

LAROUCHE TO MEXICO'S PRO-PLHINO COMMITTEE

‘Victory Is a Matter Of Grand Strategy’

On July 14, Lyndon LaRouche had a telephone conference with members of the Pro-PLHINO Committee of the 21st Century in Ciudad Obregon, Sonora, Mexico, transcribed below. The PLHINO, or North West Hydraulic Plan, has been on the drawing boards since the mid-1960s, but has never been implemented. It would build extensive waterworks to transfer vast quantities of water from the Santiago River basin in the water-rich state of Nayarit, to the Mayo and Yaqui River basins in water-poor Sonora. The state of Sinaloa would also benefit directly. The Pro-PLHINO Committee was formed on Aug. 15, 2007, in Sonora, with leadership from the LaRouche movement, to revive the long-stalled effort.

LaRouche had had an earlier discussion with the Committee on April 18, 2008, during his visit to Monterrey, Mexico (see EIR, May 2, 2008). The moderator's remarks and the questions have been translated from Spanish.

Moderator: Lyn, we know that you've always been with us, but today we want to thank you for dedicating this time to the discussion we will be having. Old and young friends are gathered here, who, over the years, have shared a commitment to the general welfare of the region and the country. This has kept us close to you, seeking the best for humanity.

Lyn, as you know, Mexico is a wounded nation. Over the last years, it has been subjected to an empire of terror, by the paramilitary structures of narcoterrorism.

Over these same years, we organized a social movement in the northwest of the country, around the idea of the PLHINO, and this gave hope to the nation. We built alliances which put us in a position of having the possibility of achieving important tactical victories for the country. However, terror was imposed. Now our allies and the population are asking themselves, what should be done vis-à-vis those who have all the money in the world, all the evil in the world, and who are prepared to take the lives of our children, of our children and of our grandchildren?

Lyn, Mexico and Sonora await your counsel. We listen very carefully, not only because of your wisdom, but because we know how much you love this region and this country. Without further ado, I leave the floor to you.

Know Your Enemy

LaRouche: First of all, we've got to clear one thing up. It's very natural that patriots in Mexico would like to see their country win a war against these enemies, but that sometimes leads to a strategic miscalculation. What you're fighting, as you know, in northern Mexico immediately, but in Mexico as a whole at the same time—you're fighting *the British Empire*, which at present has the support of a British stooge who is currently the President of the United States, and has the support also of forces in the United States which are allied with a firm called Goldman Sachs. (We like to



"You're not dealing with some local drug pushers," LaRouche said. "You're dealing with Prince Philip [left], of the royal family of the British Empire of England, through his World Wildlife Fund, which is the enemy of all civilization!" And you can't win that battle on the local level, he stressed.

LaRouche is shown here during a visit to Mexico in March 2006, at a press conference in Monterrey, in the state of Nuevo Leon. With him is translator Dennis Small.



EIRNS/Sergio Oswaldo Barbosa Garcia

call it Goldman Sucks, because that's a more fair description of the function of that particular entity.)

But the fact is that Mexico can not win this war, as Mexico. The forces are international. They're the forces of the British Empire, including the British stooges inside the United States, and British stooges around the world. The British are running the entire area of South-west Asia. They are conducting a war against Iran. They are conducting a war against China, which is manifest in the Uighur phenomenon recently. They're running the international drug traffic. And what you're faced with in northern Mexico, in particular—you're faced with the British Empire. You're not dealing with some local drug pushers; you're dealing with Prince Philip, of the royal family of the British Empire of England, through his World Wildlife Fund, which is the enemy of all civilization! And you, a small group inside of one part of Mexico, are not going to win a war, alone, by bold resistance against this Empire.

The responsibility for winning the war lies, and the possibility for victory in Mexico, lies with the prior

defeat of the British Empire, under a leadership of the United States. Which means a change in, shall we say, the management of the current President of the United States. He's not competent himself to do any good, but he can be managed to carry the message needed, shall we say. So you need an alliance, not with Western Europe, because Western Europe is impotent; not with Africa, because Africa does not have the power; not with all of South America. All of South and Central America is totally *impotent* in any effort to conduct a resistance against the British Empire. Only a combination of the United States, Russia, China, and

India represents a dimension of power which is capable of defeating your enemy in that part of Mexico.

Now, therefore, what you do, is you prepare to win war, but you don't fight battles against overwhelming forces, in a position where you're vastly outnumbered and outflanked. What you do is you concentrate the fight where you have the allied forces which must and can take on and defeat the British Empire. It's that simple.

Now, as I said, the power to do this lies in no part of the world except this combination of the United States and the part of Eurasia east of the borders of Belarus and Russia. That's the only possibility of defeating the British Empire, whose drug lords are nothing but a continuation of the policy of the British Empire since the last decade of the 18th Century.

So, that's the first thing you have to understand. You can not say each country is going to patriotically defend itself against this Empire. Nobody has ever succeeded in doing that, except the United States itself. And it didn't do it alone! The United States was able to defeat the British Empire, in creating the United States, because the British were, at the same time, threatening all of continental Europe, especially the patriotic forces in

France, in Russia, in Germany, and so forth—in Sweden, in Denmark. The United States had international allies: the League of Armed Neutrality, which was the key force which made it possible for us to defeat the British Empire in securing our own independence.

The British and the Bolivarian Problem

The problem you have also in South and Central America, as you see it in Venezuela and elsewhere, is the Bolivarian problem. You saw this in the case of what happened in Central America just now, in Honduras. You saw the problem. You have Argentina, intimidated by the drug interests, which are run through this Venezuelan operation, which put the drug representatives into a key position in a government of Argentina, which is actually opposed to such a policy. But they conceded out of pressure from the United States and Britain, which they saw as the immediate adversary, to make an alliance with Venezuela and other countries which are allied, based on the Bolivarian principle, which Simón Bolívar himself denounced as being run by the head of British intelligence at that time, the predecessor and trainer of Lord Palmerston.

So, thus, one has to look at the history of this problem, the history of the enemy. And the enemy is the British Empire! The enemy behind the British Empire is not a bunch of British fools.

No, the Empire is in the form of international financiers, international financial power. That's the essence of the British Empire. It's an international monetary—you know, Goldman Sucks, as we call it in the United States, is a typical expression of the British Empire. Goldman Sucks has more power in the United States today than the President of the United States! That's largely due to the Bush family and so forth, things like that.

So, we have to understand that we're making a global revolution against the British Empire, and we can not have one of our allies, as in Mexico, killing themselves, impaling themselves on spikes, just to demonstrate their courage. In this case, we have to use a strategic approach, and we have to start from a global standpoint in strategic thinking.

Now, my position in this, of course, is crucial. If I do not succeed in my campaign to tame the present Obama Administration, Mexico has not got a chance of survival. That's the ugly truth in this situation. And the same thing is true in Europe. Without our victory against the British puppet, or the use of the puppet Obama by the British—the same British who gave us Adolf Hitler

and are now giving us Adolf Hitler's health policies in the personality of President Obama.

So, we have to look at this thing globally, not locally. And what has killed people again and again—great patriots have been killed—because they made the mistake of assuming that their bared breasts and courage could defeat an enemy of this magnitude. They went down, and the British Empire chopped them up, one by one. They took them on singly, and they would love to take on a conflict directly with Mexico right now. They'd love to do it, because they'd win in that kind of conflict.

Run a Flanking Operation

Now, therefore, that doesn't mean you give up. That means you locate yourself as representing an independent part of an international force which is determined to defeat this Empire. And the aim is always not, one by one, to nibble at the Empire, the nibble-down theory. Forget it! It doesn't work. It's a terrible strategy. The British are better at it, and they count on fools, like the fool of a President of the United States, who admittedly is a British puppet, among his other defects.

Look at this thing he is doing in Afghanistan! He's forcing the troops, the U.S. troops, to go into Afghanistan. He's an idiot! He's a reckless, irresponsible idiot. You don't do that! But he's got an ego, he's got an ego as big as Nero, and he's probably less intelligent than Nero.

That's the kind of problem we're up against.

So, we have to think about how we protect our forces from being exposed, from being exterminated, by taking on the enemy directly *before* we're in a position to take him on. You don't choose to fight the enemy in every part of the world. You do just exactly as General MacArthur did in the Pacific. MacArthur defeated the Japanese—and the British, because the British set this thing up in the Pacific—and he had Franklin Roosevelt's support for what he was doing: a naval operation which conquered the greatest area of the planet against an enemy, which was actually global, in the relatively shortest time imaginable, and with the least loss of life on either side. Because MacArthur was not a fool, the way most of the amateur generals and commanders-in-chief and so forth around the world today are.

We have to have a global strategy for freeing civilization from an imperial system which has dominated globally extended European civilization since the time of the



National Archives

President Franklin D. Roosevelt (right) with Mexican President Avila Camacho in Monterrey, Mexico, April 20, 1943. Roosevelt thought globally and strategically about how to destroy the enemy: a lesson for our time.

Peloponnesian War. And the United States is the only significant victory—that is, a victory against that enemy, as such. The only system of economy which *works* against the Venetian interests, or Venetian-type interests of the British Empire, has been the U.S. Constitution. There is no other standard, there is no other policy, which has ever been able to defeat this Empire, the Empire that has been in various forms of monetarism, has been the ruler of European civilization and its extension, since the Peloponnesian War. So, we should not get so foolishly courageous as to imagine that we, with a few forces in any neck of the woods, are going to win. We can win, if we have a grand strategy of allies to pick the fights where we choose to pick them, strategically.

So therefore, we have to maintain our principles of what our demands are. We have to collaborate with allies on the ground in preparing for victory. We have to take small victories where they're available to us, without getting our people destroyed. And we have to concentrate our entire effort, globally, on the global defeat of a global empire. That's what we're up to.

Now, we, by our policy expressions, by our propaganda, by our attempt to organize, by making proposals, by taking small victories where they're available to us, because they all contribute to readiness for victory—but don't put our forces at risk by trying to take on and defeat, directly, an enemy which outnumbers you vastly. So therefore, we have to flank the enemy.

Strategy, Not Machismo

Now, what we've got here, we've got a couple of things going on. What you have to take into account to estimate the current situation—first of all, the existing world monetary financial system is doomed! Nothing can save this system in its present form. The danger is not that the British will triumph with their policy; the danger is that they will lose only after they have destroyed civilization, which is the way the thing is going now. So, we have to defeat the British Empire, and the British Empire is represented on your doorstep by Prince Philip and the World Wildlife Fund. Prince Philip and the World Wildlife Fund are the force directly behind George Soros, and George Soros is nothing but a tool of the Brit-

ish Empire. And if you're going to take on George Soros, you're going to take on the British Empire! And how many troops do you have in London? How many troops do you have on the continent of Europe? How many troops do you have in Venezuela, for example, or Argentina, or Bolivia? And so forth.

So, the problem is you have to think in these terms, in strategic terms, not in a bare-chested dash on the spikes of the enemy's barbed wire. But there are things which we can do, and we must do. We must not let ourselves go with a fit of bravado. Don't get too macho! And therefore, you concentrate on the programmatic approach, and see what's feasible.

For example, there are obvious things in Mexico that may work to the advantage. There are people who have more or less degrees of power, who might do this. We should stick to our purpose, our policy, our strategy for economic recovery, economic development, economic freedom, and propagandize for what our strategic objectives are, for Mexico in particular, and for the hemisphere. And we have to count on winning, not on throwing our bodies on the barbed wire of the enemy, who is shooting us down with machine guns as we hang, dying, on barbed wire.

So anyway, my pulling rank as a strategist—and you have very few; we have some good strategists among the military and others in the United States, but they're not completely in charge, with this idiot in the



Coordinación de Material Gráfico

Mexican President José López Portillo at a rally on Sept. 3, 1982 in Mexico City, in support of his nationalization of the banks. He and LaRouche collaborated at that time, in the vital interests of Mexico, but were blocked by the British and their agent Henry Kissinger.

White House. And under Bush, it was even worse—or possibly worse—we’ll have to see how that turns out. But that’s the situation.

So, the idea of the cause, the identification, the propaganda about the cause, is obvious. That’s a matter of principle. But diving onto the barbed wire of the enemy, when it vastly outnumbers you, and challenging them in that way, is just foolish. You’re just killing yourself for no good purpose. So that’s what we have to do.

Mexico’s Unique History

Now, there are things, as we know, in that area and in Mexico, which may change the situation, or modify it. These things will tend to be useful if they are coordinated with relevant things happening in other parts of the world, as in the United States. The basic thing is the solidarity of the people in the United States with the people of Mexico. And the solidarity is a very simple matter: The two states have a related history. Mexico is not like the rest of Central and South America. Mexico has an affinity with the United States; it’s not merely an affinity based on proximity, but it’s an affinity based on history, a common history of two nations. And we have—which our cross-border relations merely indicate—we have an intimacy of common interest which is not found anywhere else in the hemisphere. And therefore, our concern is, Mexico is precious to us, because of its special role.

And my view of Mexico is the same I had when [José] López Portillo was President, and the forces which were associated with him. We were defeated by the British. Of course, we had a Secretary of Defense, Cap Weinberger, who was a fanatic British lover and he was associated with [George] Shultz, who was an actual Nazi, still living today, and runs this Nazi, Schwarzenegger, in California, which is quite relevant to the Mexico situation. But we have this affinity, and we have a common cause in the hemisphere which is specific. We have a history of fights over this issue, and we’re going to defend our ally, Mexico. But we’re going to defend it intelligently, not recklessly. And we’re going to take the enemy on where we can.

The British and 9/11

We now have the evidence, for example, that what was called 9/11, Sept. 11, 2001, was orchestrated and directed by British intelligence, together with the Saudi kingdom. The personnel, leading personnel, involved in the attack itself, were funded and directed by a combination of British and Saudi governments. Now we have the evidence, we’re putting it out. What do you think the importance of *that* is for the situation in Mexico, strategically? It’s the most important thing that could happen!

Here you have the enemy, your enemy, who is essentially the World Wildlife Fund, in your immediate area—because Prince Philip is the guy behind George

Soros, as the world's biggest drug pusher—and this is your enemy. This is the guy that's out to kill you. And who is the enemy of your enemy? It's the enemies of the British Empire, the enemies of the international drug trafficking, which is run by the British Empire. Of the international policy of genocide, which is run by the British Empire. That's the enemy that must be identified and defeated. When we expose, internationally as we're doing now, the actual conclusive evidence proving that the 9/11 attack, the famous 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington, and other locations, were done by planes which were set up to do this by the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, who is a British agent—you think that has some relevance to the state of mind of the American citizen? About their present government, under a President who can not stop kissing the butt of the British monarchy?

That's the way we go at this thing. All effective warfare, combat warfare, is based not on shooting. It's based on ideas. It's based on principles and on conceptions. Strategic conceptions. What are our potential allies? Well, our potential allies are China, which is under attack by the British Empire; Iran, which is under attack by the British Empire; most of the areas around Pakistan and so forth are under attack by the British Empire. India's now under attack by the British Empire. The entire mess in the so-called Middle East is British Empire. The problems in Europe are British Empire. The problems of Russia are British Empire. The problems of Japan today are implicitly British Empire.

So therefore, we have a strategic position in terms of political issues, political strategic interests, which are to our advantage. *Don't throw away that advantage for the sake of an isolated act of bravado.* That's my conception, especially with machos. Machos are very dangerous to themselves, above all, because the tendency for bravado runs ahead of their brain sometimes. And therefore, in order to prove how brave they are, they take their shirt and tear it to show their bared breast, and then they charge forward, probably with some kind of stick, against an enemy with machine guns. We can't have that. But being smart, and thinking globally and strategically, each of us can find, in our way, a way of hitching into a global effort to move on, and finally destroy, the common enemy.

The kind of thing that [President Franklin] Roosevelt thought about. The way I like to think about things.

It's not killing that's important. That's not the victory. You may get into a situation where there's a lot of

killing going on, but killing in battle is not strategy. It's folly. You have to start from strategy, which is essentially political and cultural, rather than combat. Then you may find a way and cause to win in combat, if you have to fight it.

Dialogue with LaRouche

Moderator: Okay, having heard what Lyn has presented, we're open for questions. People here are very pensive about what Lyn has just presented, and everyone is invited to make Cervantes' *Don Quixote* into our Bible these days, precisely to not act the way Don Quixote did. So if there are any questions, please come forward to the microphone.

The Drug Traffic

Q: Lyn, I send you warm greetings from Sonora. On July 5, we had elections in the state of Sonora for governor, for federal congressmen, state congressmen, and mayors. We had a very active Election Day, but with a lot of filth; it was extremely dirty. We had clear evidence, strong evidence, of an operation carried out by people connected to the drug trade. It is estimated that \$50 million was spent to achieve their main objective, which is the territory of the state of Sonora. They want to have the power behind the power of our state. Here, I understand the British intervention of the WWF; this is very clear. The intervention of these people in the state, because this is a state which is a natural transit point for their merchandise.

So, in that regard, what advice can you give us with regard to unemployment in Mexico, especially here in our community, in our city, since we see a mistaken economic policy being carried out, which is making things worse day by day? That's one question.

And I also ask you, what else do you recommend? Because the truth is that we are going to be threatened if we don't keep fighting to make sure these people don't take control over our state. We have every possibility of winning, because there's strong proof of irregularities, really big irregularities, where we can challenge and win the challenges. These are the recommendations of our lawyers, and we're working in that direction.

LaRouche: Well, you've got to go beyond the lawyers. You've got to go to strategy; real strategy. See, the point is, when you think of us not as each independently



Attorney General of Mexico

Vicente Zambada Niebla, a kingpin of the Sinaloa drug cartel, is arraigned with five bodyguards on March 21, 2009. The drug traffic is not, in itself, the purpose of the enemy, LaRouche said. "The drug trafficking is an instrument of warfare by the enemy against the people." And it's run from the top levels of the British oligarchy.

fighting a fight in a local area—which is the first error, and a fatal error that you can make in any war. We're in a global war; not a war between special interests and Mexico, but a global war.

Now, for example, Mexico was hit in the northern section, was hit deliberately, on the direction of the British Empire. The instrument included the use of the drug trafficking, but the issue of the war was not the drug trafficking.

Now look back; just take a look at history. Look at the history of the drug warfare against China by the British Empire in the 19th Century. What happened? The drugs were used to get money, of course, by the British, but also they were used primarily to destroy the ability of the Chinese people—which already had a relatively vast population, relative to the British—who were utterly defeated by the drug traffic, because the opium destroyed the culture and mind of the people.

The purpose of the drug trafficking is to have a self-financing campaign—that is, the drug revenue self-finances the operation, and buys politicians; as in the case outside of Mexico, you know, Venezuela. The role, the corrupt role of Venezuela in the region is essentially not the oil traffic; it's the drug trafficking. The Venezuelan government was involved in backing drug trafficking, as a source of income. Other governments in South America, what are they doing? They're destroying their

own people, by saying they have a right to drugs. They have lost the war already! They have betrayed themselves already, by defending the drug trafficking. The drug trafficking is designed to destroy the people. And China, which was once a powerful part of the world, lost its power because the people were destroyed by the drug traffic.

Now, therefore, the drug traffic is not the purpose of the enemy. *The drug trafficking is an instrument of warfare by the enemy against the people.* Where's the enemy? Well, the enemy is Prince Philip. You want to say drug trafficking? Why don't you say Prince Philip? Why don't you say World Wildlife Fund? Well, what's purpose of the World Wildlife Fund? To destroy all nations; to reduce the population of the world, as

stated by the World Wildlife Fund, from presently over 6.7 billion people, to less than 2 billion. What is that? That's the issue.

Where does it come out? You come out with this idea in the United States, about the Green Revolution.¹ What is that? That's psychological warfare to corrupt the people, and induce them to destroy themselves. Anybody who is for this idea of anti-nuclear, you know, low-energy density policies, the cap-and-trade, or similar things, or the health policy, the Nazi health policy adopted by the government of the United States as by the President; it's the same thing. This is the real objective!

Don't assume the drug problem is your real problem. The drug problem is an *aspect* of the *implementation* of the intention, which is to induce people in Mexico to corrupt themselves and to destroy themselves.

Therefore, the key, the most important thing—take trade union organizations. What are you going to do? You're going to stick to, basically, your basic work in struggling for this and that, politically, and in other ways. But the question is, how far can you go alone in challenging what they are going to try to do?

1. Not to be confused with the earlier Green Revolution that improved the efficiency of grain production in many countries, such that Mexico, for example, went from importing half its wheat in 1943, to self-sufficiency in 1956, to exporting wheat in 1964—ed.

You Need International Backup

You, in a sense, have to operate like a guerrilla force, but politically, a guerrilla force. You have to flank the situation; you have to find flanks that you can develop. And you have to show courage, but also don't show desperation and panic.

And the key thing is, when they attack you in Mexico, since the attack is coming from the World Wildlife Fund, which is operating in, and controlling that whole area, we counterattack with our publication, internationally, of the evidence showing that 9/11, an attack on the United States' people and nation, was done by the combination of the British Empire with its ally, Saudi Arabia.

So, the action here is not always your reaction; it's the question of what we do as a flanking operation, to get the pressure off you. To the extent that we force the issue on the battlefields we know we can win on, we take the pressure off you, and give you some room to maneuver. And when we show courage, we are defending you. When we who have the greater power, don't show courage, we're undermining you.

So therefore, our objectives have to be defined, even though you're working in a special area, with like a trade union interest in that part of northern Mexico. The fight, in principle, is international. It's the fight for humanity. The fact is, of course, we're each functioning in terms of a cultural defense which defines a cultural defense in terms of national sovereignty. Now, we're defending national sovereignty, but at the same time, the defense of national sovereignty is an *international* interest. It's an *international human interest*. And the ability to fight these issues depends upon leadership by people who are thinking about the global interests of humanity, and look at the interests of each nation in the world in terms of that global interest. And when there's an attack on one part of us, we attack on the part we're able to.

That's the principle of warfare; the principle of warfare is, do not be provoked, even strongly provoked, into walking into a trap, into starting a war where you're crushed, when we can win the war, or win a battle for the war on another front. So, the fight we have to fight this thing, is on an international basis, and on a basis of our concern for each part of the forces in that international fight. And we have to avoid putting people at risk, where their putting themselves at risk would be dangerous to them, without fruit. And always concentrate on the areas where we have a chance of hitting the enemy on a flank where we can weaken him overall.

That's the whole point: You have to keep a clear view of what your interests are. You can define many of your interests in terms of local situations, human situations. But in winning the war, you've got to make a step up to a higher level, to a global strategic level.

And I'm sure you probably have people in Mexico, still left over from López Portillo, who did have a clear view of this matter, with some other people at the same time, of what the issue was. And if you just look at that last address he gave, public address, at the UN, and think about that—because he expressed something which he and I shared at that time. He and I were allies on a global issue, and we have not given up; I have not given up. I'm still committed to victory, where López Portillo's Mexico was committed to victory. I'm determined to win that back, for Mexico, but I have to think in terms of the global context which did crush Mexico then, and has been crushing Mexico since, over all the intervening decades. That's the point.

I'm not diminishing anything, any fight. I'm not giving up on anything that is a matter of principle; but I'm saying that the issue here of principle is, we've got to *win the war*; not just for our own personal satisfaction, but for the satisfaction of our children and grandchildren.

Water and Nuclear Power

Q: You said, that in this fight, we have to concentrate on a programmatic orientation to propagandize our objectives, our strategic objectives in Mexico and on the continent. Do you think that we should continue to push a national discussion, the idea of the PLHINO, in terms of how to organize the political forces in Mexico, and here in the northwest of Mexico?

LaRouche: Absolutely. First thing is, outflank the situation. The enemy is trying to get you to locate the PLHINO campaign in one area, in Sonora. Now, therefore, what's the point?

The mistake would be, not to propagandize for the PLHINO throughout *all* Mexico. Now, the evidence exists, as many of you know, who are experts, or leading trade unionists, are probably familiar with this thing. There's a long history of the water policy of Mexico; this is something which is inherent to the situation.

We have too many people in Mexico City. I used to sit there and watch: In the morning, you start out, and the haze, this pollution, is rising within the bowl which is Mexico City. And by afternoon, you couldn't move;

FIGURE 1

Mexico: the PLHINO and the PLHIGON

you were choking to death. And the population kept increasing, increasing, and increasing, in this bowl in Mexico City, while the development in the rest of the territory of Mexico was hindered.

And you look along the border. Now the border problem, which we dealt with at that time, was that the coastal areas, especially the southern areas, get too hot for comfortable living. But if you had nuclear power, say ten nuclear plants—which López Portillo's government planned at that time—then you would have the ability to open the territory along the coastal area, to make it habitable by air conditioning and other things you could do—water supply, and all these kinds of things, there. You also would be able to generate water development in northern Mexico, particularly in the high plateau, by various methods. This requires power: power to move water, power to get it up to higher elevations. And if you do that, now suddenly the whole area of Mexico has a change in character. You get areas which have too much water; you move some of that

water to areas which have too little. You also develop desalination as a way of doing that. You develop more density, a richer potentiality of the soil, and all these kinds of things.

So therefore, this issue which was for us then, and is still for us today, is we need nuclear power throughout Mexico. Otherwise, we really can not get to any long-term solution for the afflictions of the Mexican population in general. We wish to move the population less and less into Mexico City, and more and more away from it, but into areas of habitation which are suited for the needs of the people who are moving into these areas. It means more agriculture, it means more local industry, it means development of new towns and cities which are centers of employment and productivity.

So therefore, I think that the PLHINO is a case of a project which has been long-standing. It was developed by Mexican authorities, military and others, over a long period of time, along both coasts. And it's obvious to anyone who studies anything about it and knows any-



GNU-FDL

The El Cajón Dam in the state of Nayarit, a water-rich area that would be part of the PLHINO, to bring water to the arid north. The PLHINO will never be built without broad national support, and an international drive to defeat the British Empire.

thing, that this is what Mexico needs. And it's been stopped and blocked in one way or the other all the way over these years, as it was stopped in the case of López Portillo, by international forces led by the British, the same British as Prince Philip—they were the forces which organized Henry Kissinger and organized Cap Weinberger and others, to move in and destroy this Mexican government.

So that's the lesson, and the lesson is, you've got to broaden your appeal to the identity of all Mexico, broaden it to the sympathy that such a development has, and such thoughts have, throughout the hemisphere, particularly South America as well—Central America, but South America in particular.

And that's the way you win the war, essentially, with ideas, and you use the physical means of struggle as they are appropriate to successfully winning that war, or even to maintain a defense against some horror show.

Defeat the British Empire

So, we should just do that. The ideas are what's important. And you know, the PRI used to be an heroic organization, before it was crushed. I know, I was there. I know most of the leading people of that time. We

worked with them in López Portillo's time. They were really patriots, and the movement that he had in that short interim, when he did the reform, the economic reform, particularly in terms of the Mexican national bank, was perfect! It was right. These were good people. But you've had since, a long process of demoralization, because of the defeat, and the corrupt financial interests which have come in and polluted the countryside.

So therefore, when you take something like the PLHINO, this is crucial. This idea is crucial; it's infectious! To the extent that you can get more forces in Mexico to come out and support this kind of thing, then you have

more latitude for more tactical things, and can get victories, as you see right in this situation.

Obviously, what happened in the vote, in the orchestration of the vote in the Sonora area—which was done under the supervision of the World Wildlife Fund and under British agent George Soros and his people—was an attempt to crush exactly that, where it existed in that area, in the Sonora area.

So, your attitude has to be, well, what we have to do is make this more broad, so that we in this area are not so vulnerable on this issue, because we're the only advocates of this. Other parts of Mexico are not advocating this, even though if you look at the map, and you look at the history of the thing: The policy of development of Mexico's water system is an old one with Mexican patriots throughout the nation, and the problem here is we don't have enough support from other parts of Mexico. If we had more support, we would have more flexibility in dealing with this thing. And that's where the problem comes in.

Now, we also have another problem. Remember, the drug problem lies with the President of the United States right now. The fact that the President of the United States is allied with, and a tool of, the international drug interests, and is an ally, explicitly, of Prince

Philip, with the cap-and-trade policy and similar kinds of policy, is in favor of genocide like that of Hitler's medical policy, is not good for Mexico. So these things have to be taken into account.

Therefore, my emphasis—yes, all these things we're talking about, we agree; these are the things that must be developed, that must be strengthened. But there's certain shrewdness and tactical slyness, as well as other things. But the enemy, the real problem is the British Empire, as such, Prince Philip, his World Wildlife Fund, his drug-pushing, and those in the United States, such as President Obama, who have a Nazi policy on economy and health care. That's your problem.

So therefore, what am I doing? I'm saying that President Obama must retire, or go under management, where they have supervisors watching him like an animal in a cage, in the White House. That has to happen.

Your victory in Mexico depends on our succeeding in that. That is, any short-term victory. Because if the United States has a different policy, as a nation, the United States as a nation is sufficiently powerful to provide protection for people in northern Mexico and so forth.

A Flank in Sonora

Moderator: I believe we are coming to the end of the time allotted for this conversation, and therefore I'm going to reserve the right to ask the last question.

I think it's important for Lyn to know that today, a column appeared in the local press with revelations about the role of Soros in what is happening in Sonora. I think that this is the beginning of something which is going to happen on a regional level, and soon, it's going to be widely known. Soros's fame will be widely known all across Sonora—and the fame of the WWF and what's behind the WWF. So, the question I want to ask you, Lyn, is to develop a little further this idea of a flank.

As you know, nationally, we have a very anomalous electoral situation. The PRI grew, in the country. It got a majority in the Congress. It conserved its governorships. The only area where there was an offensive to ensure the defeat of the PRI was here, in Sonora. This speaks to us of a national scenario, which represents, relatively speaking, a kind of tactical advantage, because we are going to have a broader horizon of possibilities to push the discussion of the ideas regarding the PLHINO, and also in a certain sense, to help out with the existential crisis the PRI itself is facing, which is

whether they will accept co-government with the PAN government of [President Felipe] Calderón, which, in the last three years, his economic policies have thrust 3 million Mexicans into poverty.

That said, the question is, this flank which we were just talking about with regard to the PLHINO, we view this as the main vulnerability the enemy has, because they [the PRI] do not have a policy to protect the country, nor to present internationally a demand such as that made by López Portillo, for a new world economic order.

The other aspect which I'd like to know more about your views on is, in moving forward with this idea of hitting the weak flank of the enemy on the economic situation, and the flank that has to do with the role of Soros, and the operation that they carried out with surgical precision in Sonora, to suffocate the possibility of the PRI maintaining control over the government in the state.

LaRouche: Well, what you're dealing with is a special operation of a strategic type against Sonora, focused by the WWF organization, which outsources drug pushers as part of it.

Now, the key thing that has to be done in this, is to take this back across the border, by taking the issue inside the United States from the point where the attack was immediately launched—the political attack—and take it there. In other words, we have to escalate, by using the areas where we have strength, defensible strength, and use our capabilities where we have the advantage, to fight and avoid accepting battle on an area where we are weak. This is basic strategy in all warfare. When you are weak, don't force the battle there on the enemy's terms.

Where you are stronger, or where you can become stronger, force the battles that you choose on those terms where you have the advantage. And then get the hell out of there, and go to a new area once you've settled that operation. It's just that: It's a question of the taking of real strategy, of grand strategy.

Moderator: Okay, Lyn. We want to thank you for the time you've dedicated to us. We're going to follow your advice very closely, and we reiterate that we here are also prepared to carry this battle forward, to develop the flanks that are required, and we're moving in the direction of a victory, an international victory, a victory for all humanity. So thank you very much, Lyn.

LaRouche: Thank you.