cotton Mather and Europe's Gottfried Leibniz, at the beginning of the 18th century, whose continued exertions made possible the existence of the United States, and which contin-

ued that effort for the benefit of other nations in collaboration with such as Gilbert Marquis de Lafayette, the friends of Friedrich Schiller, and John Quincy Adams deep into the 19th century.

This is part of a worldwide ecumenical network, which includes Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, and Vedantists, all sharing the principle that each and every people must have the opportunity to choose those forms of government and forms of relations among sovereign states implicit in the U.S. Declaration of Independence and federal Constitution.

We share the conviction expressed by the U.S. Declaration of Independence, that there exists a natural law, above all man-made law, which governs not only the ordering of the physical universe, but which governs the proper natural rights of the human individual without regard to ethnic distinctions, and the proper ordering of relations among individuals and in the relationship of the state, society, and individual to one another.

We are united by the often stated, or at least implicit agreement, that to each of us is given a mortal life, that we might spend that gift to the benefit of present and future generations of humanity as a whole, an expenditure of self which must be governed by awesome submission to the notion of natural law. Each of us, like the New Testament's Good Samaritan, must recognize, even in the form of apparently accidental occurrences, the clear call to our duty according to natural law, and must sometimes act, in smaller or larger ways, as instruments of Providence, even to the extent of being martyrs in the service of that duty. We thank the Creator, that He has afforded us the strength of conscience to live and act according to that devotion.

For the Christians among us, the image of Jesus Christ at Gethsemane, is the principal instruction given to us in all great matter. Such a man is Colonel Seineldín.

We recognize, that when we are called to act as soldiers, our true adversary is the evil principalities and powers of this planet. Our implicit compact is no earthly conspiracy, but a unity we share in combat against those transcendental principalities and powers of evil, a power for which Soviet Communism is but an instrument. This spiritual quality of our association is our source of strength.

The war we fight may include actions of regular warfare, as circumstances require this. However, we know that regular warfare is but an aspect of warfare in general. Warfare in general is what the leadership of the Kuomintang defined, during the 1930s, as "Peoples War," primarily cultural warfare. We are engaged in resisting the Peoples War which the Communist forces and their auxiliaries continue to wage, and to escalate against the Creator and humanity.

In our actions, we work, as much as possible, to do good, as the great American patriot Cotton Mather prescribed this. Always, we work to shape the dynamic of the process of

events, such that, strategically, the cause of the good is strengthened relative to the cause of evil. Although our particular action must always be a moral one by standards of natural law, the purpose of that action lies not within the confines of its particularity, but in the effect of that action on the strategic correlation of the conflicting forces of good and evil.

We know, that insofar as society has come to enjoy the benefits of truth and freedom in greater or lesser degree, that enjoyment was secured at the price of blood of many political and other martyrs in this cause. We know, that that cause of truth and freedom will be lost unless there are sufficient numbers of men and women ready to spend their mortal lives, if need be, to preserve this gift for the benefit of future generations. In most among our nations, as in the morally decayed United States of today, truth and freedom are becoming a lost cause, unless men and women find the courage to restore these natural rights at whatever cost.

Knowing that these are matters so essential to our mortal life, that we become as nothing in mortal life unless we defend them, we find in that the strength to risk our mortal lives that we might save that which makes mortal life worth living. On this account, we put our faith in the Creator and His Natural Law, persuaded that if we act so according to His Will, our lives and our actions are just and fruitful. So, from this, we take the moral strength to become martyrs if it need be so.

In this cause, we know we have no true adversaries but either those who wear the Mark of the Beast, or corrupted fools who serve the cause of evil wittingly or unwittingly.

So, on this account, Colonel Seineldin is not only a patriot hero of his own nation, but, as a soldier of Christ, also a soldier-citizen of all humanity. His stature is not only his exceptional military qualities, but, more essentially, the devotion which governs his conscience.

His current actions in Argentina are those he chose to take in concert with responsible members of the patriotic institutions which he is pledged to serve. In this matter, we others, jealous of the sovereignty of his republic, have no particular authority. Yet, as his actions touch upon the security of his continent, the security of the Americas against the Soviet "peoples warfare" aggression, and the welfare of humanity at large, his actions to save the imperiled integrity of the constitutional military instruments of Argentina are a crucial flanking counterattack on the Soviets' Andean Spine offensive.

3. Regional strategic implications

From a military planning standpoint, the operation now occurring under the leadership of Colonel Seineldin had a calculable 30% chance of success from the outset, which is the best percentile possible in any military operation of this nature. The essential elements of this calculation include the

following:

1) Col. Mohamed Ali Seineldin is known by his brother officers, and enlisted ranks of the Argentina forces as the most capable, combat-tested commander of his nation. He is no "political general" of the sort who starts a fight and waits for the negotiating-team to shape the result of the conflict. That justified reputation, as a known quality of the commander, has a decisive spiritual effect upon the combat qualities of the forces under his command, and influences the temper of the command and ranks of any forces deployed against his own command.

2) His actions are not aimed at effecting a political coup d'état against the state, and constitute no intended threat against the integrity of non-military institutions of government of the civilian population. His stated goal is to defend the integrity of a constitutional agency of the Argentine state, its military institution currently in the early stages of dissolution, a dissolution being sought by forces sympathetic to the Soviet cause. Moreover, these actions against the integrity of Argentina's military forces were intended to create the preconditions for a later coup d'état against the Argentine republic, should Peronist candidate Carlos Saúl Menem be elected President. Hence, Colonel Seineldin is acting as defender of the constitutional republic, against those wittingly or otherwise complicit in a projected coup d'état.

3) He has personally broadest sympathy among the military forces of Argentina, and his actions threaten the vital interests of no section of those armed forces.

4) The majority of the population of Argentina has no sympathy with the project of crushing Colonel Seineldin's effort. This is attested by the fact that merely 5,000 rallied initially to a protest demonstration against Colonel Seineldin, and that the crowd grew to no more than 50,000 late in the evening of a typical Buenos Aires Friday night most favorable to spontaneous attendance at large political rallies.

This is no "chocolate soldier's" operetta coup; it is a deadly serious, well-prepared operation with limited objectives, constituting no intended threat to the civilian institutions of representative self-government. Its intent is in fact a resistance to the "politicization" of the military command, against the type of politicization which various agencies, including Israeli military advisers, have introduced into other nations of the hemisphere.

Its broader intent, which is proper concern to all patriots inside and outside the Americas, is a flanking assault against the Soviets' Andean Spine aggression, as part of the defense of all South America against that ongoing Soviet aggression. Whether the action succeeds in its short-term objective, or not, it is an action in defense of Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and other imperiled nations of South America; it is also a defense of the southern hemispheric flank of the United States. It is a defense of Western civilization as a whole against Soviet imperial aggression.