

LaRouche Presents Foreign Policy to Press In Paris

U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche met the Paris media on Dec. 5 in a well-attended session full of lively exchanges. The candidate was introduced by Jacques Cheminade, his ally, former French Presidential candidate and head of the party Solidarité et Progrès; and by press conference host Lancine Camara, President of the International Association of African Journalists. His introductory remarks in French, and most journalists' and other questions to LaRouche, are given as the translator paraphrased them to the candidate.

Lancine Camara: I am very happy and greet those of you who have come. I will tell you a secret: If Europe is going to become reconciled with the United States of America; if there will be no more talk of "Old Europe," but to the contrary, of the "Europe of the Future"; I believe it will be with LaRouche. But further, as I will tell you, he is the only one who knows how to defend the minorities in the United States of America—the Jews, the blacks, and naturally, the Hispanics, who are there—the *only one* who defends them, seriously—I believe it is LaRouche. If you want change things in the United States, reconcile the United States with Europe, with Africa, with the Third World, I think the only candidate that I would suggest to you, would certainly be Mr. LaRouche.

So, now, Mr. LaRouche will say a few words to you.

Lyndon LaRouche: I'll just state a few preliminary facts, and then a summary statement.

First of all, I am presently the second-ranking Democratic pre-candidate for the Democratic nomination in the United States, on the basis of the number of financial supporters—following Howard Dean, who I don't think is qualified, but has more nominal supporters than I do, at the moment.

The issue is two-fold. First of all, we're in a breakdown of the presently existing international monetary-financial system, especially the system as it was established between 1971 and '72.

Oh, I should also add that we're now in the first of the primary campaigns for the selection for the Democratic candidate, which is occurring in Washington,



Candidate Lyndon LaRouche (right) is introduced to the press in Paris on Dec. 5 by Lancine Camara (center), President of the International Association of African Journalists.

D.C., the capital of the United States. That campaign is now officially under way. I'm one of two leading candidates in that campaign, out of a total of five. The other three are Kucinich, and so forth. So, therefore, this particular campaign is now in full force, and it's occurring under the eyes of the Congress and the President, and therefore will be the most conspicuous campaign to inaugurate the whole process.

But as to the issues of the present: We are, as I said, in the financial breakdown crisis. The monetary-financial system established back with the Azores Conference, is dead. Exactly when the head will fall off the guillotined system, is uncertain, but it will be soon.

The two issues otherwise before the world now: on the one hand, the danger of a spreading war. If Vice-President Cheney is not removed soon from office, together with the so-called neo-conservatives associated with him, the war which we see in the Middle East will rapidly spread, to become a worldwide asymmetric, nuclear-armed warfare in the course of the coming years, ending probably with a war against China.

As a complication of this, the relations between the United States and the rest of the world since January of 2002, have become, during the past two years, the worst in modern U.S. history—since President Bush's January 2002 State of the Union address, in which he set forth the "axis of evil" doctrine. In this connection, the war in Iraq, with the ironic developments in Samarra, has now clearly become an impossible war for the United States. There is no possible way the United States can continue to sustain this kind of military occupation.

We are also on the threshold of the time that Cheney and

his friends would like to use nuclear weapons. As part of this, we have a recent incident involving Taiwan, a potential crisis of Taiwan and China, which would become a major crisis internationally. These wars are unnecessary. There's no need for them. They are dangerous, they threaten civilization. They can be prevented.

The 'Other Shoe'—Bankruptcy

But, the problem lies in dealing with the economic crisis. Over the past 40 years, approximately, the world went—especially Europe and some other parts of the world—went from being the world's leading center of productive power, to becoming post-industrial societies, living on the back and sweat of the poorest people in the world. There has been a change in the cultural values of the people of Europe and the United States, resembling what happened in Rome, in Italy, under the influence of the deterioration of Rome after the Second Punic War. We have gone from the world's leading producer society, to the consumer society, a parasite society, and our people have undergone a cultural transformation in their values.

In the United States and Europe, and in varying degrees, we have gone into a state of bread and circuses, as a substitute for production. This has meant that the people who went into the universities, for example, during the 1960s, and later, have developed the values of a post-industrial society. We have, in the United States and Britain, and to a large degree in Europe, a collapse of basic economic infrastructure, as a result. As the big corporations, or the big financial interests have taken over what remains, the small industries, the farmers and so forth,

have been ruined. The conditions of life of the lower 80% of family-income brackets, in Europe and the United States, have worsened over this period.

Contrary to rumors, the United States has enjoyed no growth in the recent period. The report of a 7%, or 8% growth of the economy from the United States, is nothing but one big lie. The truth is reflected in the current account deficit of the United States. The days that Europe and Japan cease to pour money into the New York financial market, will see the collapse of the U.S. economy.

Europe is also bankrupt. That is, Europe can no longer maintain itself at its present level, with the present level of economy.

So, the point is, we have to face two things. First of all, we must reverse the cultural paradigm-shift, to return to the principles of industrial society. In this connection, there has been some improvement in Europe recently. The breaking of the power of the Stability Pact by France, Germany, and Italy is a positive development. As the case of Chancellor Schröder's visit to China recently—this opens the door for long-term agreements, between Western Europe and Asia, which can lead to growth of capital formation and employment in Western Europe.

That would be beneficial; but, it would be not sufficient. What we need is a reform of the international monetary system, back to a fixed-exchange-rate system, which means 1-2% interest rates for prime lending rates on a global scale, which would be based on long-term trade agreements among nations, of 25-50 years. This, at those rates, would mean we could recover. And if we cooperate on that, we will surely act to prevent these wars from continuing.

A Eurasian Economic Initiative

So, my being in France, in particular today, is to try to promote an understanding of this situation, and to make clear the role of my Presidential campaign in the United States, as part of dealing with this problem. For reasons which I'm prepared to defend, I would say I'm the only person qualified to become President of the United States at this time. And I'm confident that, if I am President, these problems will be solved.

I see the potentiality in Asia, in Russia, in particular, and in Western Europe, for cooperation of the type that's needed to address these problems, together with the United States. And typically, if we can solve this problem in the United States and Eurasia, then Eurasia and the United States together can take the action, which has been overdue, to deal with the problem of Africa, especially Sub-Saharan Africa.

As we in the United States and Eurasia begin to improve our economic situation, we must not only end the genocide which prevails in Sub-Saharan Africa today—and I would say, *intentional* genocide—but we can provide the axis of strength for Africa to recover. Eurasia and the United States together, as combined forces, under conditions of recovery of

the international system, would be in a position to assist Africa, in developing large-scale infrastructure development, among the nations of Africa, and to assist those countries in developing their internal capabilities for solving the infrastructural and related problems within the countries.

That should stimulate the African market, and empower the creation of stable governments in Africa, which are stabilized by the fact that they have now the ability, as governments, to provide people of the country the opportunity for a future.

There's much more I can say, and I will say, if the questions require it. But I think that indicates the temper of where I stand, and what I see my role is, and why I'm here.

Principle of 'The Advantage of the Other'

Camara: We can now take reporters' questions.

Iranian Press Agency: As you know, Iran has had a very important role in the war against terrorism. What would your position be, on restoring Iranian-American relationships?

LaRouche: First of all, what we need is a conception—not only Iran—but we need a conception of how we're going to approach the relationship among nation-states and cultures on this planet. From a European cultural standpoint, I think that the answer is that the United States and other countries, in particular, should take the view of the Treaty of Westphalia agreement, of 1648.

For example, we now have a situation, concretely, in which, since Brzezinski, in particular, and Kissinger and Brzezinski, there's been an attempt to use Islam as a target for fomenting international war. . . .

Follow-up: More like a target.

LaRouche: So, the intention was to use a conflict between, especially Christianity and Islam, as a way of plunging the world into chaos.

Now, we must recognize in Europe, that apart from the Islam differences—and Islam actually is very agreeable to European civilization, both in the origins of Islam, in the role of the Abassid dynasty in Mesopotamia, for example, which played an important part in the recovery of Europe, from the time of Charlemagne; from the role of Islam in Spain—until the Spanish racists took over—which played an important part from Spain, in maintaining the culture of Europe.

So, but the problem is, when you go to Asia, that Asian people have a different culture, cultural background, than we in European civilization. So, therefore, we have to be sensitive to the fact that we can not impose an homogenized world, on other cultures.

So, therefore, my proposal is this: Go to the question of the Treaty of Westphalia—which would include the case of Iran—in which Cardinal Mazarin, from here in France, played a key part in bringing about that Peace of Westphalia. So, rather than trying to settle differences, why don't we settle common interests, and leave the differences alone? That means that the Treaty of Westphalia was based on the princi-



The Presidential candidate answers journalists' question: from left, Jacques Cheminade, President of Solidarité et Progrès; Lamine Camara, LaRouche (with a copy of the U.S. Declaration of Independence before him); and translator Elodi Viennot of the LaRouche Youth Movement.

ple: Instead of bargaining differences, you would try to help something to the advantage of the other. For example, in the case of Iran, the specific case of Iran, that means that our policy must be to find out what Iran wishes, and to see if we can give them that which they wish, from us. And to do the same in every part of the world. To say, that each of us must find what we must do for the other, and we must help give them the advantage of doing what they wish to do for themselves.

The objective should be, to establish a world community of sovereign nation-states, not world government, but a unity around principles of giving the advantage to the other.

Q: I'm a colonel in the U.S. Army. I see no reason for the war in Iraq, today. Shouldn't we worry about ourselves, before we start worrying about others?

LaRouche: No, we have to worry about other people. We are human beings. We live on this planet together. We all have the same ultimate needs, the same ultimate requirements. We all have the same need for the protection of certain kinds of institutional arrangements; those things we must share in common. We also should help each other, as nations, but the problem is, that the Treaty of Westphalia—

See, we in Europe have had the advantage, European civilization, especially from the 15th-Century Renaissance, when we became a distinctive power on the planet culturally, as distinct from—we were just a part of the average world before that—but now, we developed modern industrial society. We developed a society based on the idea of the universality of the rights of human beings. We said, "We are going to end the arrangement on which some people treat other people as cattle." And we tried to do it. The United States was founded on that principle. People in Europe wanted to do it; it didn't succeed for various reasons. We in the United States have made our mistakes, too. . . .

But what we need now is, we've come to the point that if you look at what this war in Iraq portends, we have Dick Cheney and company: They wish to launch—and they call it that—"preventive nuclear warfare" as a way of establishing world government. That's their intention. And the problem with Clinton was, he didn't fight that. He was not for that, but he wouldn't fight it. He was—because of his generation, is his problem. But we've come to the point, that if this continues, what we're going to get, is what we should have understood when preventive nuclear war was introduced by Truman, on behalf of Bertrand Russell: We got the Korean War, as a result of Truman's trying to bluff the Chinese and Russia, the Soviet Union then. So, suddenly, we had the North Korean troops coming down in Korea. Then the Soviet Union was the first to develop a thermonuclear weapon. Then we found ourselves—then we had to quit going to preventive nuclear war! We dumped Truman, finally. We should have dumped him at the beginning, at birth!

But Eisenhower gave us eight years of stability—eight years of escape from the worst. And Kennedy was not ready, then, to deal with what was thrown at him. So, therefore, we found ourselves in the Missile Crisis of '62, the Kennedy assassination, and the beginning of the Indo-China War. This was the result of the same mistake that Truman had made in the 1940s: We provoked a war, a prolonged war in Indo-China, because we thought the Chinese wouldn't intervene, *but the Soviets did*.

Now, today, the idiots in Washington have thought—Cheney has thought, and the neo-cons—that now that [Russia] is weak, they can play this game again. They have not learned that Asia will respond to this kind of attack, with what is called asymmetric warfare! They will say, "Invade our countries. You have the superweapons! But then you will be person-to-person, neighbor-to-neighbor. When you are a

neighbor, we can kill you with our weapons.” But this time, it will be also nuclear weapons. It will be deep-diving submarines, not the obsolete super-submarines the United States has now. It will be the entire electronic domain, of the GPS, will be shutting down from the time the missiles go off.

So, we’re now at a point, that the whole world could go into a Dark Age, as the result of the idiocy of people like Cheney and his supporters.

We’re looking at a kind of war that can kill over a billion people, or 2 billion people. It’s time to say, “Idiots, don’t make such wars!” We need *strategic defense*. We do not need to have a war policy. We need what Lazare Carnot conceived back at the end of the 18th Century, what Scharnhorst taught as doctrine. Not aggressive, “preventive” war.

I believe that there is no condition that warrants anybody to desire war on this planet. We have other interests, which are common interests of mankind. We must unite around a positive affirmation of those common interests of mankind; and we all recognize, we don’t want this war! So, let us work to see to it that we don’t *have this war*. And we have to work to that purpose.

Therefore, it’s not enough to take care of U.S. interests. *The United States must take care for the whole world, not as an empire, but as a partner.* And it’s my job as President, to see to it that happens.

The Mideast and Africa

African journalist: He has three good questions. The first one is, I want to remind you, as an African, that although you’re intellectually perfect, you’re 81 years old. The second one is: Imagine that you’re elected President, and you remove the United States troops from Iraq. In the meantime, Saddam Hussein has been hiding in a hole. And there he comes out, and he does again what he did when Bush, Sr. was around—when Bush, Sr. removed the troops—meaning he massacres millions of Iraqis. What do you say with that? What would be your morality with that?

Thirdly, Mr. President, or future President, the problem of Africa is mainly people who are governing. They’re corrupt up to their hair. So, how are you going to get rid of them? Are you going to send them to Auschwitz, or are you going to massacre them? What are you going to do? You can not do a coup d’état in 54 countries, minus Southern Africa; so you can’t eliminate all these corrupt Presidents, who were all set up by the English and the French 50 years ago. What will you do?

LaRouche: First of all, the 81 years is not a problem for me. I’m fortunate in some respects, and I make use of that. I think one of the reasons I’m healthy, relatively healthy, without the infirmities that do go with the age, is that I work all the time, and if you work all the time, you have no time to sit back and die. My wife also has a part in this. She keeps me alive, and keeps me motivated to remain alive.

But, on the question of this Iraq question. I’m not propos-

ing a distant action sometime in 2005, on Iraq. I’m proposing action be taken immediately, now, by a number of nations. I think if we could get Cheney out, we could do it right now.

In any case, if I were President right now, I would go directly to the United Nations Security Council, and say, “The United States, I admit, is in occupation of Iraq. I want the cooperation of the United Nations to get us out of there.” But since I’m not the President of the United States, and nobody else is around who’s qualified to do that, I have to go to the United Nations now, as a candidate, and say, they should take action to end the U.S. occupation of Iraq. Because there’s no other public figure of the United States, except me, who has earned the respect of the people of that part of that world, who would trust me in a case like that.

We’re in a state where the people of that region, until the United States does something about Sharon, and what he represents, the people of the Middle East region, are not going to trust any U.S. intervention in that part of the world. And no one in the Islamic world is going to trust the United States if Cheney is Vice-President. Because he’s a killer! His policies are well-known. What is done in Iraq, has gone beyond the point of no return. The United States has committed an appointment in Samarra, an old Persian custom.

So, therefore, the United States can not stay there. What has to be done is, *Iraq must be restored to its 1958 Constitution*, And eliminate the Anglo-American intervention, which brought Saddam Hussein to power!

See, the Iraqi people are a nationalist people. I don’t care what their religion is; they’re nationalists, they’re Iraqis. They resisted the Ottoman occupation. They resisted the British occupation under the Ottomans. They resisted the British operation later, at the end of the war. Because they understand that they do not want to become a collection of micro-states. In their unity and collaboration with one another lies their security. They’re intelligent people. They have a high tradition of culture, with a lot of poor people. But therefore, the point is, why not—don’t try to give them a new Constitution. They had a perfectly legitimate Constitution. Saddam Hussein abused it; but he abused it as an agent of the British and the United States! And the time came they wanted to get rid of him, and they set him up.

So, he was a creation of the United States, just like the African situation. From what I know of the African situation, the problem exists because Anglo-American and Israeli forces continue the thing working! Who put child warfare into Uganda? Who destroyed the [Great] Lake region? When Museveni sent his troops through, through a British park, to invade Rwanda, and start the whole process going? Who did what they did in the Congo? Who started the butchery in Liberia in 1980? Who killed Lumumba? Who starts all these wars? It is Anglo-America-Israeli influences that did it!

You have children, 10 and 12 years old, with high-powered weapons, running around killing people. If Europe and the United States decide to do it, this nonsense will stop. The



At the national Assembly of Solidarité et Progrès on Dec. 6, attended by 200 LaRouche activists from all over France.

effects of the nonsense, we'll have to cure. If anyone's going to be shot, by me, it's going to be the guy who tries to keep this kind of thing going. It won't be a war: It will be a trial.

No, the point is, the responsibility for Africa—look, look back to the 1970s: Henry A. Kissinger issued a National Security Study Memorandum 200, in 1974-75. Then Kissinger's buddy, and competitor, Brzezinski, issued *Global Futures*, and *Global 2000* in 1981, January of 1981. The policy is Malthusian. The policy was: "There are natural resources in Africa: These belong to *us*, not the Africans. We must prevent the African population from growing. We must make it less. We must not allow it to have technology."

And under that policy, since the middle of the 1970s, a Malthusian genocidal policy, has been the policy of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Israel. Who created Idi Amin? Who created Museveni? And so forth and so on. I know these guys. And so, we are guilty, not them.

If you do that to people, you will get that result—not Africans, anybody. It's happened in history before. *We* are responsible. We must give them the conditions to get their own countries back. And then, it will not be perfect—but it never is; but at least it will be their country, and they will be responsible, and we will help them.

LaRouche's U.S. Candidacy

Colombian journalist: The first question, is, she doesn't want to ask you about your opinion on the policy of the United States towards Latin America, because that would be an extensive and long subject. But, she nonetheless wants your position on the Latino minority in the United States, which is actually, more or less, the majority; and she wants to know your position on their equality, their equal rights, equal rights of this population of the United States—towards education, towards practicing Spanish in a legal way, since it's the second language after English.

The second question is, she was looking at the French press this morning, and she didn't see that your presence here was announced, in France. And so, why are you being

marginalized like that? Why are people so indifferent? And could it have to do with the fact that people have a politically correct view of history, and that you address very hot questions in current and recent history?

LaRouche: Well, I think that on the second one, easily: In France I'm being treated rather nicely now. Not abundantly, but nicely—I would say the proper treatment. I don't expect to be pushed by France. But I think that my contacts with the French establishment circles—we have correct relations with each other, and they're probably better behind the scenes than they are on the surface. And that's as far as that goes.

It's like the case of Napoleon. I don't compare myself to Napoleon, except in this sense: That when he landed from Elba at Marseilles, he was called, "The ogre has landed." And by the time he'd reached the outskirts of Paris, the same press was saying, "The hero has returned."

When a politician is trying to overturn a policy which is insane, the existing institutions do not welcome him. They like their old policies. It's like the fellow who refuses to change his socks.

I don't have any problem with the U.S. population as such; I have a problem with some people. Many people in politics, who publicly do not associate with me, do associate with me privately.

Everybody of influence in the U.S. political scene knows me. I've had as much as 25% support from the population at various times in the past. There were great efforts by some people to try to eliminate me. They not only didn't like me, but they were afraid of me, and they tried to destroy me. But it didn't work.

So, anyway, I'm rather durable. And right now I am—as I said earlier—I'm the second in terms of popular financial support in the U.S. population, for a position—in which a candidate with that position is not reported in the press, except adversely, mostly, that means they're afraid of him. Obviously in that sense, I've terrified my enemies, which is good.

Now, on the U.S. population. The problem generally,

you're talking about, goes into the fact that we have, it's not really an ethnic problem in the real sense; it's a problem of several things. First of all, the largest component of the Spanish-speaking population in the United States, especially along the borders, in California, Texas, and so forth, is Mexico. And the greatest problem has been increased during the period since 1982, since the destruction of Mexico in October of 1982, by the U.S. intervention, where I was on the side of my friend López Portillo: We were trying to defend Mexico, and the other fellows won. The United States raped Mexico. The first thing they did was devalue the peso, an act of rape; they destroyed Mexico's industry; they took over Pemex, the control of Pemex. Then they reduced the Mexicans to be a supply of cheap labor. They fomented an increase in the drug trafficking across the border: It's not safe to walk the streets of Guadalajara today—a boy with a machine gun may finish you off.

So, then what you have, therefore, is two things: You have on the Mexico side, you have particularly the problem of the *maquiladoras*. Many of these are nothing but slave-labor operations. Then you have a very large population of Mexicans, both illegal and legal, inside the United States; this is largely a product of cheap labor.

Then we have from the Caribbean, and other countries, we have refugees pouring into the United States. The recent generations of immigration, from Hispanic America, are largely 34-odd percent of the population right now—the largest single minority, larger than those of African descent.

A Melting-Pot Country

But they share a problem with the lower 80% of the U.S. population as a whole. And with old people—you just have to be old to be a minority—health care, being destroyed. So, therefore, the whole situation in the United States, for the lower 80% of the population, is one of increasing destitution.

Now, this is not a problem that you just address specifically, by taking one or two points, and trying to cure them. You have to have a much broader approach to this. You have to go to the general conditions of life, and you have to do what Roosevelt did: Return to the policy of the common good, the general welfare. The legal principle, the Constitutional principle of the general welfare, must be applied.

Also, it has to be understood, the United States always was, and *is*, a melting-pot country. We were, from the beginning, a melting-pot country. Therefore, we have no proper racial, ethnic, or so forth distinctions, within the population of the United States. Therefore, everyone has implicitly the same Constitutional rights. But that has to be practically enforced.

Now, what's this mean? My constituency is, largely, the lower 80% of the family-income brackets of the United States. Therefore, my constituency tells you what I'm going to do. My people are going to be there. And when it deals with a Congressional representation, that means, that under my

government, the relevant positions are occupied by the relevant people. So, for example, for affirmative action: I have many people in the United States who've been closely associated with me, who are experts in affirmative action, have been fighting for it. They will be in the relevant positions of government.

On the Spanish-language question, the same thing. We have, in Spanish, we have a love affair with Cervantes. I mean, for Spanish-language people, the best reference for young people is Cervantes, *Don Quixote*: It's the best possible educational program for literate Spanish, because all the problems are there. So, I need a reform of education in general, to quality education, not the junk we have now. And I have a youth movement that's working for that. And I'm determined to *build* the United States back into what it was intended to become: a melting-pot nation.

And south of the border, I have a lot of friends. And they will be well-represented where this thing comes.

But it's not a "fix-it" of one problem. You have to start from a principle, and you enforce the principle, by appropriate methods. It'll work. If you try to make a reform, one at a time, it doesn't work. You have to have the principle, and you have to have the people who will enforce the principle; then the job is done. It's *representative* government.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, I personally wish that you be elected with a great majority of votes, counted electronically, and not by hand.

LaRouche: No—by hand. I would prefer by hand.

Q: I would like your opinion on East European countries, where there has been installed a mafia structure upon the former Communist structures. And how do you plan on fighting this—because this could become as dangerous as the present international terrorism structure?

LaRouche: Well, you know, our friends in Poland were largely Solidarnosc, for example. They were pushed out by the Anglo-Americans, not by the Soviets. They did better under the Soviets than they did under the Anglo-Americans.

For example, in 1986, Gorbachov wanted to kill me, publicly. As a result of that, later, many of the same institutions of the Soviet Union—now under the Russians, now are no longer calling themselves Communists, but Russian Orthodox—welcome me with open arms.

So, I mean, that's the nature of the world. I really don't have much of a problem with any part of the world. Some parts of the world have problems, and some have problems with me, but I really don't have much of a problem with them, because I know human beings. You know, you get to be older, you have a lot of experience worldwide, you understand people, and if they behave peculiarly, you don't get too upset about it. You just realize that's the nature of humanity, and you work with it. So, these things don't frighten me one bit.

If we adjust, if you do the right thing, people do tend to come around.

American Relations With Mexico

Siempre News Agency (Mexico): She was surprised that, you're being a candidate for the Presidency—she understands your interest in Mexico, being as they connect at the border. But she was surprised that you quote López Portillo as a friend. She doesn't know how people in the political networks consider him, but 80% of the people consider López Portillo as having not done a lot of good; because especially his family got out a lot of money from the government, to buy castles in Spain and France. He's not the only Mexican President to have done this—maybe, you know, people can want to live in colder countries—but the money has to come back to the country, for infrastructure, for agriculture, and so forth. So, the people and the population of Mexico ask many questions, and they see many Presidents who didn't bring a solution, but, on the contrary, brought more pain.

And if you are running a campaign, with a lot of the people in the United States that are affiliated to Mexicans, or come from Mexico, that might prejudice you. So, I want your opinion on that.

LaRouche: Well, I go by facts, not prejudices. I often know that prejudices are contrary to facts. And I find that the best thing to do is stick with the facts, and stick with the truth as I know it, and not be swayed by prejudices.

For example, the case of López Portillo. I had a privileged relationship with President López Portillo, from the time, approximately, of his inauguration. It was one of exchange of information, which was fairly frequent, and involved my expression of my opinion and my responses to any expressions of opinion from him. And with many of the circles of the PRI, around him at that time, I had a very close relationship.

Because Mexico was important, not only to Mexico itself, but it was crucial for many other parts of Ibero-America. Many refugees moved to Mexico City, and lived in Mexico City, from many countries, adjoining countries. Central America, for example. Mexico City was full of people from Central America, who were refugees. At a certain point, also from Peru; and then from the Caribbean area generally. In trying to deal with the difficult problem with Cuba, with Fidel Castro, Mexico was crucial. The channel for dealing with Cuba in the worst times, was always through Mexico City.

So, the point was, with this problem, we were dealing not with countries which had the ability, the actual sovereign ability, to solve their problems. We're existing in countries which were living in what was increasingly part of an Anglo-American empire, colonies of an Anglo-American empire. And our basic problem we had, in all these issues, was to try to induce the United States to change its attitude on some of these questions, toward Mexico and other countries of South and Central America.

In this connection, I was privy to a lot of the details of the

life of López Portillo in that period, and later. We tried to do the right thing. The reason we didn't, was because the Anglo-Americans didn't let it happen. From October of 1982, when he made the speech at the United Nations, which was sort of the swan song for Mexico's independence—Mexico lost its sovereignty in October of 1982. Every President since then—Salinas was the worst—has been an agent of the United States.

What happened is, the PRI, which had a lot of corruption in it—it's the nature of the situation—was replaced by a group with fascist antecedents, the PAN. The PAN was created in the 1930s, based on certain conflicts which had arisen since Maximilian. It was created under the influence of the Nazi Party offices in Berlin, through the channel of the Franco government in Spain, and it was through Mexico City, with agents, Synarchist agents, such as Soustelle, through which the Nazi organization was maintained by the Nazis, in parts of South America throughout that period. The PAN is essentially the American party, the American-controlled party in Mexico. There are factions in it, because any large party naturally has factions within it, of different composition and tendencies. But the hard core is a Synarchist organization, dating from its Nazi antecedents.

And the problems in Mexico have been largely the Mexicans in the PRI who have capitulated to U.S. occupation, and those in the PAN who have been instruments of U.S. occupation. And having controlled the country, they have an excellent propaganda machine, to spread discredit upon López Portillo, for example, which popularizes myths which are lies.

I know how he lived in Spain. He went to Spain because he was in danger of assassination from the United States if he didn't. I know how he lived in Mexico—it was not his money. He lived at the sufferance of friends. I've heard the rumors. I know they're untrue. He may have weaknesses. There was a problem with his wife. There are sections of the family that had problems with him; it happens. He's now very ill. He's still essentially López Portillo, as I knew him. He was a true patriot, and he was the last President of Mexico who was allowed to function as a patriot. The others have been under U.S. control.

For example, in his time, take the crucial problems of Mexico. Just to get the picture of what the problems are, and how I deal with the problems.

For example, take Mexico's territory. Mexico is a country—at the south it has high mountains, and a lot of water. In the north, in Sonora and so forth, it has a deficit of water. Between the two, the Sierra Madre, there's a big deficit of water. The railroad system has collapsed. Mexico is a large country, in population. Its conditions of life have become progressively worse, over the past 20 years. What is needed, of course, is to build a water system through the Great American Desert area, down from the Arctic, through the United States, into Mexico in one direction, and from the mountainous area of the south, where the water is, up north in Mexico.



Helga Zepp-LaRouche speaks with young participants following one of the sessions of the Assembly, Dec. 6.

Now, since a long time, Mexico has had the plan to develop two coastal water-canal systems, to carry water from the south to the north. There are also plans to bring some of the water from the south along the mountain line, into the area between the two Sierra Madre branches. With this kind of development, and with power, Mexico can become a modern nation, in terms of industry, in terms of agriculture. And the poverty, which is driving the Mexican population north, can be ended.

These plans, I discussed with Mexicans in the 1970s, and particularly with the López Portillo government. They were intending to do the right thing by the people of Mexico. They were prevented. When I become President, those things will become a reality.

‘Different Politics Than You’re Used To’

Follow-up: After the geographic lesson on Mexico, I would like to remind you that it’s true that Mexico can solve these problems. But if you were to take the money of two Presidents, or former Presidents who are outside the country now, you could solve a lot of these economic problems that Mexico has. And I suppose you know this perfectly.

And the second thing is more of a conclusion than a question, which is, it means that you can see that even with Mexican President Vicente Fox, he also is part of all these Presidents—one of all these Presidents who manipulate countries. And if he’s not in the PRI, and he’s in the PAN, which has been the distributor for Coca-Cola all over Latin America—

he got to power, but he doesn’t have a majority in the Parliament. So we consider that once again, we’re going to have another President who will do the same policy, getting money out of the country, and being an agent of the United States.

LaRouche: Well, the point is, if I’m President of the United States, it’s different. I know these problems. This is a problem of being a part of a semi-colonial country, being dictated policies from abroad. And the one thing you have to look at is the Banco de México, which is an agent of a foreign power, which is the internal occupying power, not the Presidency.

For example, you have in the PRI, left over—Bartlett, for example, the Senator, is still playing a very crucial role in defending the sovereignty, within the limited powers available to the Parliament. Senator Bartlett.

You know, I’m passionately involved in these things, on a more or less daily basis: Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, the problems there—I’m involved in these things on a daily basis, I know these problems. And I have my friends there, and therefore I field many of these things as a personal matter, even though it’s a different country.

But in general, in answer to your follow-up question: I would say, yes, I feel these realities, I know them. I’ve lived through them. I understand them. And I know that if the United States changes its policy, in the way I indicate, the conditions and opportunities in those countries will change. In which case, the people in the country will have the sover-

eignty to make the kinds of decisions they want to make. And they will not have the choice of President dictated to them by the United States. And they won't have the national bank of Mexico, the Bank of Mexico, have its policy dictated to it by the international institutions, including the United States.

And in the United States, we have a lot of Mexicans, who are not merely illegals, but also people who have become citizens of the United States, with families back in Mexico. And I, as President of the United States, have to be sensitive to the interests of my citizens, and the people who live in the country, even if they're illegals.

And the United States, having great power, should not use it as an imperial power; but the United States has the responsibility for neglecting its responsibilities as a result of having power. The main power I can have as President, is, give other countries the opportunity to hope that they might do something for themselves. That they do not feel they have to ask permission, to do what they should be able to do for themselves.

Admittedly, it's a different kind of politics than you're used to.

Presidency and Issues of China Policy

Chinese journalist: I am a Chinese journalist, but what interests me is, the foreign policy of the United States government. I have three questions. My first question, what is your feeling about the Bush policy with respect to China? The second question is, what do you think of the relations between China and the United States, and their perspectives, because there are many problems, such as Taiwan, the problem of trade, human rights? And the third question, if you're elected President, what would be your policy towards China?

And I want to wish you, good health.

LaRouche: Yes, I'll use it. Good health I can always use.

First of all, China is China. It's a different country than any other country on the planet. And therefore, don't meddle too much inside it, because it has its own dynamic.

The Bush policy: Look, let me speak frankly—I do speak frankly, but let me forewarn you that I am speaking frankly—The current President of the United States is an idiot, and everybody knows it! So, don't blame him too much in terms of intentions. He happens to be mean-spirited, which means his intentions are often colored by bad behavior. Do not overrate the intentions of a worm.

And the man is President of the United States. How he became President is a curiosity, but he's President. And therefore, institutionally, he's the President of the United States. And I have to do things, like trying to save his life, if necessary, and so forth, because he is the President. So, he's an institutional fixture in the wrong choice of institution. Better qualified for Charenton. But anyway, so, he's a puppet. He's a puppet of certain financier interests, which are fairly described as pro-Nazi. The same kind of interest that brought

Hitler to power in Germany. The intention of these interests is ultimately to destroy China. And what has happened in Afghanistan, and what is happening in Iraq, is merely part of the stepping-stone intended to end up in places such as China.

So, Bush's father perhaps, has a different problem, a different attitude. His uncle, Prescott Bush, who's more closely associated with the Orient, probably has a different attitude, too: He likes the money from China. The circles around Bush, the senior Bush, are financially hungry, so, therefore, their attitudes are sometimes influenced by that.

So, the question should be, what should China's policy become, or the U.S. policy toward China become, and what is it? Now, I'm concerned about the Taiwan crisis which threatens now. The issue of the referendum is a provocation, by U.S. circles who orchestrated this, who wish to have a provocation. And the referendum proposal in Taiwan, today, should be considered an extension of the war in Iraq by the United States. To understand that, you have to look at the border of China, to the north.

We have North Korea. Under Clinton, during the Clinton period, the government of South Korea at that time opened up the Sunshine Policy. This was for cooperation between South and North Korea, both for humanitarian and economic purposes. This was blessed by Russia. It was recommended by Perry and others from the United States that this policy be fostered. China did not wish to be involved with the North Korea regime, for its own reasons, but is now reluctantly cooperating with Russia, on trying to promote this policy, to prevent a collision in that area.

I am for that Sunshine Policy, and I have a lot of support inside Korea for my views on this. And I think that Japan is coming more and more in that direction, or at least an increasing number of forces in Japan are moving in that direction. We have excellent cooperation with Southeast Asia and China and the North Asia group.

And obviously, one should see that the game—I know the way the game is played in Taiwan—see this as a U.S. provocation. That's the problem.

Strategic Triangle of Eurasia

Now, obviously my policy, which I laid out in other locations at great length—and my wife's policy and my friends' policy—has been for the development of what's called the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was the policy which was first expressed by me on Oct. 12, 1988 in Berlin, when I warned people that we could expect the immediate prospect, that the Comecon would begin to disintegrate very soon, bringing about the reunification of Germany, with Berlin as the future capital. And I proposed that a new policy of cooperation with the then-Soviet Union develop out of this, which would develop a transportation system to promote an increase of trade and economic development throughout Europe.

After the Wall fell, the following year, we proceeded on



The LaRouche Youth Movement in action in France; here, its members carry signs and banners against Cheney, Ashcroft, and the IMF, at the large Paris demonstration against the impending invasion of Iraq, in February 2003.

the question of extending this kind of process toward the Pacific Coast. We pushed for three routes of rail development, or magnetic levitation developed routes across Eurasia—north, south, and middle.

Today, the policy of Europe is in that direction. The development of transportation routes across Asia, with the idea of development, which includes the proposal to support China's internal development as it is now proposed—which I would say is a long-term trend which goes back to Sun Yat-sen, but was activated by Deng Xiaoping: to move the development of China from the coastal region, toward the inland regions, through infrastructure development.

Therefore it is in the interest today of Eurasia, to proceed with that objective. In the late Summer of 1998, I proposed to the Clinton Administration that that Administration sponsor what I called a Eurasian Triangle agreement: That Russia, China, and India develop a mutual arrangement, under which all of the countries of Asia could come together. That is, these are countries which are important countries, which have different cultures than the other countries; but if they can agree on common principles, then Asia could be united around an idea of countries of different cultures, but common principles.

This is a policy which requires 50 years. It requires the first generation to develop the infrastructure of the interior of China, as led by the Three Gorges Dam development. That's 25 years. The second generation will exploit the development of the interior of this land, so it'll take a capital cycle of

approximately 50 years, or two generations, to bring that to an interim level of fruition.

And this kind of development is the basis for the unity, the economic cooperation, throughout Eurasia. This requires a new system of international credit; a fixed-exchange-rate system; with basic interest rates at 1-2% simple interest. It requires treaty agreements among governments, over 25- to 50-year duration; treaty agreements which will be used to create credit for the promotion of trillions of dollars of infrastructure development across Eurasia; which will require, in the same period, between \$100 and \$200 billion equivalent, or euro equivalent, for scientific development to push this. And the issue is to create the architecture under which this kind of cooperation can occur.

This is probably the heart of the future of humanity, for a century or more to come. And this, to me, is the way to get peace: To have countries committed to projects, on which their future depends, for a long term, for many generations, and to be willing to fight to maintain that cooperation, as if they were fighting to defend national sovereignty.

It's on the basis of that kind of cooperation in Eurasia, with the United States cooperating with it, that I foresee the ability to do the transformation of Africa.

Camara: My dear friends, we have here a supercharged program. We can take only two more questions. . . . We have only the two translators, and if there are still questions, we will hold another press conference.

Did Idiots Elect Idiot President?

Q: You repeatedly said that Bush, Jr. is an idiot with a capital *I*, as if it was written on his forehead. Now, how is it possible that the American people would be so much idiots—with a capital *I*—to elect such a President for four years; and maybe, importantly for the rest of the world, for eight? Maybe you can help us—as an American—to understand what that phenomenon actually was.

LaRouche: Well, they were given no choice. They were given two choices for Presidential candidate in 2000, and they didn't choose either. Now, the choice was: Idiot Number One, George Bush, flanked by a fascist, Cheney, as Vice-President; the other one was idiot Al Gore, who's a nasty person, just like George Bush, flanked by a fascist, Joe Lieberman, who is a product of the Cuban fascists!

It's like going into a restaurant, and on the menu, getting two kinds of manure to eat—that's what the American people were faced with.

The first thing is, to give the American people a choice. And the second point, which is a little more profound, is that we've come to an end of a 40-year cycle of decadence in U.S. politics and U.S. culture. The people who are now approaching 60 years of age, have *failed*, the ones who are running the United States. They have failed miserably. Their ideas have failed. Their instincts have failed. Their sex life is worst of all. All right?

So, you come to a time where I have a generation, 18-25 years of age, university-age generation. They say of their parents, "What gave birth to them?" These young people say, "We have no future under these policies." At the same time, the international monetary-financial system is disintegrating. The international political system is disintegrating. The lower 80% of the income brackets of the U.S. population—and this is characteristic also in Europe—the lower 80% is living in worse and worse conditions, with no future.

I give you two examples of this, exactly what's happening, concretely.

First, we had a mayoral election in the city of Philadelphia, the principal city in the state of Pennsylvania, onetime capital of the United States. And Mayor Street was in trouble because the Attorney General of the United States, this fascist Ashcroft, was trying to overthrow his government. In the meantime, we had a conference, where I was giving an international address in Washington, D.C. And at the end of the conference, we had a meeting with some of our friends, who represented the so-called African-American groups in the United States, political groups. So, one of our friends, a member of that group, Harold James, who's a legislator from Pennsylvania, proposed that we do something about it; said, would I do something? I said, "Of course, we'll do something about it."

So, he organized a press conference, and I gave a statement to the press conference, stating my commitment. So, at that point, Mayor Street was about to lose his re-election

campaign. We moved in. We concentrated some of the youth movement, of the type of youth I've described. We turned the election campaign into a mission-oriented campaign. Mayor Street was elected by what's called a "landslide victory."

My Presidential campaign, in the Washington, D.C. primary now; it has a very large population of so-called African descent, very dominant part. The same youth movement, but enlarged, is organizing the Washington campaign for me. And we have them singing in the ghettos, because they've been neglected. We are administering a shock to the U.S. government and politicians. The Democratic Party has a contingency campaign: What will they do in case I win the nomination? I may not win the nomination—that's a possibility, but the shock is going to be delivered.

The United States is in a crisis. The habits of the Baby Boomers, the 50-year-old people, will no longer control the politics of the United States. The poor, the people in the lower 80% of family-income brackets, are going to be brought back into politics. And the leadership of people in the 18-25 age-group, is going to change, and be the spearhead of changing politics in the United States.

In the meantime, the *whole blasted system* is coming down, so it's going to make it a new time. The present world system of politics is ended, one way or the other, for better or for worse: You might have idiocy in the future, but it won't be the same kind of idiocy we had in the year 2000.

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

EIW

An online almanac from the publishers of **EIR**

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

gives subscribers online the same economic analysis that has made *EIR* one of the most valued publications for policymakers, and established LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world.



EIR Contributing Editor,
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Issued every Monday, *EIW* includes:

- Lyndon LaRouche's economic and strategic analyses;
- Charting of the world economic crisis;
- Critical developments ignored by "mainstream" media.

\$360 per year Two-month trial, **\$60**

For more information:

Call **1-888-347-3258** (toll-free)

VISIT ONLINE:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw