

---

## INTERVIEW: Brigadier General Hector Luis Fautario

---

# Former Air Force commander is the first spokesman in the developing sector to endorse beam weapons

*This interview with retired Brig. Gen. Hector Luis Fautario, former commander-in-chief of the Argentine Air Force, was made by Dennis Small, EIR's Ibero-American editor, in Buenos Aires on Oct. 28.*

*Brigadier Fautario was commander-in-chief of the Argentine Air Force from 1973 to 1975. During a career that began in 1942, he occupied the position of chief of Planning and Operations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (1967-1969), and also served as the Air Force chief of Planning and Development. Prior to taking up his position as commander-in-chief in 1973, he served as the Air Force general chief of staff for three years. He is particularly proud of work done as chief of the Cadet Corps, at the Air Force's Aviation School. In that capacity, Brigadier Fautario promoted the fighter training schools which, in his own words, "gave such good results during the Malvinas War, and are the true training-ground of the Air Force." The retired Air Force officer has extensive training in the field of civil aviation, and has attended many international symposia representing Argentina.*

**Small:** On March 23, President Ronald Reagan announced that the United States would adopt a new strategic defense doctrine based on beam weapons. What is your opinion on this strategy and its implications for international military doctrine?

**Fautario:** The policy announced by President Reagan in March hasn't been taken into account—at least not in my country and perhaps not in other Latin American countries. A strategy which completely changes the face of the earth has not been given the attention it deserves. This strategy which opens a completely new panorama on the future nature of war and the future defense of all countries has not been sufficiently broadcast here.

I think that the development of beam weapons . . . is tremendously important; I could compare it directly with the development made by the United States when it launched its famous NASA program to conquer the moon and reach other planets.

It involves a huge investment which evidently will result

in the development not only of all kinds of arms, but also civilian benefits such as in the field of medicine.

This military strategy is going to change the face of the Earth fundamentally because the U.S. will use a new system which already has proclaimed the future obsolescence of all multiple warhead nuclear missiles. Using a laser ray defense or using satellites with multiple warheads could anticipate any nuclear attack.

**Small:** Since the Second World War, the military doctrine called MAD—Mutually Assured Destruction—or the idea of a balance of nuclear terror as the only way of preventing war, has prevailed. What would beam weapons do to that military doctrine?

**Fautario:** I think that beam weapons are fundamentally important, because they totally alleviate that situation [of nuclear terror], given that in that way a massive nuclear attack could be avoided by destroying the rockets with rays directly from the earth or from satellites. . . . I think this would largely paralyze the nuclear terrorism doctrine so prevalent in today's world.

**Small:** Several months ago eminent scientists from the United States and the Soviet Union met in the Italian town of Erice: Dr. Teller for the United States and doctors Aleksandrov and Velikov for the U.S.S.R. They signed a final communiqué which called for the joint study of beam weapons to analyze the possibilities of those defense systems. What do you think of this kind of collaboration between the two superpowers?

**Fautario:** I believe that it is very healthy to really take advantage of all the knowledge and all applications of these systems, but I don't know if in practice this situation can be achieved, because Russia, as I understand it, is in a race to develop the laser ray systems ahead of the U.S. This fact forced President Reagan to break secrecy and launch a great program of this nature. Thus I don't know if collaboration will work out. What I believe is that countries like ours have to rapidly associate ourselves to developments of this magnitude because they would ensure the freedom of the world.

**Small:** There are some advocates of the previous MAD doctrine, such as Henry Kissinger, who argue that the world should be re-divided into two empires by means of a "New Yalta" arrangement: a Soviet colonialist empire of the East and a U.S. colonialist empire of the West. Under these circumstances, the countries of the South, according to Kissinger, would play no role at all, since "history is not made in the South." What do you think of these ideas of Henry Kissinger?

**Fautario:** I think that Henry Kissinger knows us quite well because he came to visit a number of times during the military government of the past seven years and has spoken about Argentina. So he knows very well that his policy is a one-way street. It is not exactly one that favors Argentina, but rather opposes all of the Latin American nations. He defends a position that I personally do not share . . . one that proposes cutting off all possibilities for our countries—of all of the Latin American countries—of achieving an industrial development that can be competitive. But [Kissinger's] arguments will always be used, because behind them, is an economic outlook that we do not share.

**Small:** You just spoke about the importance of Argentina associating itself with the development of beam weapons. What specific importance would these developments have for Argentina in economic as well as military fields?

**Fautario:** I believe that we have people in our country who are very capable and can collaborate in this field in much the way that we have developed nuclear energy, with a great sense of coherence. . . . The [development] of lasers would be the same. I believe it is crucial to begin decisively to put our people to work on something like this, which not only affects military strategy as such, but also affects the government's strategy for defending sovereignty.

**Small:** That is, the idea would be to use what has been achieved in nuclear science and technology and extend this into the laser field and use this as a motor to advance the whole economy.

**Fautario:** Precisely. I think this is one of the keys to the future, and in this decade we are inevitably going to see it happen. Any country which does not grasp this situation is a country which is going to be left behind—I have no doubts of that.

**Small:** Our magazine has emphasized, especially in the writings of its founder, Lyndon LaRouche, the idea of civilian use of laser technology. What is the most general meaning of technological development, first, in military strategy and, second, in civilian applications?

**Fautario:** The first application is to military strategy for national defense. And the armed forces necessarily get involved because they are the institutions in charge of these things for the State. The armed forces are the most advanced

in this area, and they can allocate more time and more manpower to a study of this kind. Thus a working group with civilians on high technology is what must be created. For this would be also useful to bring Argentine "brains" back into the country to create consciousness and develop the civilian side at the same time as we develop the military strategic side.

We sincerely believe that in these fields we can then radiate out and spread [these technologies] all over Latin America just as we are doing in the nuclear area.

**Small:** Would you then support some kind of scientific and economic integration with other countries of the continent to work together on lasers, nuclear energy, industrialization, etc. I am thinking specifically of Brazil, where important work in these areas has also been done.

**Fautario:** I think that something like that is fundamental, because it would shatter the scenarios of the people who think that we are in some kind of arms race or something similar here. That conception has to be totally cut through. There is nothing better than true cooperation and unity in this kind of work, for example with Brazil—and not so that the other Latin America countries think that the two "small powers" on the continent are uniting to dominate the rest. But simply because [together] we can offer others an advanced technology which they, for economic reasons, cannot acquire.

**Small:** What do you think of the relations between your country and the United States in this post-Malvinas period? Which way should we go?

**Fautario:** I believe that the Malvinas subject is complicated and unfortunate. In any case Argentina must continue to maintain very good relations with the United States, because the U.S. is a good country to help politically to solve the Malvinas problem and make England negotiate as mandated by the United Nations. That is, the United States must remain close to Argentina. . . . Events have distanced us somewhat, but that doesn't mean that we should not become close once again. . . .

**Small:** And some areas of cooperation could be scientific areas like nuclear energy or laser technologies?

**Fautario:** Exactly. In this case of laser systems, we would have to make a contribution, and we would look forward to a period of participation by the United States, so as to feel truly united in work like this, aside from what could be developed in any other specific field of scientific endeavor.

**Small:** Please explain to me more about your idea of the role of the armed forces in a country like Argentina in this kind of scientific and technological project.

**Fautario:** What happens is that the economy of a country like ours does not have the capacity of the United States to channel a lot of money for scientific development, not even

for private companies which it contracts and permanently encourages for that kind of study. Unfortunately, Argentina is not in that kind of situation. The only institutions that can take the initiative are the armed forces because of the allocation they receive from the State for development, and because they have their own organisms for this work, such as the Air Force's experimental institute in Cordoba, or the joint institutes that we have created with the other branches of the armed forces. . . .

What we must do is increase development through the armed forces which have their research and development institutes, advance the work as much as possible, and then try to turn it over to private industry, providing it with all the help necessary for its in-depth development—that is, for its definitive implementation. The armed forces would always be the controlling factor, not because these are purely military questions but because the armed forces have the largest scientific capability.

**Small:** On Oct. 27, our *EIR* magazine will hold a seminar in Washington on U.S.-Latin American relations, focusing especially on Argentina. What message would you send to the participants in this seminar who are interested in ending a period of strained political relations between our two countries?

**Fautario:** A meeting of that kind is very important, and it is most interesting that Mr. LaRouche's team is organizing it. As a message, I think the main thing is, as I said at the beginning of this interview, that the United States and Argentina must become closer, but opposing those policies that say that everything must come from the North and nothing from the South. That should be understood by the people at the seminar. Latin America has demonstrated that if it unites as a bloc, and does things right—as I think it can—it will give a headache to more than one giant. Let us not awaken the sleeping giant that is Latin America. If it awakens, I think there will be problems all over the world.

Therefore we must seek cooperation and to try to avoid stimulating the type of competition which would lead us only to destruction. Cooperation is fundamental and necessary between great powers. Latin America is such a power, and the United States must recognize it as such. . . .

**Small:** Do you think that the International Monetary Fund contributes to that kind of cooperation?

**Fautario:** No, I think not. There is something which the IMF and any other institution in the world which grants credits should take into account. Our countries can negotiate nothing with the hunger and poverty of our people. They cannot negotiate, as is the case in Brazil, or as may happen here, with the hunger of our workers. Everything has a limit. What I recommend is that this limit not be passed. We like to say that a cord can be stretched, but must not be snapped. I think we are at the snapping point.

## *EIR Special Report*

# How Moscow Plays the Muslim Card in the Middle East

*In the past year, have you. . .*

Suspected that the news media are not presenting an accurate picture of Soviet gains and capabilities in the Middle East?

Wondered how far the Khomeini brand of fundamentalism will spread?

Asked yourself why the United States seems to be making one blunder after another in the Middle East?

If so, you need *EIR's* new Special Report, "How Moscow Plays the Muslim Card in the Middle East." The report documents how Zbigniew Brzezinski's vision of Islamic fundamentalism spreading to break up the Soviet empire is upside down. Instead, using those Islamic radicals, the Soviets are poised for advances on all fronts in the Middle East, from diplomatic ties to conservative Gulf States, to new outbreaks of terrorism, to creating client states such as "Baluchistan" (now part of Pakistan) on the Arabian Sea. The "arc of crisis" has turned into a Soviet "arc of opportunity."

This ground-breaking report covers:

- **History and Mideast policy of the Pugwash Conferences**, whose organization by Bertrand Russell in 1957 involved high-level Soviet participation from the beginning. Pugwash Conferences predicted petroleum crises and foresaw tactical nuclear warfare in the Middle East.
- **The Soviet Islam establishment**, including Shiite-born Politburo member Geidar Aliyev, the Soviet Orientology and Ethnography think tanks, and the four Muslim Boards of the U.S.S.R.
- **Moscow's cooptation of British intelligence networks** (including those of the "Muslim Brotherhood"—most prominent member, Ayatollah Khomeini) and parts of Hitler's Middle East networks, expanded after the war.
- **The U.S.S.R.'s diplomatic and political gains in the region since 1979**. Soviet penetration of Iran as a case study of Moscow's Muslim card. The August 1983 founding of the Teheran-based terrorist "Islamintern," which showed its hand in the Oct. 23 Beirut bombings.

\$250.00. For further information, call William Engdahl, Special Services, at (212) 247-8820 or (800) 223-5594 x 818.