LaRouche in Argentina:  
‘My policy or Kissinger’s’

by Cynthia Rush

On a leading Buenos Aires television talk show aired one evening during the last week of June, host Bernardo Neustadt provocatively posed the following question to a group of trade union guests: “Well, U.S. candidate Lyndon LaRouche is in our country and reports that he is Henry Kissinger’s number one enemy. Now, whom do you prefer—Kissinger or LaRouche?”

That question accurately sums up the options presented to representatives of every sector of Argentina’s political spectrum—including the nation’s President—in conversations and meetings held with U.S. presidential contender and EIR founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. during the week of June 24-30. At a time when Argentina was, and remains, under fierce pressure from its foreign creditors to submit to the austerity conditionalities of the International Monetary Fund, LaRouche visited Argentina at the invitation of several private institutions whose leaders thought it urgent that the U.S. Democrat’s policy recommendations elaborated in the August 1982 document Operation Juarez, and his evaluation of the world financial and strategic crisis be widely disseminated in their country.

LaRouche’s visit to Buenos Aires occurred 10 days after Ibero-American debtor nations met in Cartagena, Colombia to coordinate their approach to the continent’s debt crisis; and as the Alfonsín government approached another end-of-quarter cliffhanger situation in which it had to choose between paying $460 million in back interest payments or see creditor banks declare its foreign debt to be non-performing. The country managed to squeak by the June 30 deadline by agreeing to contribute $325 million of its own reserves, together with a $125 million short-term loan from creditors. The banks showed some flexibility in lending the $125 million without an IMF agreement, but exacted an agreement from the government to impose a new austerity program whose announcement has already exacerbated the domestic crisis and threatens to unleash new instability. Thus Alfonsín is still faced with the option that has been posed to Argentina ever since the 1982 Malvinas War: accept the IMF’s dictates, or join with the rest of Ibero-America’s debtors in programmatic unity as outlined by LaRouche in Operation Juárez.

Intense counterorganizing efforts ordered from the highest levels of the State Department, including the deployment to Argentina of “the Henry Kissinger of Latin America,” Luigi Einaudi, did not prevent LaRouche from meeting and holding far-ranging discussions with representatives of the major political parties in Congress, the trade union movement, the scientific and cultural communities, and high-level members of the Armed Forces, culminating in the meeting with President Alfonsín on the morning of June 28.

Kissinger’s friends in the State Department are still foaming at the mouth over this latter meeting. As one UPI reporter insisted to this writer, “well, how did this meeting materialize? Let’s face it, the President of Argentina doesn’t meet with just anybody, especially not on the day before $460 million in interest payments are due to foreign creditors. What is LaRouche doing here?”

In a press conference following the meeting at the presidential palace—the Casa Rosada—LaRouche said that when he elected President of the United States, he would aid Argentina “with justice and equality to overcome the crisis unleashed by its foreign debt.” LaRouche reported that he had expressed to President Alfonsín his “respect for the sovereignty of this country,” adding that “I come as a personal friend of the Argentine President and feel that he and I are...
pleased to have met each other.” The U.S. Democrat added that he was able to explain his policy proposals to Alfonsin and “comment on some things that were said in confidence and establish mutual respect.” He expressed confidence that he could be “useful to future relations between the two countries, as a public political figure whose voice is very loud, strong, and very controversial in my own country.”

An American patriot

The warmth and enthusiasm with which LaRouche was greeted in almost every case is testimony to the failure of desperate State Department counterorganizing. Argentine patriots attempting to save their nation from Henry Kissinger’s plans for social and political dissolution, were astounded to discover in LaRouche an outspoken defender of their national interests inside the United States who could provide them not only with sane policy recommendations but also with a differentiated sense of the political battles taking place in Washington.

LaRouche’s presence in Buenos Aires defused the rampant “Yankee-go-home” mentality that permeates most political circles. His explanation of Henry Kissinger’s takeover of the White House and control of U.S. foreign policy allowed concerned Argentines to understand for the first time the origin of policies defended by the Reagan administration that are so obviously contrary to U.S. national interests, and to U.S. relations with Ibero-America. And they were tremendously moved by LaRouche’s commitment to reestablishing an alliance of the sovereign republics of the Western Hemisphere bound by common philosophical, historical, and cultural ties. Argentina, LaRouche constantly reiterated, has a vigorous republican tradition based on American System economics, which must be revived.

Exemplary of this warmth was the commentary of prominent members of Argentina’s scientific community as they listened to LaRouche’s staunch defense of the nation’s vanguard nuclear program—the pride of nationalist civilian and military sectors—which the State Department is determined to dismantle, and specific proposals for transforming Argentina into the continental leader of a scientific and cultural renaissance. At a seminar at the Foundation for a Project Argentina, which included representatives of the Argentine Nuclear Technology Association (AATN), and the National Atomic Energy Commission (CNEA), LaRouche’s presentation visibly moved the participants. Dr. Cosentino, a Perónist nuclear physicist from the CNEA who was chosen by Gen. Juan Perón to help launch the nuclear program in 1953, told the audience: “Thirty years ago, I heard a powerful speech given by Gen. Juan Perón, when he announced his decision to initiate the nuclear program, and the strength of it has carried me through the last 30 years. Now today, I have heard a similar speech from Mr. LaRouche. . . .” Dr. Cosentino later marveled, as did others, that a man of LaRouche’s qualities was actually a presidential candidate in the United States. “When I think of our own presidential candidates, and others in the United States,” he said, “I am amazed. We need a man like you here in Argentina.”

LaRouche sparked a similar response, leading to several hours of discussion, among a group of prominent young economists when he outlined the real origins of the current Ibero-American and world debt crisis and what’s behind U.S. economic and foreign policy. “Argentina doesn’t have a problem,” LaRouche told them. “The banks have a problem. Why negotiate with them? You can only do so when both sides negotiate in good faith. But the banks aren’t doing that. They’re bankrupt. The IMF is not negotiating in good faith. They are prepared to destroy you. Volcker and Kissinger want to destroy every Ibero-American nation. The people of Argentina know something about the problem of colonialism . . . you certainly know something about the problem with the British. So you can’t be fooled by this nonsense. I think the people of Argentina have the resources and the intelligence to respond appropriately.”

In this and other meetings, LaRouche emphasized that the momentum created at the recent conference of 11 debtor nations at Cartagena, Colombia must be maintained. “The meeting at Cartagena was a political success,” LaRouche told a June 28 press conference, “even though the United States thought it was going to fail.” “If the Ibero-Americans negotiate individually, they will become cadavers, and this is what is forcing them into a coalition, just as we anticipated. Central America is a bloody mess; Ecuador is threatened; Bolivia is dying; Venezuela and Brazil have false illusions, and the Colombian situation is extremely difficult. . . .” In the same press conference, LaRouche outlined in detail the major aspects of his proposals for setting up a new gold-reserve monetary system, and reorganizing the debts of Ibero-America in a manner that would guarantee industrial and technological development.

Philosophical revolution needed

What Lyndon LaRouche succeeded in transmitting to all groups with which he met in Buenos Aires is his assessment that Argentina is the country in Ibero-America most capable at this moment of launching a cultural and philosophical revolution. “I have not seen in the last 20 years a population as committed to the ideas of progress and cultural optimism as this one,” the U.S. presidential candidate commented. Argentina’s levels of cultural, educational, and technological development, heavily influenced by the most positive classical traditions of Europe, uniquely qualify it to become a scientific leader of the entire continent, LaRouche emphasized.

It is precisely Argentina’s potential for becoming an industrial and scientific leader of Ibero-America that the international banking community and the State Department are determined to smash at all cost. Their vision is one of a nation wracked by social upheaval, terrorism, and civil war unleashed as national political and cultural institutions and infrastructure are deliberately dismantled through applica-
tion of destructive and irrational economic policies.

In the year since this writer last visited Argentina, this scenario has moved closer to reality. The economic chaos inherited from the previous military regime has worsened, leading to a visible process of social dissolution. For the first time in the cosmopolitan city of Buenos Aires, a scene which is unprecedented in Argentina—small children begging for food or money—is becoming commonplace. “Whatever you see in the capital, where there is still money,” one friend commented, “the situation in the interior of the country is devastating. For the first time in this country, people do not have food to eat . . . in Argentina, the breadbasket of South America!” Now, on two days a week, meat cannot be purchased anywhere in Buenos Aires, as Argentines are told that their “overconsumption” of beef is responsible for inflation!

Other contacts described the appearance of groups of abandoned children sleeping in subway stations, and of neighborhoods whose streets clear off at 5 p.m. because inhabitants fear attack from gangs of youth or unemployed workers who rob out of desperation. A strike wave of as many as 2.8 million workers in one week—comprising 63% of the work force of the province of Buenos Aires—is also commonplace. And trade union leadership has no control over the increasing number of wildcat strikes and protest actions taken by workers who cannot survive on current salaries.

State Department goes berserk

In this kind of crisis environment, in which political leaders are searching for viable solutions, the State Department correctly perceived that Argentines would be open to Lyndon LaRouche’s alternative policy viewpoint. Evidence of this was his meeting with such important policy-making bodies as the Peronist Comando Superior, the entity just established by former head-of-state Mrs. Isabel Perón through which to exercise her leadership over the Peronist movement. High-level members of the armed forces, who warmly recall LaRouche’s defense of Argentina during the 1982 Malvinas War, also met with the U.S. Democrat to candidly discuss the world strategic crisis and the nature of U.S.-Argentine military relations.

Reliable sources have informed EIR that U.S. ambassador in Buenos Aires, Frank Ortiz, directly intervened on orders from higher up to sabotage meetings between LaRouche and Argentine leaders, especially the meeting set with President Alfonsín. On the day that LaRouche was scheduled to meet with members of the Peronist bloc of deputies at the national congress, the U.S. embassy invited the same grouping to attend a special luncheon for State Department coup-maker Luigi Einaudi. However, the senators boycotted the luncheon, and informed the embassy that they could not attend because they had a meeting with “friends.”

Several frantic calls were placed from the embassy to the executive council of the Peronist trade union federation, the CGT, to tell them not to meet with LaRouche. But these efforts also failed: the 30-man executive met with LaRouche in a 3-hour luncheon at the meatpackers union hall, characterized by sometimes heated debate over the treasonous role of AFL-CIO president Lane Kirkland and organizations like the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), a think-tank run by the AFL-CIO outside the United States, in defending Henry Kissinger’s policies for Ibero-America. The trade union leaders described the meeting as “historic” and effusively thanked LaRouche for discussing these issues with them.

Henry Kissinger and his associates at the IMF and the State Department, are not about to forgive the Argentine government for having met with Lyndon LaRouche, however.

Only a few days after LaRouche’s departure from Argentina, the Alfonsín government faced a crisis within the armed forces which, from all indications, reveals widespread coup plotting against the government. On July 3, the commander of the III Army Corps stationed in Córdoba staged an uprising, ostensibly to protest poor wages, attacks on the institution of the armed forces, and ongoing trials of military officers accused of “excesses” in the 1970s war against subversion. The commander-in-chief of the army General Arquindegui attempted to squelch the rebellion by firing its visible leader, Gen. Pedro Mansilla, but was prevented from doing so by a group of young colonels who threw their support behind Mansilla.

To calm military tensions, Alfonsín intervened directly and ousted not only Mansilla but also Arquindegui, handing dangerous advantage to the rebellious faction. General Pantia, the officer chosen to replace Arquindegui, is a factional ally of the rebel General Mansilla! Sources in Buenos Aires have reported to EIR that the allegedly ‘nationalist’ colonels group is backed by political and financial networks in the direct employ of Swiss and Venetian oligarchy; their goal is to stage a coup against Alfonsín and replace him with his more “controllable” vice-president Víctor Martínez, who is closely tied to British financial interests. However, a military coup at this point would unleash civil war and social chaos that would quickly become uncontrollable.

Human rights organizations and Zionist-led ultraleft factions of the Radical Civic Union (UCR) have accelerated their activities in recent days to exacerbate military unrest. Over the opposition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the government authorized the July 3 showing of an hour-and-a-half TV documentary sponsored by the Permanent Commission on Disappeared Persons, which charged the military with gross violations of human rights and illegal repressive practices in the war against subversion. Provocatively entitled “Never Again,” the documentary was intended to convey the lying message also transmitted by U.S. and European liberal media over recent years—that the Argentine armed forces are Nazis who must be destroyed.
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Argentina’s press covers LaRouche

The following is excerpted from the article published in the Buenos Aires daily Clarín, under the headline “Alfonsín Met with a U.S. Democrat,” on June 29, 1984.

The Democratic Party precandidate for the presidency of the United States, Lyndon LaRouche, yesterday visited President Raul Alfonsín to express his solidarity with Argentina’s position in the renegotiation of its foreign debt and with [Argentina’s] claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

The North American politician asserted that his visit “in no way bore the smell of Yankee imperialism or arrogance,” especially considering “something that impressed me considerably in 1982: the Malvinas War in which the United States failed Argentina.” . . . The politician condemned the attitude of his country’s banks and politicians in their treatment of Argentina in the renegotiation of the latter’s foreign debt.

The following are excerpts from an article published in the afternoon daily, La Razón, under the headline “Lyndon LaRouche, U.S. Presidential Precandidate, Met with the Head of State,” on June 28, 1984.

Lyndon LaRouche, pre-candidate of the Democratic Party for the presidency of the United States, stated today that were he elected, he would be in a position to help Argentina with “justice and equality” to overcome the crisis unleashed by its foreign debt. He maintained that the amount of this debt is “truly unknown” but added that “if an accountant were to analyze it, he would find that it is really a third of the stated amount.” He mentioned that the crisis originated with the “bankruptcy of the North American banks, [whose personnel] do not believe in technological progress, and has a philosophy different from that of the Ibero-American peoples. . . .”

[LaRouche] indicated that his conversation with the Argentine head-of-state was very useful, because he was able to explain his policies and “say some things in confidence, and establish mutual respect.” He commented that he was able to communicate that “I am a personal friend of the Argentine President, and feel that the President and I are pleased to have met each other.”

He said . . . that many of the problems which afflict U.S. relations with Latin American countries arise from Henry Kissinger’s insertion as an adviser in the Reagan administration.

An acid critique of U.S. foreign policy toward Argentina and unconditional support for the actions of the Argentine government, which he characterized as “patriotic,” were the chief characteristics of the press conference given at a downtown hotel last night by the economist and U.S. Democratic Party presidential precandidate Lyndon LaRouche.

His first comments pertained to nuclear energy: “While I spoke with president Alfonsín this morning on general matters, I wanted to emphasize one point in which I and various other members of my country’s political life differ with the Reagan administration. . . . We do not agree with the policy of conditioning all [debt] negotiations to the suppression of Argentina’s nuclear program. . . .”

As for the policies that the Democrats will apply to Latin America if they win, the visitor commented: “If our faction doesn’t win . . . it will be terrible. If you think the Republicans are bad, Mondale will be worse. We want to defeat him, and the only way is to use a form of legal blackmail against Reagan. To do that we propose two basic points: unite the continent from Mexico to Tierra del Fuego, creating a customs union to promote technological and agricultural cooperation. This would favor existing barter with the installation of a new monetary system for industrial development. This is the second point: The U.S. must place the dollar on a new gold standard and thus permit the reorganization of these nations’ foreign debt. . . .

LaRouche stated . . . that were he the president of Argentina, “in the United States they would think that I were as bad as Perón . . . I’m not Perón although I might not do things so differently. I would put aggressive, nasty people like myself in office and would hope for the triumph of the Cartagena decisions. We don’t want countries to collapse one by one, that’s why the renegotiation must be done on a joint basis, but not through the international financial institutions; governments must decide and then tell the bankers, who are bankrupt and can’t handle the situation. The government of the United States and the debtor nations must decide on solutions and ship the bankers off to the zoo where they won’t be allowed near little children.”