

World Media Line Up To Hear From LaRouche

Throughout the world, radio and television stations are increasingly anxious to get interviews with the one U.S. Presidential candidate they find trustworthy, Democrat Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Here are excerpts from three of them: Palestinian Satellite TV in Gaza, Radio Cumbre in Neuquén, Argentina, and Radio Universidad of Gualajara, Mexico.

Palestinian Satellite TV

Usama Sabawi broadcast a live interview with LaRouche by telephone for half an hour, on Aug. 27. This is the only TV station left in Gaza, since the Israelis bombed the other one. Because of Israeli shelling in Gaza while the interview was ongoing, many questions were inaudible and we have paraphrased them. The program “Message to the World” was broadcast in English all over the Arab world, and in the United States.

Sabawi: Good morning, Mr. LaRouche. It’s a pleasure to have you with us on the show, and, unfortunately, we’re talking from difficult circumstances. As you heard me, Israelis are a few meters away from our headquarters, and at any time, we might have to stop transmission and evacuate the building. But please, the rest of the viewers are interested in your opinion on what’s really going on right now in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. . . . What do you think is the solution in order to achieve peace with the Israelis?

LaRouche: Well, obviously, from, as you know, from my past background over a quarter-century, I’ve been very much concerned with this business in the Middle East and Palestinian justice. At present, it’s obvious, that a certain faction in Israel, typified by Shamir earlier, or Sharon or Netanyahu, who are the hard core of the old Jabotinsky apparatus, are now hoping, that the United States will start an attack on Iraq, which would then enable Sharon, under that cover, to begin the exodus of the Palestinian people in large numbers across the Jordan River into Jordan, in accord with their policy.

If this happens, I don’t think anybody knows how hellish the world as a whole will tend to become. That is, if President Bush were to actually launch an attack on Iraq, I don’t think anybody can calculate how bad the result will be for history of most of mankind, not just that region. And thus, to me, this cause of coming back at least to the level of the Rabin agreements with Chairman Arafat—that that agreement must be restored. Otherwise, we’re going to have this lingering

threat, not only to the Palestinian people, but to the people of the entire region.

Sabawi: If that’s the way they’re thinking, and this is their ideology, why did they sign with us the peace agreement at Oslo, and the rest of the agreements, if they don’t admit our right of existence, and to live as those two nations in peace, and the concept of land in exchange for peace?

LaRouche: Well, there are, probably, three issues involved. First of all, among European Jews, in the Moses Mendelssohn tradition, the idea of ecumenical peace, is natural. Then, you have those in Israel who are not otherwise fascists, who are Zionists, who, like Rabin, recognize as a matter of practicality that Israel could not continue to exist, unless it established just relations with the Palestinians. The third group is the group that actually wants to exterminate any Palestinian existence, in terms of what they call “Eretz Israel” [“Greater Israel”], which in some cases, means the River Euphrates, as the border of Israel.

So, we have these three conditions. The case of Rabin, I think, is the middle position, that, as a practical matter, and as a humane matter, they must find reconciliation with the Palestinians—between the Palestinians and the Israelis. That’s the positive factor I think we can shoot for.

My own view is more consistent with the Moses Mendelssohn view, of an ecumenical peace among all peoples, especially peoples of the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish faith. That’s my objective; but I would settle, in the meantime, as a practical matter, for going back to the “Peace of the Brave,” to describe [the accords] between Rabin and Arafat.

Sabawi: What is the role of the U.S. in the Middle East during the current conflict? Do you think the current American Administration is playing a fair role for our case?

LaRouche: Of course not. No, we have in the United States, we have a utopian faction, which includes people who are the financiers of Sharon. These are wealthy people, who have gangster backgrounds, family backgrounds. They call themselves “from rackets to riches to respectability,” like the Bronfman interests, or the Lansky mob, and their descendants, who now control, for example, the Perle apparatus in the United States—what’s behind Richard Perle and others. These people are, in a sense, really fascists. They are as bad as Sharon, perhaps worse. They are the people who’ve made possible this development inside Palestine, inside Palestine and Israel. It came largely from the United States, from these circles. At present, the President of the United States, and some of the leadership of the Democratic Party, as well, are fully in support of Sharon. President Bush may hate Sharon personally. But as a political reality, he is now committed to support Sharon, and to go with an Iraq war. So, that’s our situation.

Sabawi: As an economist, and a professor in economy, and



The al-Nasr Palestinian television studio on the West Bank was vandalized by the Israeli Defense Forces in April. In Gaza, the only remaining TV station interviewed Lyndon LaRouche on Aug. 27, while undergoing Israeli bombardment that threatened to cut the interview off at any moment. The journalist expressed the hope that LaRouche would soon become President of the United States.

a politician, how do you see the impact of striking against Iraq, on the U.S., and the world economy and policy?

LaRouche: Well, the point is, this is a war in which the United States has the capability of doing great damage, vast damage. But it can not win the war. This is a situation similar to what Rabin said, in presenting his case for a “Peace of the Brave” with Chairman Arafat. That is, that there is no possibility of winning such a war. There is no possibility of actually winning a secure peace, through war, by an attack upon Iraq. It can only ruin the region. And, I think, all Arab governments that I’ve heard from agree on that—as well as others. Europe, I believe, Continental Europe, agrees; a powerful faction in the United Kingdom agrees; most of Asia, I believe, agrees; many of us in the United States agree.

My concern is, here we are in a very dangerous economic crisis, collapse, and I think the President of the United States is inadequate to face the reality of that financial collapse. There are solutions, along the lines of Franklin Roosevelt’s response to the Depression of the 1930s. Those solutions would work.

There are peaceful options. I can only hope that our work in that direction will be successful. We’re doing what we can. You’ll find more and more people in the United States, by the day—including recently, General Zinni—who have pointed out, that only a person who is militarily incompetent, would suggest the kind of policy which the President and the Vice President of the United States have lately presented.

Sabawi: [inaudible] Why are they not allowing the United Nations to send the observers, for example as a way to calm

the situation? What do they gain out of this policy?

LaRouche: They don’t gain anything out of it; they gain chaos. But when people are seized by an ideology, and are blind to reality, they ignore the consequences of their own actions. That’s the situation now. No sane person would conduct the kind of policy which the United States is presently conducting toward the Middle East. But, look, the point is, all of the leading people supporting this policy, are people who, in the time they should have had military service, avoided military service. Those who are professional military people, who are competent in military affairs, say, “Don’t do it.” Only a bunch of incompetents, many of whom were draft-dodgers, are the ones who are pushing this wild policy now. The problem in the United States is that both parties are weak. They’ve been heavily corrupted. Their orientation over the recent decades, actually, has been downward. We have a pretty sick United States; I’m trying to save the United States. And I’m doing what I can, as probably one of the few standing political leaders left, to try to mobilize people around this issue. I think we’re doing a fairly good job. I’m not satisfied, but I hope we can stop it.

Sabawi: If you would become the President of the United States (which we would hope you would), what do you promise the Palestinians and the Arabs inside and outside the U.S.?

LaRouche: Well, what I’m doing presently, is there are a large number of Arab-Americans—and, of course, people in other parts of the Arab world, as well as elsewhere—with whom I am discussing these matters, and we’re collaborating as much as possible. But also, in the United States, there are

many groups called “minority groups,” and they share our concern, generally, about this Middle East crisis. My hope is that we can bring enough of them together. And I’m working to do that, to build an effective force to change the situation.

The situation is not hopeless: The situation is a matter of timing. The question is: Will the attack on Iraq come, before we can stop it? But, there are serious forces in the United States, trying to stop this attack at this time. So, on that part, the Iraq thing, there is real concern. And there is, actually, resistance building up against it. It may not be obvious, or satisfactory to people in the Middle East, but it exists. My concern is to make that more effective.

Sabawi: How could the Arabs and Muslims inside the United States get united, and influence the decision-making of the current American administration?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, I’ve always looked at this as, first of all, an economic question. The Palestinian people were among the best educated in the Arab world. They are people, therefore, with potential for running their own economy. They have the culture for it. The Arab people are not, of course, all of one faith, so, therefore, it’s an ecumenical kind of thing.

What is needed is large-scale water development, and energy resources for the Middle East. Because, presently, with the drainage of the aquifers in that area, there is not enough water for the foreseeable future to meet the requirements of life, of all the population. This is one of the aggravating factors.

My concern has been, is to get large-scale development projects, like the old Ledem idea, of getting water development, desalination and other methods, and energy resources in there, so that we can create viable states, which are self-sufficient.

Sabawi: What is your message to the world?

LaRouche: Well, I have a very impassioned personal sense of justice in this matter. I feel that I can feel some of the suffering, the desperation of the people in that region, as I do in other parts of the world, as parts of Africa, for example, where there is grave suffering inflicted. Now, in parts of South and Central America, we have similar situations, not as bad.

But, we have to understand, that we as human beings are different than animals: that through our power of ideas, which is a gift given to us in the image of the Creator, we have the ability to do acts and make discoveries, which we transmit as experiences to our children and grandchildren, and so forth. And, through which we are able to honor our indebtedness to the work of our predecessors.

If we can have that kind of conception of man, man as made in the image of the Creator, and our obligations toward one another, I think the very crisis that threatens us means, that perhaps, we will learn a lesson, and finally build relations among peoples, and provide justice for peoples on the basis of this notion, this ecumenical notion of man as made in the

image of the Creator. That must move us, because I think that a person who does not have that view does not have the strength to withstand the kind of problems we face today.

Radio Cumbre, Neuquén, Argentina

Jorge Omar Allende interviewed LaRouche on Sept. 6, 2002.

Allende: Over the last few minutes, there have been news reports of a supposed U.S. attack against Iraq. This was denied moments ago. What is your view of this news event? . . .

LaRouche: We are actually very close to the danger of a large-scale war against Iraq. We don’t know at what moment it can erupt. We’re looking at the period from approximately Monday [Sept. 9] to about Sept. 15, as the first period in which we are on alert. We also have to be alert to some other incident, which may be a Gulf of Tonkin-type of incident to try to provoke the U.S. attack on Iraq. It is a very dangerous situation. . . .

Allende: Of your vast writings on economics, Mr. LaRouche, I would like to take you in particular to the subject of Argentina, not out of egoism, but because this is an example for the entire region and the world. I have in my hands a book that you published in 1989, entitled *Industrial Argentina: Axis of Ibero-American Integration*, which has a prologue written by you. It was first printed in 1983, and I understand you sent it to President [Raúl] Alfonsín at the time, urging him to take the kinds of steps which you recommended there. He did not; quite the opposite. Could you summarize the advice that you were offering at that point?

LaRouche: Already in 1982, in the immediate aftermath of the Malvinas War, it was obvious that the war, which had been provoked from London, had been intended to set off a process of destruction of the powers of all of Central and South America. And the major countries which were targeted for destruction, then as now, were not only Argentina, but also Brazil and Mexico. So, in the case of Mexico, after my discussions with President [José] López Portillo, I composed a paper called *Operation Juárez*, which would have worked then if we would have been able to implement it. President López Portillo was prepared to implement it in the early Fall of 1982, but the other governments, such as that of Argentina and Brazil, withdrew their initial support for Mexico.

That was the beginning of what we face now. So, during this period, in my writing to Alfonsín, my concern was to try to educate, inform, and influence governments of, particularly, Argentina and Brazil, to understand what we had to do, if we were to avoid what is actually happening now. So therefore, what I wrote in 1982 contains many of the elements of analysis and proposals which are applicable to the situation today, and

it still has educational value to that purpose.

I realize that it is difficult for some governments to technically understand some of the problems, but it is extremely important to get an immediate dialogue on these subjects, to get clarity on what the necessary steps are.

Allende: Mr. LaRouche, about two weeks ago, there was an article in the New York Times, which discussed . . . splitting the country into different regional areas: Patagonia going its way, and others the same. This has been broadly circulated inside Argentina. Some of us view this as a form of manipulation, to bring about the disintegration of the country. . . . Most recently, capital that left Argentina earlier in the year, now seems to be returning to buy up very fertile lands for a song. . . .

LaRouche: This is a long-standing policy of a faction in the United States and elsewhere, which is called the utopians. It is the same group behind the proposed Iraq war. Their intention is to disintegrate every country in Central and South America—Argentina and Brazil above all—to chop them up into small, powerless units. . . . That unfortunately is the present policy of the International Monetary Fund. That is also, unfortunately, the policy of the anti-globalization movement led by Teddy Goldsmith. Another term for it is the “Africanization” of South and Central America. I would think that that’s the way some people in Brazil are thinking about it, because they’re very sensitive on the African question.

Allende: This radio show is heard regionally, with the help of various repeater stations, including in one town which was the birthplace of YPF, which was Argentina’s national petroleum company, the pride of the nation, which explored for and exploited petroleum throughout the country, but which was recently taken over by Spanish capital, by Repsol.

The goal of this program is to translate economic matters for the common people. . . . We recently took a poll of people on the street, asking them . . . should Argentina follow the IMF plans, or devise their own plan? We would like your response.

[The following is EIR’s translated paraphrase of responses given to the pollster: One person said, of course we can live without the IMF. It would have a price, but it will cost us more with them. Another said, the IMF is the worst thing imaginable. Another said, we have to have our own plan, not something imposed by others. A fourth said the IMF is responsible for all of our problems. Another said they’re killing us with high interest rates. Another said we have to have our own policies, the country is being robbed blind.]

LaRouche: I think they’re probably right. I think they’re fair. I don’t think that they’re adequate perceptions. But for somebody who’s trapped in the barrel that they’re trapped in, and not able to get much access to the outside world, it’s a pretty fair image of what they’re up against.

I wish we had more people just as intelligent among the

LaRouche on Dominican TV

Dominican Republic television aired an hour-long interview with Lyndon LaRouche on his 80th birthday, Sept. 8, on Julio Hazim’s “Revista 110,” the nation’s most important political commentary program. It was also broadcast on “Voice of the Tropics” radio station. The interest in the show was so great, that Channel 53 cable TV decided to rebroadcast the interview later that night.

The interview, conducted by Dr. Cristino Del Castillo, was filmed during the Labor Day weekend annual conference of the International Conference of Labor Committees/Schiller Institute in Northern Virginia.

Dr. Hazim built the audience for the interview on Sept. 6, inviting his viewers to tune in and see “the controversial U.S. economist, Lyndon LaRouche, who has been right in all his forecasts. Although we don’t belong to his movement, I believe that it is necessary to see him and listen to him carefully.”

citizens of the United States. They’re right. I sympathize with them totally in their attitude and their perception. The difference is that I, perhaps, know more about the world at large, and am in a position to formulate things that may be solutions to these problems. But they have my complete sympathy.

Allende: It seems to be much easier to convince the common people of your ideas and your economic views, than it is to convince the leaders that we have around us, especially the people trained at Harvard and the Chicago School. . . .

However, your views otherwise have been understood for years . . . here in the Neuquén region. Right now, there is a class-series, sponsored by the LaRouche Center for Physical Economy, taught by EIR correspondent Gerardo Terán, who is with us in the newsroom. We’d like to have him ask you a question.

Terán: There is a tremendous amount of interest in the area on the Brazil-Argentina-Mexico integration project. How does integration fit into the global solution?

LaRouche: I think integration of a certain type—integration as a community of principle among respectively sovereign nation-states—could set up a series of long-term agreements in order to mobilize resources of credit for long-term investments, largely in infrastructure and in specific industries, and to strengthen agriculture. Such a group of countries, working together, is much stronger, and much better able to defend themselves.

Also, we're in a period in which you have to look at the world at large. On continental Eurasia, there is presently a great and accelerating impetus for cooperation on a large scale. Not globalization, but cooperation. Long-term credit agreements. Long-term credit for technological investment. In the Americas, the same thing would apply. My hope is that we can get the world moving in that direction, because that's what we'll have to do if we're going to get out of this economic mess.

Mario Ferrin: [EIR representative in Neuquén] I would like people to know you better, so rather than asking a question about specific current events, I would like you to explain who you are. For example, a Macedonian newspaper recently referred to you as the person who is most successful in unmasking the views of the oligarchy; Argentine patriots have talked about your views on world reconstruction; the Russian Ecological Academy referred to your original scientific work. . . .

LaRouche: Well, I'm a follower of Gottfried Leibniz, and also, as an American and U.S. patriot, much in the same tradition of John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt. And I'm intellectually influential enough that my enemies in power consider me very dangerous, and have tried to eliminate me a number of times. And personally, I think I could safely say that I'm the only person in sight who is qualified to be the President of the United States under the present circumstances. I'm otherwise a philosopher and a scientist in economics. I guess that would, in short, summarize who I am.

Allende: Mr. LaRouche, how relevant is it for Argentina, and for the Patagonia region in particular, to develop a bi-oceanic corridor . . . especially in connection with the Eurasian Land-Bridge?

LaRouche: It does go with that. If we are sane, if we shift to a pro-development policy toward Africa, and if we develop the Land-Bridge program in Asia, there is going to be a very significant increase in international ocean freight. In that case, the connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific becomes extremely important, and so, under those circumstances, in that part particularly, it would mean also an impetus for increasing the development potential in Patagonia. Because any good communication and transport system opens the way for development of the adjoining region. . . .

Allende: Regarding [former World Bank official] Joseph Stiglitz: Although perhaps he doesn't agree with you in all aspects and areas, nonetheless he has talked about the problem of poverty, and the number of people who make less than \$1 a day. Is it possible to actually change the point of view of people such as Stiglitz, in order to bring about the necessary changes as you propose?

LaRouche: Well, I wouldn't hang by my nails on that. He

does act like a kind of Voltaire, of his particular philosophy. Unfortunately, his cynicism goes both ways. There's his cynicism about his former associates, but he shows the same cynicism toward serious proposals and solutions, which is why he doesn't like me at all. . . .

Radio Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico

Carlos Ramírez Powell's interview with LaRouche was broadcast on Aug. 4 and 5, 2002.

Ramírez: . . . How are the prospects now for the Democratic Party to propose your nomination as a candidate?

LaRouche: The key thing is the process of elimination of the qualifications of all indicated competitors for that position. And with the downfall of Lieberman, Gore, and others, faced with the problem of the present international financial crisis, which they are incompetent to address and are not willing to address, this is going to produce a phase-change in the U.S. population during the current period. So, by the time two years roll around, there will be a vastly changed U.S. population, and public opinion. . . .

For example, the present threat of a war against Iraq is a common concern of all of my friends, . . . all leading people in the Democratic Party constituency groups, and also many people in the Republican Party. . . .

Ramírez: Mr. LaRouche. I'd like to orient this next question a little bit toward Latin America. . . . There was a letter written by José López Portillo to the three-nation conference that happened here in Guadalajara. An endorsement by José López Portillo . . . carries a lot of weight among certain political circles. . . .

LaRouche: López Portillo and I had the happy occasion, and also the frustrating occasion, of collaboration at a certain point in the history of Mexico. I very much respected López Portillo as President of Mexico from the beginning of his administration as President. And when 1982 came and the crisis was striking, the occasion came for me to meet personally with the President for an hour. And we had important discussions.

I have many friends in Mexico of those same circles, and some others as well. So we tried to prevent the crisis which happened in Mexico in 1982, and also tried to maintain the unity of Mexico with Brazil, Argentina, and other countries, on the issues of that crisis. We tried; we were defeated. . . .

Well, actually, he had the support for a time of both the governments of Brazil and Argentina. But tremendous pressure came down on the governments of Brazil and Argentina. They capitulated to U.S. pressure, especially from Henry Kissinger and so forth, who was no longer in the government

of the United States but was very influential in the so-called Latin American commission of the government. . . .

Ramírez: . . . There has been a series . . . [of drops in the market], going down since approximately March . . . with a slight pause during August. What do you see for the next three or four months, and how will you deal with a monetary system that seems to be cracking at its core—which is the mounting national and international debt, and private debt in the United States?

LaRouche: We're now in the month of September, which I expect—and I'm not the only one, other leading people in finances and so forth around the world as well, knew that the month of September was going to be a month of horror for the U.S. and many other countries. . . .

The thing to look at, which of course people in Mexico will look at, where there's been so much dependency since 1982, increasing dependency on the U.S. market—what is collapsing around the world is the role of the U.S. market as the export market of last resort—in the Orient, and in Mexico in particular. And therefore, the thing we have to look at is the underlying problem, the physical economic problems of employment, production, and so forth, and that's where the problem lies.

We are going to have to realize that the present international monetary system is bankrupt, in a fashion which is similar, in some respects, to 1929-32, '33, but it's much worse. However, we can solve this kind of problem among governments, by using the power of governments and cooperation among governments to create new monetary systems, to put the old systems into bankruptcy, and to take measures to ensure that not only do we preserve levels of employment, trade, and production, but we can increase them.

For example, right now I'm concerned about the situation throughout the Americas. Look at what's happened to Argentina. A similar thing, with greater magnitude of impact, is happening to Brazil. Look at what has happened to Peru, Ecuador, what is threatened now in Bolivia, Uruguay, Paraguay; the crisis in Colombia, which is becoming worse; a new kind of crisis erupting in Venezuela. And Chile now is going from security to insecurity along with the rest of the states of South America. Central America is a nightmare.

And therefore, you have states like Mexico and Brazil, which are the keystone nations of Ibero-America—both Central and South America—these nations have to be looked at, along with Argentina, for example, as a model. We must decide how we're going to save these nations from the impact of an ongoing depression. And this is a part, for the United States, of the security of the Americas.

I did address this in 1982 with my Operation Juárez, but I knew what was going to happen. I would say that what I wrote in Operation Juárez contains most of the model for what has to be done within the Americas as a whole, to try to stop this crisis and to deal with this on a reasonable basis. But

we also must deal with the problem on an international basis at the same time. But the relationship of the United States to the states of the Americas, is special. And within that pattern, Mexico and Brazil are the keystone nations of U.S. relations with all of the other states of the Americas.

. . . What Roosevelt did was to establish, in the United States first, a gold reserve standard. The Roosevelt proposal for a gold reserve standard was the principal basis for the post-war Bretton Woods monetary system. In other words, that the gold was not used as the basis for printing currency. Rather, gold was used as a way of balancing deficit accounts on balance of trade, balance of payments. So, by controlling balance of payments in a fixed-exchange-rate system, we were able, between 1946 and 1964, and a bit later, to maintain a very successful—in the Americas, with Europe and Japan, for example—a very successful form of fixed-exchange-rate system.

Now, we need that, because what we have to do is this. Take Mexico, for example. Mexico's development is going to require not merely foreign markets, but actually a rich development of the internal market, which means a large build-up of infrastructure—rail, water systems, power systems, sanitation systems, and so forth—which means employing Mexicans in increasing levels of technological productivity. Now, this requires long-term credit, which must be at between 1-2% simple interest, no more, on 25-30 years. That is what is required to build an actual recovery machine now, throughout the Americas. Mexico is just typical of it. We know that better than many other countries. . . .

What I would do, with oil, petroleum, in particular: I think we need a fixed parity price, a world market parity price, for petroleum. Now, we let countries themselves, individually, deal with whether their internal price is higher or lower than the international parity price, but the international parity price should be approximately a fixed price. That's necessary in energy. There are certain other prime commodities which should be regulated at a fixed price, or a fixed ratio of price, on the international markets. That is necessary to make the system work.

Remember, I'm not talking about gold. I'm talking about a gold reserve, priced at \$800-1,000 per troy ounce, or maybe more now. It's obvious, when you look at those prices, that gold is now artificially way below its real market price. . . .

WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW

The LaRouche Show

EVERY SATURDAY

3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time

<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>