Argentina: A Lesson From Lazare Carnot

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. submitted this paper to a meeting entitled “Brazil-Argentina: The Moment of Truth,” held on Jan. 18 in Passo Fundo, Brazil.

I transmit the following message of greeting to the esteemed meeting of citizens from Argentina and Brazil:

As a U.S. Presidential candidate, I have a grave patriotic concern for the danger which my nation is inflicting upon both itself and the world at large. This danger is as much through the consequences of my republic’s own continuing follies, as any plausible external adversary. I express that same concern for those natural hemispheric partners of my republic, such as the republics of Argentina and Brazil.

We have, each and all among us, lately entered into the most perilous period of the history of globally extended European civilization since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. As the most consistently successful economic forecaster of the recent thirty-odd years, I assure you that the crisis into which we have entered this year, is not a mere world economic depression, but a threatened general breakdown of civilization as a whole, a breakdown which threatens, rather immediately, to bring a prolonged new dark age upon this planet as a whole.

Inevitably, the recent months’ onset of the terminal phase of collapse of the post-1971 world monetary-financial system, has plunged us again into a new period of intensified global warfare and related homicidal strife. The events of Sept. 11, 2001 and the rising tide of warfare since, are, echoing the Adolf Hitler coups d’état of 1933-34, to be recognized as a lawful expression and correlative of the collapse of the present IMF monetary-financial system.

These crisis-developments intersect the insurgency of a long-prepared military policy, a so-called “utopian” military policy, that associated with U.S. figures such as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington, modelled upon the immediate historical precedent of the internationalized Nazi Waffen-SS.

The recently attempted, Sept. 11th military coup against the government of U.S. President George W. Bush, and the efforts to bring the U.S. into a utopian form of military alliance with the present military dictatorship of Israel, to launch genocidal global religious-ethnic warfare, are the reality within which the present threats to Argentina and Brazil are also immediately situated. It is the military threat from those treacherous utopians, against the U.S. Constitution and other targets, which constitutes the special characteristic of the present deadly situation.

How shall we deal with the military component of this threat? I introduce an observation which should not be overlooked in these circumstances.

Since U.S. President Harry S Truman’s firing of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, Anglo-American and NATO military policies, have been transformed into rejection of the principle of the citizen-soldier, upon which the great improvements in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century military philosophy had been premised. These traditions, which won U.S. Independence, the U.S. Civil War of 1861-1865, and World War II, have been largely uprooted, subverted, and replaced, increasingly by a new military and related strategic doctrine.

Indeed, these perversions of military policy were denounced publicly by MacArthur himself, as by U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower, the distinguished U.S. Senator William Fulbright, and others.

These perverted, so-called “utopian” military doctrines, as defended by Samuel P. Huntington in his 1957 The Soldier and the State, are an avowed attempt to revive the imperial doctrine and practice of the pagan Roman imperial legions. That Roman imperial tradition, was echoed by the private armies deployed by the British East India Company, and was the model used to establish the first modern fascist state, that of the Emperor Napoleon III. The fascism of Napoleon and
of his imitator Benito Mussolini, was copied by Adolf Hitler. The tradition of the Roman legions was echoed by that internationalist evolution of the Nazi Waffen-SS. That pagan Roman tradition, and the Nazi Waffen-SS precedent, has served as the model for the doctrine of universal fascism taught and practiced today as the military doctrine of the U.S.A. utopians such as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Huntington, and promoted by institutions such as the Smith-Richardson, Olin, and Mellon-Scaife foundations, and others.

That utopianism is presently the immediate threat to the continued very existence of Argentina and Brazil as sovereign states, as to the entirety of Central and South America, and to civilization at large.

The build-up of this transformation in U.S., Anglo-American, and NATO military policies and practices, was launched by the firing of MacArthur, thus introducing, immediately, the folly of a kind of protracted warfare in Korea, which was later reenacted in a more extreme, more disastrous form as the U.S. war in Indo-China, and, again, in wild-eyed utopian Zbigniew Brzezinski’s 1979 launching of a protracted geopolitical war in Afghanistan.

We live today under the combined circumstances of an onrushing disintegration of the present world monetary-financial system and the efforts of the confederates of Brzezinski to launch a generalized “clash of civilizations” state of planetary religious and ethnic warfare. There are certain lessons from modern history which must enjoy the foremost attention of serious political forces everywhere. The leading object-lesson of reference, ought to be the doom which the fascist emperor Napoleon Bonaparte encountered in his Russian campaign of 1812, a campaign against which a greatly superior military mind, Lazare Carnot, explicitly warned Emperor-turned-bandit Napoleon himself.

The Strategic Alternative

Consider then the concept of citizen-soldier and the principle of defense, as advocated and practiced by Carnot, and adopted by Russia’s allies Scharnhorst, et al. respecting Napoleon’s Russia campaign of 1812.

The only justified purpose of warfare, is the establishment of a more or less durable condition of peace. This policy requires a defeat of the adversary, but never either the virtual extermination, or crushing of the defeated people. The intent must be, to define the defeated nation as an essential pillar of a post-war peace; his defeat is best brought about by his acceptance of that future role as a bright pillar of peace in a

---

Brazil-Argentina: ‘The Hour of Truth’

The fourth meeting on “Brazil-Argentina: Hour of Truth,” held in Passo Fundo in the Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul on Jan. 18, marked a significant step forward in building a movement to unify South America around Lyndon LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods strategy. The movement is being jointly organized by LaRouche’s Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) and the Movement for National Identity and Ibero-American Integration (MINeoII), which is oriented by Argentine political prisoner and former colonel, Mohamed Ali Seineldin.

LaRouche’s message to the meeting was read in its entirety.

Occurring as it did in the middle of the Argentine financial blowout, the meeting generated a lot of press interest, with one regional television program broadcasting an interview with LaRouche spokesman Lorenzo Carrasco on Argentina and LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods.

Seventy-five people participated, including local dignitaries, 10-15 trade unionists from the region around Passo Fundo, agricultural producers, and a van-load of people from the neighboring state of Santa Catarina. Argentina was represented by two agricultural leaders from the northern state of Corrientes, who provided the Brazilians with a firsthand report on the crisis there.

The Mayor of Passo Fundo welcomed the participants, and two federal congressmen from the state attended the meeting: Deputy Luis Carlos Heinze, who chairs the Agriculture Commission of the House of Deputies and has participated in several previous “Brazil-Argentina” meetings, spoke on how regional integration can work. Deputy Augusto Nardes also spoke.

Many participants were shocked at how LaRouche and Seineldin had warned in advance of what is now happening in Argentina. Lorenzo Carrasco presented a global strategic overview, including graphs that show Argentina to be a case-study in why no solution other than LaRouche’s can work. He also delivered greetings from Colonel Seineldin, reading parts of Seineldin’s message to the second “Brazil-Argentina” meeting last August, in which he warned that governments around the world would fall, unless they addressed economic reality, and listened to LaRouche. EIR correspondent Silvia Palacios presented EIR’s new Portuguese-language book, Terror Against the Nation-State, which contains LaRouche’s major post-Sept. 11 interviews, and exposes the World Social Forum as an instrument of irregular warfare. Nilder Costa spoke on development corridors as the way to develop the productive capabilities of Ibero-America.
post-war order.

MacArthur illustrated this brilliantly in the Pacific war of 1941-1945, especially when MacArthur’s policies are compared with the bloody, but unnecessary battles fought in the Pacific by U.S. commanders of an errant, contrary persuasion. MacArthur’s policy of blockade of Japan had brought the islands to the point of imminent, inevitable surrender; the use of nuclear bombs on civilians was one of the greatest moral and strategic follies of the past fifty-six years.

In all respects, neither war, nor the perpetual search of mad legionnaires for new choices of plausible choices of enemy, are the normal condition of mankind. War, to the extent it is justified, is a phase in the effort of mankind to achieve that “multi-polar” order prescribed by then-U.S. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, as a community of principle among perfectly sovereign nation-state republics.

To this end, the lust of the legionnaire for new victim-enemies, and new wars, must be met by a philosophically republican emphasis on the principle of the citizen-soldiers’ strategy of defense, as Carnot and Scharnhorst exemplify the principle of the matter. Just as the strategy of defense defeated the presumably unconquerable “Waffen-SS” of Napoleon’s Grand Armée, so we must rely on the same underlying principle of a strategy of defense, today.

The soldier must be a builder, not a killer, by profession. Contrary to the aristocratic cabinet-warriors of the Eighteenth Century, Carnot was a scientist-engineer who upheld the lessons of Vauban’s methods of defense. Scharnhorst was a citizen, educated, under the program designed by the great Moses Mendelssohn at the military academy of Wilhelm Graf Schaumburg-Lippe.

**The Soldier As Engineer**

During 1792-1794 Carnot defeated all those foreign armies intent upon the destruction and dismemberment of France, not only by the levée en masse, but by the combination of excellent principles of command with the greatest science-engineering program undertaken in world history up to that time. Scharnhorst’s conception of the essentially decisive role of the citizen serving as soldier, and the development of the general staff principle, by Carnot, and Scharnhorst, produced the most effective form of modern military policy. This was a policy based on the principle of strategic defense, and based upon the educational and scientific-technological development of the citizen of the sovereign nation-state republic.

These characteristic qualities emphasized by those great pioneers in the modern strategy of defense must be contrasted with the characteristic features of the mentality and practice of the utopian universal fascists of contemporary military and related practice. For the purposes of strategy, the key expression of that difference lies in the fact, that the republican army conquers by building economic potential, whereas the utopian seeks to conquer through his efforts to destroy that potential. Therein lies the key to outflanking the utopian’s strategy.

Approximately half of the per-capita economic potential of any nation lies essentially in the development of what is called basic economic infrastructure. This features state-directed programs in revolutionizing the quality of land-areas, through large-scale water management, national and regional mass transportation systems, national and regional power systems of increasing energy-flux-density, urban organization, and educational systems which educate all of the population according to Classical standards for education in science and Classical culture.

While some part of this may be done by private entrepreneurs, the undivestible responsibility for the development, maintenance, and regulation of basic economic infrastructure lies with the executive powers of the national government. All basic economic infrastructure must be regulated by the relevant institutions of national, state, and local government, whether or not the work is done by government agencies, or franchised private entrepreneurs. Historically, the military corps of engineers, or, what are in effect, the same functions performed by the military under other titles, has been a crucial element within the national effort as a whole. The past contributions of the U.S. military Corps of Engineers, is exemplary.

The great military leaders never overlooked the tactical
implications of training a national military force and its reserves as an engineering capability. The superior combat qualities of the German soldier, as developed under Moltke according to the intent of Scharnhorst, is a striking demonstration of the point. It was largely in this aspect, the logistical side, that the U.S. soldier, less capable than the German in combat equations, accomplished his mission in World War II. However, combining both national experiences, and those of other nations, we should recognize the role of the combination of Classical humanist education policies and technological progress, in providing the social basis for the successful implementation of that doctrine of Auftragstaktik upon which combat excellence of the German military unit substantially depended.

We say to those who are duped into admiring the utopians: “Soldier, could you rebuild what you just blew up?”

Today, throughout the world, we are faced with a terrible shrinkage of the average productive powers of labor relative to the past. Argentina offers the clearest example of the destruction of a nation’s economic potential under the impact of post-1964 U.S. policies, especially post-1971, and post-1982 policies for the hemisphere. Throughout the Americas, there is a vast deficit in development of basic economic infrastructure. As in Argentina and Brazil, some of the vastest and richest potential of the planet as a whole, is sitting fallow because of (chiefly) foreign meddling to prevent that development of basic economic infrastructure, upon which the realization of that vast potential depends.

Given the hordes of massed unemployment and misemployment, and given the urgent need to bring these economies substantially above the physical-economic break-even levels once again, the principal immediate opportunity for rapid increase in useful employment, lies in implementation of waiting plans for large-scale infrastructural development. For much of this work, the military engineering teams perform an indispensable role. This initiative on the military side, then provides the main body of the skeleton on which the civilian side of infrastructure-building adds the muscle and flesh.

The use of the principle of perfect sovereignty of the nation-state, to put corrupted financial systems into state-directed bankruptcy-reorganization, and to, simultaneously, mobilize and direct created national credit, for the vast expansion of employment, into infrastructure-building and other productive endeavors, is the only way in which to defend, and to save nations, under the present circumstances in the world at large.

The alternatives to that set of measures, are all horrible consequences for the nation and humanity at large.

The War on Terrorism

In conclusion, I emphasize the following on the subject of the so-called “war against terrorism.”

The universal-fascist policies of decadent utopians such as Brzezinski and Huntington, conquer by destroying what they consume. They have thus weakened the very forces on which their strength of capability depends. Unfortunately, by that very same logic, the present conduct of the U.S.’s military deployments under the rubric of “war against terrorism,” tend to defeat the very stated purpose of that campaign.

The first source of the problem lies in the currently popular
There is a phenomenon which corresponds to some of that which the current policy calls “international terrorism.” Unfortunately, the lack of precision in the definition of the term creates a problem potentially as deadly as the terrorism itself.

The proper word for the problem is not “terrorism.” The name of the problem is the utopian development of so-called “special warfare” during the recent fifty-odd years. The new doctrines and practice of “special warfare” were adapted to the new conditions defined by H.G. Wells’ and Bertrand Russell’s stated intent to use nuclear weapons as a threat so terrible that, as Wells and Russell stated, nations would give up their sovereignty to world government, to avoid war. States therefore relied increasingly on covert forms of “irregular warfare,” as ways of conducting warfare against other nations, or even targeted large sections of their own population.

An example of this is the way in which the Italian fascist element which the U.S. and Britain incorporated into the secret post-war organization “Gladio” was used as an instrument of Anglo-American and Israeli terrorist operations against Italy during the 1970s. The assassination of Aldo Moro was a notable example of this; the earlier assassination of Italy’s Enrico Mattei and attempted assassination of France’s President Charles de Gaulle, were also examples of this same method for targeting France’s President.

Under U.S. National Security Advisors Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, increasingly large-scale use of irregular warfare using private armies financed largely by proceeds of weapons- and drug-trafficking, became the leading direction of development. “Iran-Contra” was a leading example of this. The shift to such forms of “special warfare,” begun on a large scale by Brzezinski in Afghanistan, was correlated with an accelerating purging of the U.S. and other military institutions of their traditional capabilities and outlooks, and increasing emphasis on the soldier as a wild-eyed “Nintendo killer.”

To defeat what is legitimately denounced as the effects of international terrorism, we must, first of all, clean out the money-laundering systems associated with the traffic in drugs, and related problems. This, relevant governments, so far, are unwilling to do. However, we must also do two other things.

We must uproot the capabilities for actions such as those of Sept. 11th, which exist only within the military institutions of the principal powers. We must outflank the utopian warriors, by using our weapon, economic growth, against their weapon, lunatic destruction. If we do not find the courage to defend economic growth against the demands that we dismantle essential elements of our economies, we, by our own negligence, would have surrendered already to the utopian reign of general destruction of humanity as a whole.

There is no price, a true patriot would not pay, to prevent such a dark age from descending upon humanity as a whole.

---

**Conference Report**

**Egyptian Expert Raises Questions on Sept. 11**

Dr. Mahmoud Khalaf gave this speech, entitled “Who Committed the Sept. 11 Attacks, and Why?” at a seminar at the Center for Asian Studies at the University of Cairo, on Dec. 5, 2002. The meeting was hosted by the center’s director, Prof. Mohammed Selim. EIR correspondent Muriel Mirak-Weissbach also spoke, presenting Lyndon LaRouche’s analysis of Sept. 11 (see last week’s EIR). Dr. Khalaf is a strategic analyst; a retired Major General; a fellow of the Nasr Higher Military Academy; a member of the Royal College of Defense Studies (RCDS), London; and honorary member of the Association of the United States Army, Fort Benning, Georgia. He participated in several training courses with the U.S. Army in the United States and Germany. His speech has been translated from the Arabic, and subheads have been added.

The lecture I just listened to [by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach] was very exciting, because it gave me answers to many questions that had remained unanswered on this issue as a whole, from the beginning in Sept. 11 to this moment.

There is one important part, which I want to explain to you very quickly. And this is military-strategic analysis. Military-strategic analysis is an independent branch of science within the strategic sciences, and not mere predictions and speculations. But, it has complete rules that are identical to “post mortem tests,” an autopsy process used to find out the causes of death. The truth is that those who analyzed this precise operation—and I, personally, worked in special operations for 20 years and acquired deep expertise in this subject. This subject, people say, is very complicated and difficult, when they look at it as a whole. But I will explain it to you very briefly. . . .

First, [regarding the Sept. 11 attacks], we are confronted with a technical operation of extremely great dimensions. We estimate that the planning organ for this operation must have consisted of at least 100 specialized technicians, who needed one year for planning. Each stage of this operation has many details, and every single technical detail needed measures, which are called “deception” and camouflage, against around ten specialized organs in the United States of America, which are called the “intelligence community.” We will not say the CIA, but we will say the DIA, which is the Defense Intelligence Agency. The DIA has a highly qualified technical capability that enables it to— I will not exaggerate and say it can audio- visually monitor every single square meter of the planet at any moment. There is an agency called the National