

Argentine Army chief visits London, bows down to the British Empire

by Gretchen Small and Valerie Rush

Argentine Army Commander Gen. Martín Balza was received with honors in Great Britain Nov. 4-6, the highest-level Argentine military officer to visit there since the 1982 Malvinas War. Balza's visit was intended to assure London of the "de-Malvinization" of Argentina. That is, that nationalist elements in Argentina—and particularly within its Armed Forces—will never pose a threat to the British Empire again.

An obsessive concern of both London and General Balza continues to be the nationalist *Carapintada* ("painted face") movement, led by the imprisoned Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín. It was Colonel Seineldín who had identified from the outset that the issues behind the Malvinas War went far beyond the question of territorial sovereignty over the South Atlantic islands. Rather, the war called into question for every nation in the Western Hemisphere, what its relations with imperial London would be.

As Seineldín put it in a 1991 interview with *EIR*, the significance of the war was that, "beyond the military setback, we hit at the nerve center from which all the imperialist maneuvers in the world stem: Great Britain."

Indeed, General Balza's visit to London to pay homage to the Crown, intersects a renewed push by the British Empire to extend its dominion across the continent through mineral, oil, and land grabs. The success of such a drive depends on the emasculation, and eventual dismantling, of the continent's Armed Forces, among other institutions of nationalist resistance. Argentina's military, under General Balza, is already reduced to a mere shadow of its former self, while the armies of Colombia, Peru, Brazil, Mexico, and elsewhere are under attack by hordes of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) largely controlled from London.

General Balza used every opportunity while in London, to bury the Malvinas War, and with it, his nation's history. He called the war "a war without hatred," and insisted that Britain was never more than "a momentary" enemy of Argentina, "the same one with whom we work today jointly in peacekeeping missions." He added that the British "got over the war on June 15 [1982], while some Argentines are still stuck in 1982."

Two articles filed by *Clarín* correspondent Daniel Santoro, during Balza's trip to London, published Nov. 4 and

5, contained the following exact-same formulation: "For the British, ever since he put down the *Carapintada* uprising led by former Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín in 1990, Balza became a guarantor of control over the Army defeated in the Malvinas."

The Nov. 4 article followed that sentence with another: "Until 1990, the British had always placed as a condition for re-establishment of relations, the assurance that the military was subordinate to political power, to back up the word of Argentine democratic governments, that they would not again use force to recover the Malvinas."

The carefully worded formulation was clearly dictated by official channels, to deliver the message that Colonel Seineldín was from the beginning, and continues to be, a *British* prisoner of war, whose incarceration is required for continued Argentine relations with London.

A U.S. defeat

Argentina's defeat by the British in 1982, was also a defeat for the United States. As U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche warned in April of that year, the United States had a Constitutional obligation, under the Monroe Doctrine, to act "to secure the hemisphere from military actions and other assaults on sovereignty by either extra-hemispheric nations or powerful supranational agencies." If the United States refuses to come to Argentina's aid, said LaRouche at the time, "who will keep Great Britain and its oligarchical brethren from not only devastating Latin America and the Third World, but undermining the sovereignty of the U.S. itself?"

The U.S. officials who in 1982 ensured that the United States would serve, as Monroe Doctrine architect John Quincy Adams once put it, "as a cock-boat in the wake of a British man-of-war," have since been knighted by the Queen: former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, then-Vice President George Bush, and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

Kissinger, in particular, was quite clear on what was at stake in the Malvinas conflict. In a May 10, 1982 speech at London's Royal Institute of International Affairs, where he declared himself a British agent of influence, Sir Henry described the United States as faced with two choices: a "Western Hemisphere vocation" based on Franklin Roosevelt's

anti-colonialist heritage, or an “Atlantic vocation” allied to British oligarchic interests. Fortunately, said Kissinger, Britain won out: “In the end we came together; the old friendship prevailed over other considerations.”

Colonel Seineldín was right on target when he identified the nature of the “new world order project” being pushed by the British. Speaking from his jail cell in a Nov. 10, 1996 interview with the daily *La Nación*, Seineldín said that this project “implies religious syncretism in the spiritual realm, limited sovereignty in the political realm, free trade and the World Trade Organization in the economic arena, and multinational armies in the military area.” The idea, he said, “is to break with the Catholic Church, with the idea of the nation-state, with economic independence, and with national armies” (see interview, below).

In fact, on Dec. 3, 1990, the very day that Seineldín led an abortive military uprising in Argentina against the Menem government’s efforts to dismantle the Armed Forces, Sir George Bush was giving a speech in Brazil on “the new Dawn of the New World,” which he identified as a hemisphere-wide free-trade pact that would open up the economies of Ibero-America to “competition from abroad.” Two days later, Bush held a press conference in Buenos Aires, with Menem standing by his side, and praised the Argentine President for giving “a superb show of strength and commitment” in putting down the uprising.

In a radio interview on Sept. 19, 1996, Seineldín charged that the Bush government had demanded that he and his officers be quickly executed, before the heat of the Dec. 3, 1990 uprising wore off. “We were condemned that same day to be shot at 4 in the morning. . . . Those were the orders . . . suggested by the government of the United States. . . . The U.S. could not allow [Argentina] to enter the system if it did not have a submissive Armed Forces.” The planned executions were halted by the combined efforts of former Argentine President Arturo Frondizi and representatives of the Vatican, but President Bush was later to intervene successfully to halt a planned Presidential pardon for Seineldín and his jailed supporters.

Documentation

The following are excerpts from an interview conducted on Nov. 10, 1996 with Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín, by Fernando Laborda, for the Buenos Aires daily La Nación.

Q: How do you evaluate today, six years later, the events of Dec. 3, which many people saw as an uprising against the institutions?

Seineldín: Former President Frondizi called it “an act of resistance to the policy of destruction of the Armed Forces.”

Our purpose was to return to the origin of the old professional Army; we wanted to revive the Armed Forces, and place them at the service of the nation. Today, we must put up with those who call us coup-makers, even though the ruling of the Federal Court which convicted us, stated that “. . . December 3 was not an anti-democratic coup d’état.”

Q: There was much talk in late 1995 of the possibility of a Presidential pardon for Seineldín and his comrades. Why do you think that measure was never carried out?

Seineldín: In the beginning, Menem believed that it would be easy to pardon us. But international pressures prevailed. Both Bush and the B’nai B’rith asked him not to adopt that measure. . . .

Q: Do you have hope of being freed?

Seineldín: I am accustomed to the idea of staying and dying here. . . . There are those who accuse me of being fundamentalist, because what they want are relativists. They are never going to be able to buy me, because I am very hard-headed. So they have to eliminate me. What they want is my head.

Q: British historian David Rock said years ago, “Seineldín is the purest representative of old nationalism. . . . He symbolizes the joining of the cross and the sword. . . .”

Seineldín: I believe that it is a correct definition. . . . The conjunction of the cross and sword is useful, except for the New World Order project which they seek to impose on us.

Q: What project are you referring to?

Seineldín: To the project they are pushing from abroad, which implies religious syncretism in the spiritual realm, limited sovereignty in the political realm, free trade and the World Trade Organization in the economic arena, and multinational armies in the military area. The idea is to break with the Catholic Church, with the idea of the nation-state, with economic independence and with national armies.

There are two international organizations working against national interests. One is the São Paulo Forum, which has operated out of Cuba since 1990. The other is the Inter-American Dialogue, which has operated out of the United States since 1982. . . .

Q: What course of action do you oppose to this supposed international conspiracy?

Seineldín: There are two alternatives to avoid the internationalist revolution. One is a violent course of action, which is what this government would like to see, to prove that there are no alternatives. The other is the peaceful route, such as was used in Brazil to overthrow Collor de Mello. And I would remind you that, at that time, nationalist Brazilian sectors painted their faces. We are in favor of the peaceful route. That is why the Popular Reconstruction Party (PPR) will run in the 1997 legislative elections.