

## Lyndon LaRouche: The Positive Role of the Armed Forces

**T**he following are excerpts from an interview granted in April 1993 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. to Robyn Quijano, the editor of Executive Intelligence Review's Spanish-language magazine, Resumen Ejecutivo.

**RQ:** After the collapse of communism in 1989, with the bringing down of the Berlin Wall, there was a great deal of optimism internationally, which always is very important for people getting things done, as we know. But since the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has destroyed the Russian and eastern European economies, there is a tremendous amount of pessimism that has set in; and I am wondering if you think that this is going to give communism a new lease on life in the Third World in particular.

**LaRouche:** I think at this point, it is a mistake to speak of communism in the same sense you would have spoken of it before 1989.

Communism as such has been discredited and will not come back in Russia, though obviously the cultural marks left by the history of Bolshevism will be a factor.

Communism is significant in the form of, say, Shining Path [Sendero Luminoso]; or Rigoberta Menchú, who is a communist, and whose background is just like Shining Path. They're murderers, they're butchers; she's a woman from hell, essentially.

All right. We know that and the tradition of M.N. Roy,

who is responsible for this movement along the Andean Spine, for example, those people; that phenomenon exists. But it is not communist in the sense of appealing to labor to revolt against the oppressors, it is no longer appealing to national sentiment to revolt against colonial oppressions, what we knew as the old communism. That is gone.

What we see is what was behind the control of the old communists. Let's take the case of Marx.

Karl Marx, people will say, or the so-called Marxists will remind you, that Marx denounced Lord Palmerston and accused him of being a Russian agent. But in point of fact, while Karl Marx did not know it (but that is only because he was stupid), *Karl Marx himself was a Palmerston agent.*

First of all, Marx was an agent of Giuseppe Mazzini. That was his first role in life. He went to London, where he worked under the direction, by his own admission, of David Urquhart of the British Museum. David Urquhart was Lord Palmerston's agent controlling Mazzinian refugees in London, among other places.

When Marx became head of what was called later the First International, the person who created the First International was Giuseppe Mazzini in London; and he did it on behalf of Lord Palmerston, and he appointed Marx to the position that Marx assumed with the First International. So Marx, of course, was an agent of Lord Palmerston, but he did not have the sense to investigate and find out who owned him.

But when you talk about Mazzini, as opposed to communism, you talk about Wagner, who is the same thing as Mazzini, and who has the same political, philosophical, spiritual, parentage as Karl Marx. He was a satanist. When you talk about Bakunin, the bomb-thrower, the deadly enemy of Karl Marx, he has the same political parentage and philosophy as Karl Marx.

Now it begins to make sense. Now we go in and say, what is the form of communism behind communism? Not Bolshevism, not the so-called Workingmen's philosophy, not the nationalist-independence movement; what is really behind it? Who was *using* this?

Well, we find a satanic force typified by Giuseppe Mazzini.

In what form does it appear? In European history, and, to some degree, in the Americas today, we all know of the Frankfurt School. The Frankfurt School was created by whom? By a communist, Georg Lukacs (and company). What was the purpose of the Frankfurt School? To destroy western Christian civilization. What does it do in the Americas? That is what it does.

What are the allies of the Frankfurt School in the Western Hemisphere?

For example, wherever you hear the term "authoritarian personality," that is communist propaganda. Whoever tells you you are endangered by the influence of the authoritarian personality, is a real satanic communist. That's a mark; you can recognize the Frankfurt School. Because they call *reason* authoritarianism. They wish to eliminate reason.

So then you have the Tavistock Institute, and you have the outright satanic Lucifer cult, which is what the United Nations in New York is part of, which the United Nations is full of, which the Anglican Church supports. You have the worship of the Mother of Satan, Gaia, by members of the British royal family, that kind of congruence.

The Mother of Satan is loose in the land, though Satan died of old age. But his mother is still around and she's still trying to breed.

So the danger is that in the collapse, now we could have something coming back which is not the old communism but a danger which is even greater.

## Menchú and Fundamentalism

**RQ:** Just going back to the question of Rigoberta Menchú, we were remembering that in 1982, you wrote a paper warning President José López Portillo and the PRI party in Mexico that their Achilles' heel was Aztec fundamentalism, and ten years later, Rigoberta Menchú, whom we might call a Mayan fundamentalist, received the Nobel Peace Prize, which represents a huge international backing for this hideous operation.

How do you think Ibero-American patriots should con-

front this problem, which is so much bigger than it was when you talked about Aztec fundamentalism ten years ago?

**LaRouche:** This is communism. Aztec fundamentalism is not communism in the sense of Karl Marx's breed but it's the sense of his mother's communism—or Satan's mother's communism.

Look at the population curve of civilization, the population curve of the human race. And now look back past thousands and thousands of years; and suddenly, 550 years ago approximately, a great hyperbolic growth of the world population occurred—not just in Europe, but around the world, as a result of something that happened in Europe. That something in Europe, we would call the Golden Renaissance; the center was the Council of Florence, that same Council of Florence which gave Columbus the map to discover the New World.

What was the condition of the people in the Americas prior to this discovery? Collapsed civilization. What is the symbol of that collapse, what expresses that collapse, the degeneration of the culture of the Americas, which had occurred over a long period *preceding* Columbus?

It was the Aztecs.

There is no aspect of a Nazi culture which was as evil as the Aztecs. The Aztecs embody everything that destroyed the Indians of the Americas from within and drove them into bestiality. Is there anything more evil than taking 18,000 poor creatures captive, lining them up on the steps, and cutting their hearts out in mass production in a two-day orgy, and someone says the "natural culture" of the Americas is Aztec?!

Well, I could say, if you want to talk about Henry Kissinger's culture, that might be the case, except the only reason Kissinger wouldn't cut out 18,000 hearts in two days, is that he's too lazy.

Despite the fact that European civilization is indebted to contributions of many other parts of culture, and despite the fact that many culture groups around the world have participated in using and spreading European civilization and advancing it, European civilization was the *greatest* discovery in the known history of mankind.

This discovery comes from the belated, but effective appli-

cation of a principle embedded in Christianity, of *imago Dei*, man in the image of God, applied in a very correct way, for the first time.

Now we look: Who are the Europeans in the Americas? Let's look at Mexico. Look in the faces of the Mexicans. Are these Europeans or are these Indians? Most of them are Indians. You look down the Andean Spine. Indians, you see; but they represent European culture at its highest cultural level, because the culture belongs to them.

And somebody comes along and says, "No, you don't have a right to have this culture, you're Indians. You don't have a right to have European culture. You're supposed to have your hearts pulled out by Aztec priests!" And you can't get an Aztec priest quite as evil as Rigoberta Menchú. She's the kind of woman that would do it—and she probably has already a couple of times.

**RQ:** This brings me to the question of fighting the IMF. *Ombro a Ombro*, magazine of the retired military in Brazil, had a recent editorial in which they stated that 62 percent of Brazil's budget goes to internal and external debt, and that this is an impossible situation.

They said, which is absolutely correct, that confronting this will probably mean a boycott by the banks, and a tremendous pressure by the IMF and the banks. That would be better than the current genocide that they are being forced into.

This is actually the situation which every Hispanic American country faces, and the question is: How do you confront such an international boycott? What would you do to actually be able to survive under those difficult circumstances?

**LaRouche:** One has to think, not formally. One must, of course, be able to think formally, but one should not think formalistically.

If the banking system of the world is going to suck the blood of one's nation, that is an act of war against one's nation. And so let it go hang; let it collapse.

The financial system of the world is now a gigantic cancerous bubble, which cannot be sustained in any case. Let it collapse. People ask, "What will we do for a credit system?"

Well, I don't give a hang about that. I can create a system on the basis of the same kind of system which U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton outlined.

Every country can create its own national credit system. The idea of borrowing foreign money, in order to borrow the use of domestic resources, is complete lunacy in any case. So we don't need to borrow foreign money and to get permission to use your own national resources for development.

The problem of cutting off credit has nothing to do with domestic requirements, in terms of domestic trade. It has to do with imports. You need import credit, and you need export credit also.

Well, if cooperating nations which have their own credit systems were to decide that they were going to trade with each other, and that they were going to put national credit systems into cooperation in order to facilitate that, you can do it. You're not going to collapse trade. The banking system is going to collapse *anyway*. So let's not worry about the collapse of the international banking system, let's hope it comes *soon*. But the alternative must be in place, and the alternative is national banking systems, replacing central banking systems, replacing the present system of international banking, replacing the IMF, must happen. It must happen *now*, it must happen *immediately*; otherwise, this world is going to go into something beyond belief.

So don't be afraid of the collapse of the international banking system: Wish for it. Pray for it—and help make it happen. Because the alternative is, we have to commit ourselves at all costs to restoring national banking and national credit systems, and to deal with the problems of international trade, to rely upon cooperation among cooperating states and their respective national banking systems. That is the way we are going to have to deal with it.

There *is* no other solution.

**RQ:** I'd like to move to the whole question of the conspiracy to demilitarize Ibero-America. The so-called U.N. Truth Commission on El Salvador has created a big stir in the press internationally, to the extent that someone actually suggested

that instead of talking about an international war crimes tribunal to try the Serbians, that instead, the Ibero-American military, particularly the Salvadoran military, should be tried in such a tribunal.

What do you think about this push of the Salvadoran Truth Commission, so called?

**LaRouche:** The Truth Commission, of all the things it lacks, it lacks the most, truth. It is obvious.

First of all, there were atrocities committed throughout the history of Ibero-America—Central and South America—in the fight against guerrillas. To the extent this was true, as in the case of El Salvador, the dirtiest fighting done by the Salvadoran military forces, was done, if by anyone, by units which were under U.S. technical direction. *But* that is really not the story, even though one may concede that things like that may have happened or did happen, as happened in other cases, where people encountering terrorist or guerrilla forces, under the circumstances, may get a little wild. Take the green troops.

*But* the essential atrocities committed, were committed by the guerrillas themselves.

For comparison, let's take the case of Shining Path in Peru, which is paradigmatic for these guerrilla movements. As I know from my work in this area, the method of the guerrillas is to go into an Indian village, for example; and if the Indians refuse to cooperate with the guerrillas, they kill them. They come back and massacre them, and then go to the next village, and say, if you don't want to be massacred, give us your labor, your young men for training, and cooperate.

In some cases, in Peru, of course, some of the Indians grow coca anyway and cooperate with the Senderistas on the coca operation; but in many cases, the Indians did not want to cooperate, but did so at the point of a gun—by terrorist methods.

We know that in Guatemala, as of 1985, that the people whom Rigoberta Menchú praises, were committing atrocities against the Indians. The atrocities were not so much committed by the military. We don't know everything that happened in that country, I certainly don't. But I *do know*—and I was

involved in suggesting what became Operation Guatusa, an anti-drug operation in Guatemala, because we knew, because of the use of gasoline to burn people alive in these villages by Menchú's friends, that they were getting the gasoline to do this terrorism, from the sale of gasoline to drug-runners running planes on the Caribbean side of Guatemala.

This was commonplace; in the terms we know today, the United States government, or part of the State Department under George Bush at least (the policy has not been cleared up since), Shining Path was *actually being backed* by the U.S. State Department. And the greatest amount of terrorism, the greatest amount of crimes, if not the *total* amount of crimes against humanity, were perpetrated by the guerrillas themselves.

Now this Truth Commission has made itself clearly the instrument of apology for the propaganda of the people who *did*, to my knowledge, commit the major part of the terrorism in that part of the world. So the Truth Commission is obviously an *instrument* of forces in the United States and elsewhere, who are *behind* the terrorism.

Put that together with the effort to destroy the military. Someone will ask you: "Why would a capitalist country like the United States want to support anti-capitalist, communist guerrilla forces in these countries?"

For a very simple reason. The same way they like to spread diseases among their enemies: to kill them. They wish to destroy the sovereignty of these nations. They wish to destroy their security. They don't want these nations to develop. They have a population policy, to reduce the population of Central and South America, and if you lower the technology you do that; if you spread disease you do that. And if you unleash this kind of horror show, you're going to wipe out the Catholic Church in Central and South America by wiping out its parishioners.

The ideologues behind this support of the Truth Commission in the United States, are people who have been committed to such policies.

The reason you have difficulty in dealing with this, is that when we explain this to people, they say, "I can't believe



the nice United States—they may make mistakes and do bad things—but I can't believe that anybody up there is crazy enough to have evil policies like that." Well, I am afraid that people are just going to have to wake up and recognize that there are people in the United States and Great Britain who do have evil policies like that.

## The IMF and Irregular War

**RQ:** Speaking of Shining Path, you visited Peru and spoke to military leaders, many of whom are now engaged in this battle against terrorism.

Could you elaborate on what the proper war-fighting doctrine under these conditions of irregular warfare is?

**LaRouche:** The problem is, when you are fighting irregular warfare, the essential thing is to fight for what you are fighting for, not just fight against the guerrillas.

The problem is, you get these idiotic experts from the United States and elsewhere, who may have certain technical military capability who come in and say, "Here is how you kill guerrillas, here is how you get rid of them."

But that is not what your objective is; your objective is to eliminate them.

There is an interesting case in Malaysia, where the British ended up doing something, in a sense, right. . . . What they actually did, was to isolate the Chinese ethnic and Chinese communist guerrillas from the population, and actually moved in to *assist* the population in some development in that region.

To this day, elements of the famous late-1940s Malaysian communist guerrilla movement linked to China, still exist. But they are a pitiful remnant, who are no longer even noticed. They live on the border area between Thailand and Malaysia, what is left of them. They are old, they are dying, they are old veterans, nobody cares about them any more.

The object in guerrilla warfare is to establish the political objectives of the movement you're fighting for, in order to destroy and isolate the political capacity of the enemy. Because if you isolate them, then you can mop them up easily.

Take the case of Peru. I don't want to be overconfident about what has happened in Peru, but obviously a great accomplishment has been made.

Once the government is able to *isolate* the guerrillas from the people they dominate, and protect the people, then the guerrillas become exposed as a very relatively small force. We find they become not the Quechua speakers, but the French speakers from Ayacucho, and things like that, who are fairly easy—not easy, but practically easy—to deal with. And *the essence of irregular warfare* is the policy of nation-building and security action to assist the nation-building process. In that way, you are winning.

Once you get into this idea of techniques “to win the hearts and minds” against the guerrilla force, the way they did in Vietnam, some crazy thing like that; then you've lost it. No matter how successful you *think* you are militarily.

For example, I am worried about Colombia, for that reason. The communists appear to be retreating under military pressure. But what if the communists are letting some of their forces retreat, and they are sitting there, waiting to come out of the bushes, armed, and to attack the flanks of the military forces which are chasing them over the hills?

The problem in Colombia is, that the political-economic measures needed to deal with the problem, are not being provided; and thus, the problem exists. So the military victories can be *temporary*, they are not decisive. Whereas if you have a correct conception of warfare, then what you are going to do is to address the problem, and *isolate* the problem, by providing the population with solutions to the real problems of life through a national policy.

It is almost impossible to fight guerrillas and submit to the IMF at the same time. If you are carrying out an IMF program against your own population, which is what it is, or similar policies, and you are trying to fight guerrillas, you are facing a losing battle. Because the IMF is recruiting the guerrillas while the United States State Department will come in and threaten to cut you off from what little aid you're getting, if you kill any more of these guerrillas and the Masons are accusing *you* of being human rights violators.

So a firm, determined policy, but a policy which is based on *affirming* the welfare of your people, is the way to fight; and if you do not do that, you may lose.

**RQ:** In terms of Colombia, there is a very big move on right now, probably because of the recent military success against the guerrillas, to bring in the United Nations as mediators. And there is a lot of talk of the Salvadorization of Colombia.

What are your thoughts on that?

**LaRouche:** I think the Colombian government, before it goes ahead with such a measure of bringing the United Nations in to help it deal with its problems, should perhaps get an experienced Bosnian government agent in there. Or perhaps get a couple of victims of the Serbs from the rape camps in Bosnia down there, to say what they think the United Nations' assistance is in such a situation.

**RQ:** Let's go back to the Salvadoran situation.

U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher recently said that he would consider a proposal to back alleged victims of the Salvadoran military suing the military in U.S. courts. At the same time, the U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to hear a complaint of an Argentine, who is now a U.S. resident, against the Argentine military.

Is this the proper domain of U.S. justice?

**LaRouche:** Of course not.

Maybe somebody in South America should sue the United States government for abuses which it suffered and the human rights violations at the hands of the U.S. operation there, for example, IMF, or something of that sort.

The significance of [U.S. Secretary of State] Christopher's statements of course, should not be exaggerated. Christopher is a man who speaks for the policy of a government; and it is the drift of the establishment to continue the Thornburgh Doctrine direction. That may not continue; but nonetheless the problem is there.

The United States government is still on inertia. It is continuing the policy of the Bush administration; and the

Bush administration policy was to support terrorism against the governments of Central and South America.

## The Human Rights Campaign

**RQ:** To return to the Peru situation.

Americas Watch has insisted on calling Shining Path and Túpac Amaru Revolutionary Movement terrorists “insurgents,” and from there enumerating “violations of laws of war governing internal armed conflicts.” There is evidently a lot of pressure on the government of Peru to accept such a status, which would obviously play into the human rights trap.

**LaRouche:** People should not get sucked into this kind of stuff. They had a clearer idea years ago. The pressure is on them. You have to look at *who* is putting the pressure on these governments to say they must do this. That is where the problem lies.

Ten years ago, even five years ago, these governments would have recognized such a proposal and defied and brushed it aside, as absolutely insane. Now they are seriously considering such things. Why?

Because powerful external pressures are asking them to consider it. What are these powerful external pressures? That is where the problem lies; and they have to understand, that the United States government, at least under Bush, and the policy has not yet changed, were supporting Shining Path, a terrorist organization, working for the destruction of the nation, supporting it, using human rights flags to do it; and they have to have the guts to stand up and realize that this is something you cannot trade off as a concession. You will lose your whole country. You can't do it.

**RQ:** There have been a few developments lately in other Third World countries, namely, India refusing Amnesty International entrance into certain of their own affairs, and also a big fight in Thailand against the non-governmental organizations.

Do you think that this can tend to break the tyranny of this apparatus?

**LaRouche:** If you get enough of them linked together.

If you get what happened in Thailand, this resistance and what Fujimori has done in Peru, or what some of the others have done in Peru, very plainly speaking on this—and they can speak even more bluntly about organizations which, in the name of “defending” human rights, don’t defend human rights in other cases, intervene to help the guerrillas.

The Abimael Guzmán case is a good example.

All these people are so concerned about poor old Guzmán, this mass murderer. It reminds me of people coming to the rescue of Adolf Hitler’s corpse or something. It’s disgusting. Absolutely disgusting stuff.

If this is resisted in a united way, and say, “cut it out,” it can be stopped.

## **Natural Law and the Right to Revolt**

**RQ:** On the Venezuelan situation: As you know, the Bush administration and the Clinton administration, have backed President Carlos Andrés Pérez [known as CAP] and actually spoken of a total boycott against Venezuela should there be a successful movement to overthrow his corrupt regime. What do you think of this as U.S. policy?

**LaRouche:** Of course, it’s stupid.

We talk about corruption. The United States says it doesn’t want to support corrupt governments, the United States goes on a crusade against alleged corruption in many parts of the world.

Carlos Andrés Pérez is a pretty corrupt character. People talk about democracy; and here you have a President who is disliked heartily by the overwhelming majority of his population. As a matter of fact, the majority of people wanted to coup him; and only the United States has prevented that.

So we would say, by ordinary criteria, that the United States is propping up another unpopular, corrupt, disgusting dictator in the form of CAP. That is what it adds up to; here we have a man whom 90 percent of the population want out. He is accused of corruption left and right; he’s associated with people, or has been, like the Cisneroses, who are most dubious people. He is engaged in acts, or his office is engaged in acts,

which would be considered outrageous repression and corruption. And normally, the United States, you'd think, the State Department, would be screaming up and down, "We've gotta get rid of this corrupt dictator!"

Well, you know, people have to do what they have to do, for the sake of their nation. And if they do it, it were better they do it prudently, taking into account all the risks and taking measures to minimize them; and it were better if they could do it, together with other nations, at the same time—with their backing.

If you are intimidated by such threats into not doing what is necessary to save your nation, then you're betraying your nation. There is always an element of risk in trying to do the right thing in adversity; and if you don't have the courage to do it, then you are not a prisoner of the external force, you are a prisoner of your own cowardice.

**RQ:** A number of the Venezuelan patriots who have tried to get rid of the corrupt government of Carlos Andrés Pérez, countered the U.S. argument of this being a great democracy, by saying, "This is simply an IMF dictatorship." But they mistakenly base their right to overthrow this corrupt regime on a Rousseauvian notion of popular will.

From the standpoint of natural law, how would you define the battle that these forces are in?

**LaRouche:** If you have natural law, in the sense of a constitution; if a President or any other elected official in the country violates natural law, then the institutions of government have a responsibility to remedy the error of the erring institutional government.

In other words, any action in a case like that, has to be taken according to natural law. The idea of the popular will—well, we saw that in France, in 1789 to 1792-1793, in the French Jacobin terror. And that distinction has to be made. It is not the popular will; it is not majority will.

What they are doing, is they're playing up to this talk about "democracy." A crime is not a crime because it is against the popular will; a crime is a crime because it is a violation of natural law.

For example, the unjust murder of *one person*—the murder of one person—may be the occasion for the overthrow of a presidency. Because it's a violation of the law, which cannot be tolerated. It must be brought to account. It is violation of natural rights. Starving a nation for the sake of the IMF. Betraying a nation for the sake of a bunch of cronies, like Cisneros and so forth; these are crimes.

It does not require majority opinion to say they are crimes. We have to defend the dignity and rights of the individual person. We have to defend the dignity of a nation. These are *absolutes*, relatively speaking. This is not a matter of opinion. This is a matter of very clear obligations under laws.

You don't have to have a majority opinion against robbery every time you apprehend somebody for a robbery, you don't have to have a majority opinion against a particular murder before you apprehend someone for that murder. For a violation of natural law, you don't need a majority opinion that natural law ought to be enforced. You have to enforce it. It's merely a fact that it has reached the point that the majority of the people of the country are disgusted with the situation. And that is a fact to be considered, but the authority of law does not flow from popular opinion.

The tactics of action may flow from consideration of popular opinion, but not the rightness or wrongness of an action.

**RQ:** In a certain way, you've just answered this, but I think this would be helpful for a lot of our readers.

What is the basis for the legitimacy of a government, then?

**LaRouche:** Legitimacy? That depends on the way you define law; but history has defined law for us, in the sense that European civilization has demonstrated that certain principles of government are to the benefit of mankind and are consistent with natural law, and certain principles are not. And the conflict within European civilization, disasters and so forth, have exactly reinforced that distinction.

The legitimacy of a government flows from its rightness, that is, a quality of agreement with natural law. For example, the principle of language, that if you are going to have partici-

pation of the individual, first of all, we start with *imago Dei*. Right starts with *imago Dei*. A human being is an image of God, as Philo emphasized, by virtue of a quality in the individual, which echoes, imperfectly, the Creator as creator—the creative power of mind.

It is manifest that only man has this quality among all living creatures, and it is manifest that this is a quality of the individual as an individual, not of some group.

Thus, humanity is based on the principle of *imago Dei*. *Imago Dei* means the creative process, these creative powers. *Imago Dei* means the generation of individuals who have these creative powers, which involves education. *Imago Dei* obliges society to treat the family accordingly; *imago Dei* requires us to provide opportunities for self-employment, that is, for activities in life which are consistent with *imago Dei*.

In order to have this kind of participation, you require a literate form of language which is commonly used by the people who are participating in the joint effort to provide themselves and their posterity with the natural rights and obligations which belong to *imago Dei*. That constitutes a nation.

The legitimacy of the nation is its dedication to that purpose. It establishes institutions which are called constitutional, which are designed to respond to this commitment. That is the extent of the nation. It must be sovereign, because it must make decisions. It can't have some kibitzer coming in and saying, "No, you have to consider this." No, this nation is *accountable* for the welfare of its people; and that is a sovereign responsibility. It's not just a sovereign right; it's a sovereign responsibility. And that is legitimacy.

We talk about these countries—Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Colombia, or Peru. We know what that means. We know these are people who, in a large part of, say, Peru or Mexico, are Indians who were lifted from the conditions by struggles which gave them a form of state which was responsive to the idea of *imago Dei*, the individual. All individuals are *imago Dei*. This form of state, which was dedicated to promoting the welfare of the family, which was dedicated to protecting the health of the individual in the family; which was dedicated



to educating the individual, which was dedicated to providing for *all* persons the opportunity for some kind of work activity in life, which is consistent with being *imago Dei*.

These states have demonstrated in life their legitimacy, by the degree that even when they violate their obligations, they recognize that that obligation has been violated or has been neglected. It is that commitment to that obligation of the state, through participation in a common language by people who agree to live together, for this purpose, to share these benefits and to share these responsibilities. That is legitimacy.

And when somebody comes in and brings in usury, "Well, no, people have a right—" "Usury has its rights, too." Let's eliminate usury, and we will eliminate the problem. That is the issue.

But people do things that actually violate these principles. Then some idiot comes along and says, "No, you can't do that, because not everybody agrees with *imago Dei*." They say, "What about democracy? Let's use democracy as an idea."

"What do you mean by democracy?"

"Well, everybody has their own opinion."

"How about right from wrong?"

"Oh, that's a matter of opinion."

Now, at that point, once you deny a distinction between right and wrong, that everything is just a matter of opinion, a matter of democracy, *you deny the very idea of legitimacy*; because you deny the idea of right and wrong.

So the attack on the denial of right and wrong is itself a denial of legitimacy; and a state that enforces, accepts the idea of democracy in that sense, as a substitute for legitimacy, has lost legitimacy. And you can dig up old Mencius, the follower of Confucius, who will give from a Chinese standpoint an argument to a similar effect.

## The Role of the Armed Forces

**RQ:** Could you discuss what you think the proper mission for the military in Latin America is?

**LaRouche:** The military is an instrument of legitimacy of the

state. That is exactly what it is. That is what it is intended to be. It is an institution of people who, by profession and by selection, are committed as officers, for example—above all, first the officers corps—to the defense and promotion of the best interests of the nation, not only in an ordinary military way, but in every way, as figures dedicated to that purpose.

The enlisted personnel are people who are selected as persons who accept that and accept the leadership of the officers corps in that direction.

We build up in a military a professional non-commissioned officer corps, which is actually engaged, day to day, hour to hour, in the training and leadership of the enlisted troops.

We know what that is. We know the obligation of the military, the scientific and other education which a military officer must have, and which the others must share in, to some degree. We know the importance of that in the defense of the nation, in building nations.

For example, the civil engineering role of the military, which I have often emphasized as one which is necessary to maintain its balanced character. That is, the civil engineering in national projects, national interests. It *must* be participating in the economic life.

A military arm that cannot organize its own logistics, cannot function as a military arm. A military arm is by definition involved in economy. It is involved in economic policy; it's got to defend the nation. It's got to consider the logistics of the defense of the nation.

It must go to the government and say, "We must as a nation have this economic development of our infrastructure and resources, and deal with the logistical problems of defense of the nation."

I would say, in a case like that, you have to consider the source; and sometimes, what is in the document tells you what the quality of the source is. These people want to destroy these countries, pure and simple.

**RQ:** Do you have a final message to our readers in Ibero-America?

**LaRouche:** Yes, what we were just talking about, in a sense.

We have had a fight to try to save this part of the world from the attempt to destroy it by these forces. We could have won a great deal more. We would have won in 1982, if the governments of Brazil and Argentina had continued to maintain the promise of alliance with López Portillo. We would have won this fight. And people should never forget that.

I am used to victories of that type. We all came close to winning that, except that the governments of Brazil and Argentina capitulated, and abandoned López Portillo. That is why all these countries have suffered since then. We would have won! We had it in our hand right then! And they blew it, by their cowardice and vacillation—and Henry Kissinger's blandishments.

We almost won the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)—we did win the SDI, in a sense. We didn't win the policy but we won the *effect* which brought down the Wall, which brought down the Soviet system as a result of the fact that Reagan adopted it; that was enough to set into motion a chain of events.

We can win again.

Now, in Ibero-America, that is the lesson to be learned, the lesson of 1982. We have seen the horror that has happened since 1982 as a result of the *cowardice* of the governments of Brazil and the Argentine junta at that time, when they abandoned López Portillo. *We had it in our hand, we would have won but for their cowardice.*

Once that lesson is understood, we know what to do, in this part of the Hemisphere. That is all we really need to know, for that part. Correct that error; and do not be cowards the next time around—and do not betray the struggle once you have joined it; it is even worse than being a coward.