

LaRouche in Mexico: A Dialogue On Economics and Statecraft

Editors' note: We present here the third installment of our coverage of Lyndon LaRouche's March 28-April 2 visit to Monterrey, Mexico. In our April 7 issue, we covered Mr. LaRouche's speech to the Monterrey Technological Institute, which invited him to address their 27th International Symposium on Economics. Last week, our cover feature reported on LaRouche's address to a group of political, business and trade union leaders from around the country, as well as his exciting presentation and exchange with 100 youth—members and supporters of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) in Mexico, Argentina, the United States, and Canada.

Here you will read the transcript of three discussions LaRouche had with Mexican media during his visit. The first is a 30-minute dialogue with Architect Héctor Benavides, the most-watched TV anchor in northern Mexico, which was broadcast in full on April 9 on the "Cambios" show of Multi-medios TV. This is followed by LaRouche's hour-long dialogue with radio and TV host René Alonso, which was broadcast on Alonso's program "Encuentro" on Radio Nuevo León on April 6. And third, we report on LaRouche's press conference on March 31, which includes an exchange he had with a group of youth present on that occasion.

The final element of the package is a call issued by the Mexico LaRouche Youth Movement following LaRouche's visit, which announced that the LYM and *EIR* will be co-sponsoring a seminar on "Oil for Nuclear Technology," to be held in Mexico City on June 7, 2006.

LaRouche on Mexican Television

U.S. and Mexico Can Jointly Solve the Crisis

Here is the transcript of Architect Héctor Benavides's March 29 television interview with Lyndon LaRouche. The last eight minutes of that interview, starting with the question about which of the three Presidential candidates had the most support from the U.S. government, were aired on the news broadcast that night, just after coverage of President Bush's meeting in Mexico City with President Fox. The full half-hour

interview was aired on April 9, on "Cambios," one of Benavides's most-watched programs, which airs late on Sunday evenings. The questions and answers were translated on air by Dennis Small.

Q: Welcome, Mr. LaRouche. With just 100 days to go before the election for the Presidency of Mexico, how do you see the situation in the country?

LaRouche: Well, I don't look so much at the candidates, as I do at the overall situation which I know very well. In former times, when I was more closely associated with the PRI, then I had inside knowledge on the candidates. I don't presently have inside knowledge on the candidates, but I do know what the global situation is which Mexico faces. Because you have to look at the international situation: The international financial system in the post-Greenspan period is being put through a collapse. The collapse was inevitable. The inflation under Greenspan was beyond belief. His successors now realize that they have to let the thing collapse.

But the financial groups have no interest in the people or the nations. You look, for example, at South America: You have a very interesting President in Argentina, Kirchner. I watched him closely—I think he's good. I know Argentina somewhat—the bad people and the good people. The partnership between the new government of Chile and Argentina is very important. It's very important for Mexico, if indirectly. Because the question here is, can we, in the Western Hemisphere deal with a crisis, the biggest crisis in modern history, in which whole countries can disappear? Therefore, what I'm concerned about, is, we have to have a return to a form of the old IMF, the original Bretton Woods system.

The fact is that most banks, most of the financial systems which today are dictating to other countries, are bankrupt themselves. There probably is no major bank in Japan, in the Americas, or in Western or Central Europe which is not bankrupt. The entire U.S. system is bankrupt—it's hopelessly bankrupt. The only solution is to go to government, and that is the only solution in any part of the world. The private financiers can not solve the problem. Only government, by going back to methods like those of Franklin Roosevelt, can deal with this crisis.

So, the question of what the policies are—not only in Mexico, but especially across the border, between the United States and Mexico—therefore is my great concern.

Q: If you look at what's happened in Brazil, Argentina,



EIRNS/Richard Magraw

Lyndon LaRouche, in an interview with Mexican TV host Héctor Benavides March 29, emphasized that the looming blowout of the globalized financial system will play a greater role in determining what happens in Mexico, than the outcome of the Presidential elections in July.

Chile, Bolivia, there's talk of an advance of the left in the Americas. Were there to be in Mexico a similar advance, with the election of Andrés Manuel López Obrador, what do you think would happen?

LaRouche: I have two ways of looking at it. First of all, I think what the opportunities for Mexico are, in terms of these countries—Ibero-American countries—coming out of the South, not Mexico's South. However, to make any recovery work, Mexico must be mobilized to play a leading role. Because, if you understand Ibero-America, Mexico has a very special importance for the entire hemisphere. It has not been playing that role recently, not since 1982. But the role Mexico was able to have before 1982, is the role that Mexico must play politically, in the community of the nations to the south, now.

We have certain problems in the hemisphere. Argentina has a very strong character, particularly since [Argentine President Néstor] Kirchner has cleaned up some of the problems. Chile coming in means that the Southern Cone is not destabilized. I think Bolivia can be stabilized. [Venezuelan President Hugo] Chávez is Chávez. But, we can not dictate the conditions inside a sovereign nation. We can dictate the terms of cooperation among sovereign nations, and I think that Chávez, so far, has been willing to cooperate, and that is positive.

But Mexico has a very strong historical character. If that can be mobilized, Mexico could become a powerful factor in the organization.

Q: How do you mobilize Mexico? This is twice that you've mentioned this.

LaRouche: Well, I went through this with [former Mexican

President José López Portillo: As you know, in the Spring of 1982, in the middle of the Malvinas War, he asked me for my advice. He said, "What are they going to do to me? What are they going to do to Mexico?" And I said, "They're going to try to destroy Mexico by September." He said, "What do we do?" So, I wrote a book, *Operation Juárez*, which, still, I think, is the valid policy approach for today. In the crisis in August, when it hit, he acted properly. But everything was against him. Mexico was crushed; the institutions were crushed.

My view is, being an old man, and having roots back hundreds of years, I know that certain values don't disappear, and that what you need is a leadership in Mexico which will bring these deeper values back to the surface, which is essentially a patriotic image.

Q: That leadership, do you see this in Calderón, the PAN's candidate? In Madrazo, the PRI candidate? In López Obrador, the PRD candidate?

LaRouche: I don't see any of the candidates as particularly strong. The problem is, that the United States and the Europeans will not allow Mexico to have a strong candidate. They would destroy any candidate they think is a strong patriot, and therefore, the candidate is going to be weak. But, with what we have in the hemisphere, and certain forces in Europe, and other places, we can take even a weak President; if he's uplifted by a movement, a patriotic movement, he will respond to that. And often in history, a weak President has acted strongly, because he had a popular base and good advisors. So, my concern is to give whoever is going to be the President of Mexico the best advice I can.

Q: That leadership which you're talking about, who of the three might have it? Which of the three is the least weak?

LaRouche: I'm not sure. López Obrador has had a certain strength. But I don't know. Because I know the pressures that are coming in on him. Conditions: "You want to be President? You want to be killed, or you want to be President?" And that's the kind of thing that's coming from the North. I know these characters. I know what they're like.

My view is, that it's up to us in the United States, particularly with circles that I'm bringing together within the Democratic Party, to act in a way in a crisis in which Mexico's sovereign powers can be exerted as a sovereign approach. And therefore, I think it's my job, because in the past two years, I've come into a more significant position inside the Democratic Party, and other institutions. I'm also in the process of destroying a couple of powerful people, including Felix Rohatyn, including George Shultz, and people of that type. I'm presently engaged in destroying them politically. They have to be destroyed, if we're going to get our country back. And therefore, from the standpoint, if I can do what I did in 2005 with the Democratic Party, what we did in defeating Bush on taking away the pensions—if I can get into that

position again, which I think I will, then I can do something in shaping policy here.

Q: You formed a political action committee in the Democratic Party, and especially in California—

LaRouche: No, more than that. California is our largest youth organization. And our people, youth who came with me six, eight years ago, are now leading figures at certain levels of the Democratic Party. But, essentially, I'm pretty much integrated with the institutions in Washington, and I have a sometimes strong, sometimes weak, relationship with the leaders of the party. I'm generally being identified as close to President Clinton, and I'm very much hated by Vice President Cheney.

Q: These youth in California, what's their position with regard to the Hispanic marches which we've seen in the recent period in the United States?

LaRouche: Well, they're part of it. It's our function inside the Democratic Party, in the base, largely on the lower base, though we have friends at a higher level. And we function with certain leaders in the Democratic Party and in things like this, this protest movement. No, we're very much involved in that, we support that. Because this thing, this must not happen—this *must* not happen. And therefore, we're committed to it. It's a policy question. It's not a social issue, it's a national policy question: *This kind of bad law must never occur.*

Look at the border: All right, Mexico was destroyed. So therefore, people go northward, as illegals, other ways, to survive. They get to the United States, they're semi-slave labor for the cheapest kinds of jobs. What happens if those jobs collapse? As they will. Then, what do you do? Push them back here? What do you cause in the northern provinces of Mexico? You cause a crisis! You cause a very deadly situation.

We don't want it. We must go back to the kind of things we were talking about years ago. We can organize the relationship of migration into the United States on a fair basis to protect the individual who migrates, through consular arrangements. But, we must not have this. So therefore, on an issue like this, this is a very serious matter for us.

Q: What can be done to stop the construction of that 1,000-kilometer wall that they're talking about?

LaRouche: That's what we're trying to do. Look, this is the same thing as fighting Cheney: You have to realize that what Cheney represents, what Felix Rohatyn represents, what George Shultz represents—they represent a Nazi-like operation inside the United States. If these people were to succeed, you would have a Nazi power in the United States, north of Mexico. So, the question is not merely this issue: The question is *stopping them.*

It's the same mentality behind this war in Iraq. The United

States had won the war in Iraq. The government had surrendered. General Garner was ready to work with them. But, Halliburton wanted money. So, they started the war again by firing Garner. And now, \$11-something billion is paid to Halliburton and other firms. This is a private army war! And it's about to become a chaos! This war in Iraq is about to disintegrate!

But, what we've got there: You want to know about Nazism? You look at Cheney, and the people behind them. If we don't *stop them* inside the United States, you're going to have Hell here.

Q: What's been the role of the electronic and print media in this whole situation? There seems to be unhappiness of the families with soldiers who are dying in a war that seems to have no end, and have no purpose.

LaRouche: You have a generation which was the 68er generation. Now, the 68er generation does not have the depth of character of the preceding generation; the preceding generation would not have put up with this. So, what happens is, the press is more corrupt than ever before. We have some of the press that is responding, but for opportunistic reasons. There are some parts of the U.S. establishment which are responding, because they are against Nazism, they're against fascism, like the *New York Times*. Other major parts of the press are pro-fascist, in fact. They don't have swastikas yet, but they have the mind, just the same.

So, that's our problem. We're at a point, however—you *have* to understand that the situation in Iraq now, for the United States, is worse than at the end in Vietnam—far, far worse! It's an absolutely hopeless situation, militarily. We are now, some of us, negotiating internationally to get a withdrawal by an agreement with Iran. While Cheney wants a war in Iran, we know we need cooperation with Iran to stabilize the situation in that part of the world.

Q: Some say that the Fox government in Mexico has made significant mistakes regarding the U.S.-Mexican relationship. What is your view?

LaRouche: Yeah, terrible mistakes! Economic and everything.

You have to recognize that people of Hispanic-speaking origin are the largest single minority group in the United States. This is potentially a very powerful political force. This force has been alienated by the present government. If the Democratic Party goes back to itself—these groups are being kept out, they're being kept in special categories. They don't feel like citizens, they don't think they have rights; they make complaints, they protest, they ask. But they don't think of themselves as having *rights!*

Give me citizens, a majority of the American citizens who think they have rights, and these problems can be changed overnight. It's one of the things I'm taking up here, in my visit here—some of the things that have to be done. If we



EIRNS/Dan Sturman

Tens of thousands rallied in Washington, D.C. (shown here), and other U.S. cities April 10, calling for immigration reform. "The Hispanic-American legacy in the United States today, is a general welfare tendency."

decide to cooperate between the two countries, we can produce what will seem like miracles. But we have to find a political solution that enables us to cooperate.

Q: How many millions of Mexicans are we talking about in that situation? How many millions of Hispanics?

LaRouche: Well, you're talking about—I'm not sure of the exact numbers. But the official count is, that the number exceeds that of U.S. citizens of African descent. It's the largest single so-called minority in the United States. And most of them have some degree of a Spanish cultural background. And the Mexican background is the largest, most deeply embedded. If these people are convinced that they have the right to be real leadership, to be a decisive factor in the next election, this November.

Q: What are the scenarios which you think about regarding the upcoming July elections in Mexico? Please tell us what you think would happen should each of these three candidates be elected. What would happen to Mexico, and in its relationship to the United States? Let's start with Calderón, the PAN candidate.

LaRouche: Well, I think, the case in all is the same, because, I think these are all weak candidates. They may have certain strengths as contenders, but for purposes of government, they're dealing with the international financial community, they're dealing with the United States; therefore, in respect to those forces, they're going to be weak. And therefore, they will not do anything strong.

However, my approach is different: My approach is to give them the opportunity to become strong. You've got two key problems—actually three, but two key problems: First of

all, the world is going to nuclear energy, and that's the only way you can deal with the water problem in Mexico, Northern Mexico. Now, that is not only a Mexico option. If you look around the world, you will see that the anti-nuclear campaign is over! It's not just because of the price of petroleum. It's because of technological reasons that go beyond that. We *must* go to high-temperature sources of power. This is all over the world.

Therefore, if Mexico finds itself in a situation, in which the President of Mexico sees that that is the trend, then they'll go with it. You have, already in the plans in Mexico—20 nuclear plants were planned years ago. Mexico needs those. Mexico has to build new cities, otherwise the population problem can't be dealt with. Agriculture must be restored—and without water, this won't work! And we can not get enough water without desalination. Just, there is not enough water—we're drawing down fossil water. There's some water in Mexico that could come north from south, along the coast, in part, but through the mountains. That would help.

But, for the long term, you need nuclear power. And therefore, you have to develop the land-area, you have to build up agriculture, you have to build industries and towns. It is in the interest of the United States that that happen, in the long term. It's in the immediate interest of Mexico. If Mexico is able to have an orientation in that direction, I think the political process in Mexico will take care of the problem—whoever the President is. That is, a serious person were the best President.

Q: Have you heard anything about what each of these three candidates tell us about their own programs?

LaRouche: I've heard, but I don't believe anything. Because

I've also heard things behind the scenes, as well as on the surface. Any candidate who has popularity and has a political base with popularity, is going to say a number of things which are attractive. But then, when they become President, the pressure *from behind the scenes*, on the major questions of banking and finance and economic policy will take over, as they have so far, since 1982: It's the international financial forces reflected within Mexico, that have dictated the policy. Now, that is at a breaking-point, that won't work. So, if there's a change in trend, then we have a possibility. But I think what's probably happened is, that a qualified candidate, in the old sense—that these financial interests and the U.S. interests have been very careful to prevent this from happening.

Q: From what you have observed, which of the three candidates, of the major parties—Calderón, López Obrador, and Madrazo—has greater support from the United States' government?

LaRouche: Well, I think that they're looking at Madrazo as a very likely person, to get the maximum pressure on him. And if he doesn't do what they want, they'll get somebody else.

Q: The polls indicate that there is a nine point advantage—with each point representing a half-million voters in Mexico—in favor of López Obrador. Are the polls mistaken?

LaRouche: I think, no, they're not mistaken. That's in general what my reading is. He's been a very successful populist candidate, a populist mayor [of Mexico City]. So, it was an attack on him, which worked to his advantage on the question of that road. So, all the things have gone to his advantage, in the ordinary sense. And if he becomes President, I wish him the best. But, I have deep ties to certain currents of the PRI; there are some people still alive who, I would consider friends. And I would trust them personally.

Q: What do they tell you?

LaRouche: I haven't talked to them about this question. I've kept my fingers out of the Presidential campaign in Mexico, and I'm looking at Mexico as a whole.

Q: The problem of ungovernability in Mexico: Should the announced winner of the elections not be López Obrador—which the polls and everyone says, for the last two years, is the one on top—is there a possibility of ungovernability? Is there such a risk?

LaRouche: Let me be very concrete: This is an international question, not a Mexico question. We're now at the point, we have gotten rid of Alan Greenspan. Alan Greenspan was in charge from 1987 until recently. Alan Greenspan was one of the worst things that ever happened to the United States—and to the world.

You have to realize that money is not worth anything, really. Because, what you have, you don't have deposits,

assets in banks. You have financial derivatives. And these financial derivatives are in layers. You saw what happened in Iceland: Iceland is totally bankrupt. New Zealand is bankrupt. Australia is near-bankrupt. They're having a meeting in Australia now, of bankrupt countries: But it's not just them. *Every leading bank in the United States is bankrupt.* The housing bubble is about to blow—all kinds of things are about to blow.

We can have, in the period of the coming months—April, May, June—these three months, are potentially three months of an *incalculable rate of financial collapse internationally.*

So, therefore, when you're talking about an election coming up in Mexico, you have to realize that whatever the situation is now, you have to factor in the fact that we're facing a very great danger of an immediate collapse.

Presently, the leading bankers of the world have realized that this is the case. Therefore, they're not going to put any more expansion or any money into the system. They're going to allow the bubbles to collapse. They're going to shut down the carry-trade. Unless they change their mind in the coming months. But, right now, if they continue on the present policy, during the next three months, we're facing a general collapse of the financial system, with horrifying effects on the economies and on the condition of people in national economies.

In France, you have 3 million people going on strike; you have strikes in Germany; you have an ungovernable situation in Italy; Poland is breaking down. The Belarus election show you that there's no popularity for this trend over there. Ukraine, they've lost. Netanyahu has lost the election in Israel: You're now in a *global political crisis*, building up, so that there is no stable condition on which to hold an election. Because, you can proceed like a commanding general in warfare, to have a strategy, which takes all conditions into account, but you can't predict anything. *No one* can predict, because you have too many people who are now unpredictable in powerful positions.

Q: My last question: Will the picture you're painting for us become worse in Mexico? The majority of the banks in Mexico are no longer ours, they're not Mexican any more.

LaRouche: That's right! That's the worst of it. Because, a bank that is not yours in Mexico, is a bandit robbing your country under these conditions. Therefore, the problem is, only the strengthening of national governments, the assertion of the sovereignty of the people of a country, is the real line of defense around which we can mobilize to defend people. We need strong, patriotic government, which the people respect!

Q: Leadership.

LaRouche: Yes!

Q: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Dennis Small.

LaRouche: It's always good to see you.

LaRouche: The Issue In Mexico Is Defense Of the Nation-State

An hour-long interview with Lyndon LaRouche was conducted by Monterrey radio and TV host René Alonso, and aired on April 6 on Alonso's program "Encuentro," on Radio Nuevo León.

Q: Today we will talk with someone who has had a close relationship with Mexico, a man who, for quite some time, has been an important protagonist in the political life of the United States, and now is an influential personality in international politics. We are referring to Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, a former Presidential candidate in the United States—a man who has built an entire movement, and who has views which are totally different than those of the U.S. establishment. Mr. LaRouche, thank you for being here.

LaRouche: Good to be here.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, the United States is turning out to be a major war power around the world; however, there are indications that internally, its economy is collapsing. Is this in fact the case?

LaRouche: Yes.

Q: Why?

LaRouche: Well, you've got two problems. First of all, the international monetary system, especially in the form it's been in since 1987, under the model of Alan Greenspan, the former head of the Federal Reserve System—he instituted a form of financial derivatives, which is now about to blow up as the greatest bankruptcy in modern history. Then you have to go back further to 1971-72, when we broke up the Bretton Woods system and went to a floating-exchange-rate system. So, the whole world system has been in a period of decadence, since 1971-72. But the worst of it started after 1987, and now it's out. We can expect a total collapse of the system as early as this year. Interestingly enough, it could happen before the elections in Mexico.

Q: This is something that is very interesting, because we can see that this global international system has not actually strengthened internal economies. For example in the United States, we see this in the auto sector.

LaRouche: It's not only that. The point is this: This is the same thing that really hit Mexico in 1982. There's been a long-term intention to destroy the nation-state as an institution.

It's called globalization. Eliminate the nation-state and let an international financier group control the world.

This is the same group, not the same people, but the same group which created Adolf Hitler: That the world should be run by a group of powerful bankers. Destroy the nation-state, have nothing but cheap labor, reduce the world's population to less than 1 billion. And this is what we're living in. It's crazy. It won't work, but it could destroy society.

Q: The society as we now know it.

LaRouche: Well, you would not call it jungle society. This is like a reenactment of a farce of the Roman Empire collapse. It's a situation like the 14th-Century New Dark Age.

Q: Why is this happening? Do the international financial interests think they could stay in control of things under such conditions of chaos?

LaRouche: Look, you look at history. For example, look at history, 1492: You had an attempt to break up the foundation of the modern nation-state. It started in Spain, but it was actually organized from Venice. This resulted in religious war until 1648. So, you date modern European civilization actually from 1648, the Treaty of Westphalia. That was religious warfare, to attempt to destroy civilization through wars, organized by religious warfare. Then the Crusades were the same thing: The Venetian bankers used the Norman chivalry to run religious warfare against Islam, and others. It was called the ultramontane system, which ended up in a New Dark Age. The Roman Empire went down in the same way. Athens went down in a similar way: To become an empire, sophistry, gave up principle. So you see, you might call it a form of mass insanity which keeps coming back. It's like a disease. If you catch the disease, you may die of it; and it's always associated with a certain kind of a use of usury, and it's an imperial system. All of it's imperial—the nation-state must have no power.

The modern nation-state since the Renaissance is always based on the principle of the common good. The law is the nation-state has no right to exist, unless the nation protects the welfare of all the people. By modern civilization, we mean that nation-states together share the same principle. Each nation runs its own affairs, but it must protect the general welfare.

That's the problem.

Q: How do we organize things to break this kind of vicious circle, so that humanity can move forward, from the edge of what you've called a New Dark Age?

LaRouche: Actually, we have done pretty well in beating it many times. Especially, the progress of European civilization since the 15th Century. You had the dark age of the Roman Empire, you had the Byzantine Empire, you had the Venetian-chivalry system. But the 1439 Council of Florence, the principles—a Christian version of the principles of ancient

Greece—were used to adopt the modern nation-state. So, we had modern European civilization with the best heritage of modern European civilization before it, in other words, European culture, but finally realizing a decent form of society. And the key thing was the development of the Americas, particularly from the 16th Century on. People left Europe—some people were chased from Europe, but some people left—to come here, in this Hemisphere, away from the oligarchy (but some of the oligarchy came, too), in order to build a form of society based on European culture without the oligarchy!

And so, that's been the struggle—it's like the history of Mexico, Maximilian, hmm? Mexico was emerging in the 19th Century as a solid nation-state. So, the British send their agent over, Maximilian, through Napoleon III, to try to destroy the country. Unfortunately, they lost the war, because Lincoln won the Civil War, and then the French were chased out! And thus, Juárez came back. Juárez got rid of this crowd.

So then, you have this struggle, but there *is* progress. We kept getting defeats and betrayals, but there's progress. Now, they're determined to crash it, once and for all! But they will fail; it's too late.

Q: What about certain people involved in this process, what is their relation to this? I'm talking about individuals we could describe as pawns in the game, such as Dick Cheney.

LaRouche: Dick Cheney is like a mafia killer. That's just all he is. He's a thug. He will do anything for money. He works for George Shultz, he works for international financial oligarchy. And he has an idiot called "the President"! We used to have this dummy on television, a famous ventriloquist, Edgar Bergen. He had two dummies. One was called Charlie McCarthy, the other was Mortimer Snerd. Mortimer Snerd was a hayseed, he was a bucolic figure. But then, the wooden dummy wore out, the termites got it. And at this time, George Bush had a chance to get a job as a fill-in for Mortimer Snerd as dummy! But he failed the intelligence test.

I mean, you have to say this, in order to appreciate the irony of the situation. This President is not totally stupid, but mentally, he's a mental case.

Q: But, nonetheless, President Bush was reelected by a wide margin—

LaRouche: Not reelected by a wide margin. We were always on the case, and Ohio was very close. First of all, you have a corruption of the Democratic Party over the '70s and '80s. The Democratic Party tried to break from the Franklin Roosevelt tradition. The real exception was Clinton. And so, Clinton is a very able, brilliant person—I've often had criticisms of him, but we're on friendly terms. And with his help, and with his role, we have reestablished the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt in the Democratic Party. I've been doing it, but he's been in a sense saying I should do it. He's convinced I was right—



EIRNS/Richard Magraw

In an interview with René Alonso, aired on Radio Nueva León April 6, LaRouche outlined an FDR-style policy for the entire Hemisphere. "In the Americas," LaRouche said, "Roosevelt is the idea of the independence of the republics of the Americas."

so, we have a war in the Democratic Party, now, inside.

Last year, I defeated Bush, 2005. We defeated him on the question of the social welfare, Social Security, and several other questions. But then, this crazy Howard Dean, who is the leader of the Democratic Party, spent the money. So now, the Democratic Party's going into a new election this year, and they're looking for money. So you have two sources of money: George Soros and Felix Rohatyn. So now, Rohatyn moved in, to try get me out of the way. And now, I'm going to destroy Felix Rohatyn.

Q: You speak frequently about Franklin Roosevelt and John Quincy Adams, citing them and saying that the United States is not an imperial power. Why do you refer to these two figures, in particular?

LaRouche: Well, from the standpoint of, particularly around the world, John Quincy Adams created the diplomatic system of the United States. For example, what was called the Monroe Doctrine was entirely his work. And the Monroe Doctrine was the defense of the sovereign nation-states of the Hemisphere, an anti-imperialist doctrine. And the French and the British didn't like it, one bit; it was the Habsburgs and the British, essentially. So, he's important, because he built the system of the State Department, the diplomatic system, when he was Secretary of State under Monroe, with a mission. With a plan, a mission, a conception. And before that, he had become a leading diplomat, one of the most successful diplomats.

Franklin Roosevelt is important because of the last century. There's no difference between Franklin Roosevelt and the Founders of the nation. His great-grandfather was Isaac

Roosevelt, who was an ally of Alexander Hamilton against Aaron Burr. So, the tradition. And Franklin Roosevelt was a conscious continuation of his ancestor, and of Abraham Lincoln, and some others, who were great men.

So, the point is, today, when you're dealing nationally and internationally, you must place emphasis on those personalities who best represent, in the most recent point of reference, for example, to deal with an America internally, you have to say Franklin Roosevelt is the tradition which—against Hoover and Coolidge and so forth—which restored the United States. And which, unlike Truman, was against colonialism. And also, he built a world monetary system which is first equitable monetary system the world ever had.

In the Americas, for example, Roosevelt is the idea of the independence of the republics of the Americas.

So, in this case, it's a problem that you have to deal with, when you're dealing with ideas. You've got to personify ideas: Because ideas come as grandfather to grandson and so forth, to help people to locate their own identity, by referring to somebody in the past who is—"Oh, yes! I remember that!" To find in themselves the ideas which they really need.

Q: Given this idea of trying to establish that American tradition, how does that fit in with recent problems and conflicts, such as the Iraq War and the conflict in the Middle East?

LaRouche: What you have: The modern danger has older roots, but the modern form of danger became known as the Synarchist International. So, for example, the Synarchists in Mexico were an extension of this. In the 1930s, they were open Nazis, and Roosevelt and the President of Mexico controlled them. And they're still here! They're also still in Europe: Felix Rohatyn is a Synarchist—a Nazi, of Jewish extraction.

See, most of the categories don't make sense sometimes. Simplistic categories don't make sense. There are processes that define things.

So, it was called the Synarchist International in the Versailles Treaty. The way it worked was this: At Versailles, the intention was actually to keep the United States from taking over Europe. The British and the French, in particular, had seen that the power of the United States had risen to the point that they had to stop the United States. So, they had an idea, the idea was to start a war in Europe, and keep the United States out of it. So, they assassinated the President of France, this was done by the Prince of Wales. Then they pulled the Dreyfus case in France.

By this process, they leveraged French politics into a coalition controlled by the Synarchists. As a result of that, the Prince of Wales and France formed an alliance, which became known as the Entente Cordiale. Then, what they did, is they orchestrated, with the aid of this organizing, they got the Russian Czar in on their alliance against Germany. Then they started the Balkan Wars. And therefore, then they got the

Russians upset because the Balkan War involved Slavic peoples, Eastern Orthodox. They got rid of Bismarck, who wanted to prevent this—and they started World War I.

Then, after that, to keep the United States out, they decided to have a second war, this time, to send Germany against Russia: While Germany was engaged with Russia, they would attack it from the rearm but keep the United States out of this war. But then, the German military said, this is crazy. We're willing to go to war, but you don't go attacking, invading Russia, before you get rid of your enemy behind. So, they said, all right, fine—and you had the Hitler-Stalin Pact as a result. The Hitler policy was to attack west first, then, having defeated the British and French, to force them to give their alliance for the Russian warfare.

But then, when the French and British discovered the German attack was coming against France and England first, they changed their mind, and came to Roosevelt! So, therefore, we got into the Second World War.

Now, the issue at the end of the war: Franklin Roosevelt's policy was to set up a world monetary system, the Bretton Woods system, to include elimination of colonialism: All imperial systems go. Make the world a nation-state world, only nation-states. And the United Nations was supposed to be the vehicle by which the nation-states would form a consortium, particularly to prevent wars, and to assist in bringing the younger nations into the system. Churchill wanted to go to war immediately against the Soviet Union. When Roosevelt died, they used the conflict with the Soviet Union to immediately recolonize whole areas of the world; to drop two nuclear weapons on an already defeated Japan; and to prepare for a surprise nuclear attack on the Soviet Union. It didn't work out. So, they got rid of Truman.

Eisenhower came in. Eisenhower saved the world from a war, as President, because he knew what these people were—the Synarchists again, in a new form.

And, when they killed Kennedy, attempted to assassinate de Gaulle, got Macmillan out of government in Britain, got Adenauer out of government in Germany—they killed Kennedy, and they went to the Vietnam War. And in the process of this, they started the 68er movement, based on this stuff. They destroyed the idea of industrial society, agro-industrial society, and we have, then, Nixon and after Nixon destroyed the monetary system, they set out to recolonize the world—as you know from 1982 in Mexico.

So, we've gone down this road, toward globalization.

Q: But globalization is a fact. It's moving forward, through communications and so on. How can the nation-state survive? Under a different type of globalization, perhaps?

LaRouche: The nation-state can not survive under globalization. There will be no nation-state under globalization. You can't invest. You can't make any capital investment: Because you get work, then another nation works more cheaply—

you're gone! You can not protect the capital investment in the improvements of the capital resources of the state and of private industry. You're back to barbarism. The work goes from one place to the other, capital is destroyed. And we're now at the point, that if this system were to continue, the entire world system would be destroyed.

Now, we've reached the point where the system no longer works the way it did under Alan Greenspan. The hyperinflation under financial derivatives has reached the point, that under Bernanke, the new Federal Reserve chairman, there's agreement that the carry-trade will end. It means that you can no longer borrow at zero interest from Japan, and loan that money to Iceland. Iceland is bankrupt, New Zealand is bankrupt, Australia is probably bankrupt. You're going to see the collapse of the housing bubble in the United States, the mortgage-based bubble, many other bubbles are going to collapse. The next three months, as they stand now, unless somebody changes policy, the next three months—April, May, June, before the July election here—are going to be a period of increasing chaos.

Q: This is the key point you've pointed to: You're talking about a *very* short-term crisis. What would be the impact of such a crisis on countries like Mexico?

LaRouche: Destruction. Unless we stop it. Or unless we take remedial measures.

See, my problem is largely in the U.S. Senate. During 2005, what I was doing was generally accepted in the U.S. Senate among Democrats, and also in increasing numbers of Republicans. On most issues, we had a majority vote against the President. The President of the United States was a lame-duck all last year. He's still a lame-duck. The problem is, when the money problem came up, and they thought they needed the money organized by Felix Rohatyn, and possibly also George Soros, then they wouldn't do anything to offend Felix Rohatyn until after the next November election. In 2005, the U.S. Senate was a fighting force, for sanity! Now, it's a bunch of bums. Individually, they're nice people—mostly. But they won't fight, now! They say, "Wait till after the November elections." Which means, "Let us get our money from Felix Rohatyn and so forth." The idea of going out to the people does not occur to them. The money for advertising occurs to them!

This is a problem of a generation! They're not like my generation. What we're organizing with—we still have a lot of friends there, in the Senate, and in the House. That's not a problem. The problem is, they don't do what they should do! So, we get on the phone, we talk to the [Democratic] county chairmen, we get them materials, we help them on this.

Last spring, they were ready to take my proposal on reorganizing the auto industry to save it. No! Not now! "Wait till after November!"

So, the problem is the generational problem. They don't

have—the 68er does not have the instinct for strategic decisions under fire. They're sophists.

Q: Under such conditions, how do situations like the immigration problem play out? Given the situation in the U.S. Congress, given the rise of conservative voices, such as those of Samuel Huntington; how does this affect the immigration question?

LaRouche: Well, Samuel Huntington is different. Samuel Huntington is a British intelligence operation, of which Brzezinski's a part. But, the idea was creating anti-Islam, a conflict with Islam, as a way of creating a condition of warfare, like the medieval warfare, to disrupt society with religious warfare.

Now, what happens is, the thing on immigration here, has a certain accidental aspect to it. If you throw a bomb, a hand grenade at one person, you may hit others. So therefore, if you inspire *hate*, people will tend to express the hate in some direction.

The other thing is, that the Hispanic-American legacy in the United States today, is a general welfare tendency. That people who feel that they're in a sense under, or think their neighbor's under, will tend to vote and act on the basis of trying to promote the general welfare. You promote a general cause, because you know you need that protection. Under these conditions, in which the lower 80% of the family-income brackets in the United States are *down*, way down, and with the demoralization of the African-American groups, which have been going on for the past two years, the Hispanic minority in the United States is not only the largest minority, but it's a very important one. The present administration is about to lose the election in November. So therefore, it is a time where they turn loose lunatics, in a typical Cheney-George Bush kind of mentality. George will come across the border. He's been across the border with Fox, before. He doesn't want to have bad relations with his friend Fox, so he'll moderate. He'll say, no, he'll do this, and such and such.

Now, the obvious thing, which is the same thing which I happen to have discussed with López Portillo years ago, is to deal with this thing: Document them! How? Let the Mexican government document them. And then, let consuls in the United States, Mexican consuls in the United States, deal with the problem. As long as you have it documented as a state-to-state agreement, you always can handle the problem diplomatically. You have a way of administering, you talk; the two governments talk. "Oh, this one? Don't bother him, let him stay. This one—send him back home!"

So, you don't *need* to have a big fight about it.

Q: This would be a joint agreement?

LaRouche: Absolutely! That's the only way to do it. The first thing is not to make a detailed plan—a detailed plan is a mistake.



EIRNS/Dan Sturman



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Leading Democrats in the U.S. are afraid to offend Felix Rohatyn (left) and George Soros (right)—the “Biche” and “Mouche” of the Synarchist banking crowd: “They won’t fight, now! They say, ‘Wait till after the November elections.’ ”

Q: Not unilateral, like they’re proposing today?

LaRouche: No, no. But, the point is, it’s a diplomatic problem. Don’t make it complicated. Get the two governments handling the problem.

Now, the other thing you have to do, is you have to stop this nonsense that’s happened in the northern area. Driving problem: You’ve got these five states, of the northern border states in Mexico—you have to stabilize life in this area, where this is hitting the hardest. Either people from here, or people who come through here. You create some degree of social stability with economic programs—very easy, joint economic programs.

For example, Texas is the most important state in this, and New Mexico is the second most important. Because, Texas should be developing a light rail system. Now, the key problem here, is the two areas between the two Sierra Madres, the dry area, water, and so forth. So therefore, you need a transportation system and a logistical system, and irrigation, to promote some development, to keep families together. That doesn’t mean eliminating people coming across the border, it means simply putting some stability into this. So, development projects—I insisted a rail line from El Paso to Mexico City is very important. Otherwise, you get the *cacique* problem, which is an old thing left over from the Aztecs and Spanish. You want to have a sense of national integration, and Mexico City, sitting down there with all these people, sitting in a sinking city, you’ve got to get a sense of national unity. Otherwise, people will play upon the regional conflicts.

Q: Speaking of the border and these regional conflicts, the drug trade and the lack of security in the border area. What

you’re talking about would help deal with this problem; but how do you deal with something that’s already out of control?

LaRouche: No, it’s out of control, but it can be dealt with. What’s needed, essentially, is more than just control. You have to recognize, I’ve been fighting against this drug problem, not just here, but in the Hemisphere. We got very deep into this anti-drug business. This is not a spontaneous problem, it’s an orchestrated one. And it’s orchestrated through special channels, like financial interests and so forth.

Look, George Bush, the Vice President, was actually coordinating some of this stuff, when he was Vice President. I was working with people at one end of the National Security Council of the United States; George Bush had a special mission on the other end. And what happened with the death squads in Central America, and the deals that were cut with the Colombian cartels—how crack cocaine got into Los Angeles, for example—this whole war in Central America was extended to this thing.

What has happened internationally is, the spread of the drug traffic has two functions: First of all, it is a destructive force. To destroy a nation, you corrupt it, you weaken them. Secondly, it’s very profitable. Now, if you want to hire private armies, take a group of people who have been given Special Forces kinds training, or equivalent military training; have them run a drug organization. Now, this means doing a certain amount of killing. But it also means you can set up an uncontrolled territory within a nation. You have a private army, funded by drugs, which can take over a territory. So, there’s an effort to use this thing, even right here, because of the trafficking throughput to the Texas border.

Q: In search of a conclusion to this discussion, how do you see the Mexican elections, especially vis-à-vis what Mexico's orientation towards the United States should be, and towards nations to the South?

LaRouche: Well, I would hope that the basis for this would come from people around the U.S. Senate in the Democratic Party. The thing is, right now, a President of Mexico, newly elected, is not really independent. He'll be independent on certain questions, but not the existential ones. And you have certain banking groups which are foreign, which control the situation here.

Now, in order for a Mexican President to function, since the last independent President was López Portillo, you have to give Mexico back the authority to make some of its own decisions, the really important ones, not just the neighborhood. That can only come in the form of a signal from inside the United States, which means it has to come from the political system. Now, what you have now: We're now at the point of getting out of Iraq, despite Cheney and Co. The idea is to negotiate with Turkey and Iran, and to get a group of countries to sponsor the reorganization of the situation in and around Iraq. You have three elements there in Iraq—Iraq is now three federated semi-autonomous areas. One, north, the Kurds, who are operating with agreement with Turkey. Turkey does not want another Kurdish problem inside Turkey. Therefore, Turkey is now cooperating with a northern Federal government in Iraq. The southern part, Sistani and Co., Shi'a. Now, this group is tied to Iran, but it is not quite the same thing. The Iraqi ayatollahs are different than the Iranian ayatollahs (that's an old story). Then, you have in the middle, the small area in between.

If we have a coordination among the Organization of the Islamic Conference and others, with the backing of some other forces in Europe, we could create a situation which would bring this whole area under control, and *get our troops out*. Now, you have a special study group, headed up by Senator Warner, who is in charge of the Armed Services Committee. This is a bipartisan group, to whose work I've given my sign I support this. They are working on this. So, we have two tendencies—one tendency, in Berlin for example, just this past week, Brzezinski, who is usually on the other side, Brzezinski signalled that his group is going to support this. No conflict with Iran. Stop the conflict. Create a group, to get the United States out, the troops out: Because the situation for the U.S. military forces in Iraq is worse now, than it ever was in Indo-China. So therefore, this fact is a very strong motive, for stopping this Cheney nonsense.

That's the situation.

So, under these conditions, there are no simple answers; there are no simple predictions. I can guarantee you that the financial crisis is going to become unbelievable within the next three months. It's already happening. You could see whole governments going under, whole nations going bank-

rupt. The collapse of the real-estate mortgage bubble in the United States, for example, will cause a crisis. But there are many other things, that depend upon who is willing to jump. We're on the verge of the breakup of the U.S. auto industry, which is the core of the U.S. economy! So, we're in a period in which you can not predict what's going to happen, but you know the weather problems. You know what the problems are, you know what you have to be prepared to deal with.

And therefore, in the case of Mexico, the next election, which people are concerned about here—who's going to be it—I say, that's important in a certain way, but more important is, what does being the President of Mexico mean? What powers will he actually have to make decisions? And that's going to depend on the United States. For example, if the United States deals, gets rid of this immigration nonsense—and there is a mood to do so—if that's done, that helps. There are other things that could happen that help. If the people of Mexico see the United States getting out of Iraq, that will help. If the United States is once again predictable, calculable, that would help. Then, the President of Mexico could go to the United States, and say, "I need this cooperation." But, right now, any President of Mexico is not going to expect much cooperation from the United States. They may pretend they're getting it, but they're not going to expect it.

Q: It's a pleasure to talk with you, and we really appreciate your time and your visit with us.

LaRouche: Thank you. Good to see you!

Press Conference

What Mexico Needs To Know About the U.S.A.

Here is Lyndon LaRouche's March 31 press conference in Monterrey, Mexico. After the press conference, LaRouche talked with some of the youth and supporters who had attended.

LaRouche: I've given a number of addresses, press interviews, as well as at the "Tec" [Monterrey Technological Institute] during my visit here, and I thought it was appropriate to have a press conference, at which I could answer questions on matters which I have not covered in these addresses.

The problem that I want to specifically focus on, is the fact that, in Mexico, even though it's next to the United States, some of the most important things that are happening inside

the United States are not much discussed. Essentially, I have a very peculiar position inside the U.S. Democratic Party and institutions, particularly since 2004, July of 2004, when a lot of the Democratic Party leadership agreed to accept my leadership in some role. And we had a very successful year in 2005, where most of us were united, especially in the Senate and some people in the House of Representatives, in defeating Bush on the attempt to eliminate Social Security. The situation now is a little more tenuous; the Democratic Party is not quite as well united, as much as it was then.

But all this is happening at the point that the biggest financial crisis in modern history is now breaking out. The next three months are likely to be among the most crucial. And since there's an election in Mexico of some importance, I think it's important that I say what I have to say about the conditions which Mexico faces.

Essentially, the situation is this: The passing of the leadership of Alan Greenspan from the Federal Reserve Board left the world economy with the worst inflationary crisis in a very long period of history. The decision was made in leading circles, including the Federal Reserve Board, to shut down the international carry-trade. The international carry-trade is the biggest factor in inflation in the world today. But that means that you're going to have a very dangerous collapse of the world financial system which is going on right now. You have the bankruptcy of Iceland, the bankruptcy of New Zealand, the threat of a similar condition in Australia. This is going to affect every financial market in the world, and could trigger a real-estate mortgage bubble inside the United States.

We're entering a period, as you see, in France, strikes in France—mass strikes; a lesser degree, mass strikes in Germany; and volcanic, earthquake-like effects in other parts of the world.

So, what the situation is today with the Mexican Presidential campaigns, and what they will be at the time of the election, may be far different. I think that Mexicans should be informed of this, so I wanted to make myself available on that question.

Q: If the next President of Mexico turns out to be Andrés Manuel López Obrador, as the polls indicate, what does that mean for the United States, that a leftist take the reins of power in Mexico?

LaRouche: That's not bad. It's not a serious problem. First of all, we have too much regime-change going on from the United States to other countries today. Especially in the Americas, we need a system of sovereign nation-states, which means the U.S. government must accept the decision of the people of Mexico in their choice of candidate, and not use pressure to try to interfere with the internal politics of Mexico. Instead of using pressure, we should use diplomacy, to try to find ways to work together with whoever the new President is. There's too much giving orders.

Q: Under current conditions you have very good relations between the United States and Mexico. What will happen when the next government comes in, in Mexico? Will relations improve?

LaRouche: We are going to have a crisis inside the United States in the meantime, and therefore, there's a certain amount of uncertainty about what the conditions will be after July.

For example, right now, the entire U.S. domestic auto industry is at the verge of collapse. The international situation is—for example, the case of Iraq-Iran: The majority of Democratic and Republican legislators and similar people is for dumping the Bush policy of confrontation with Iran.

Because the situation for the U.S. military in Iraq is worse than ever it was in Indo-China. The Iraq situation is a total military disaster. The United States troops have got to get out, nearly immediately, despite Cheney.

So, we have the majority of Republicans *and* Democrats around the Congress saying we have to get out. We can not walk away; we have to make an agreement with a number of governments, including Turkey and Iran, to achieve the stability of the region. And we cooperate, in withdrawing from the region.

This coincides with the worsening of the financial-monetary crisis. You look at the prices of gold, the price of precious metals, and non-precious metals: We have an *explosive, hyperinflationary collapse in process*.

My effort has been to get the U.S. government, especially the Senate—and you have people like Senator Clinton, the former President's wife—among those who are working on this. My view is, the United States government has to take the auto industry into receivership to protect it, and buy up much of the capacity of the auto industry, to build things like railroad systems, nuclear power systems, river systems, and other things that an engineering facility can do. Under these conditions, if we move in that direction, which we might, then it would not be difficult for the U.S. government to work together with a government, say, of the former mayor of Mexico City, because our great mutual interests, are cooperation on economy and human relations. The fact that the largest single minority group in the United States is of Hispanic origin, which is also a very active group in the United States. Many have come recently from Mexico, especially the poorest. Therefore, the immediate issue on the table between the U.S. government and the Mexican government, is the issue of dealing with this problem.

In my view, you take a state like Texas, the U.S. state of Texas, with about five states in northern Mexico on the U.S. border: Obviously, the challenge is going to be to establish cooperation between Mexico and the United States government on social and economic solutions to the potential crisis. For example, all of this since the time of [José] López Portillo, President López Portillo here, when conditions were not as bad as now. Our policy has always been, to fight for the docu-



EIRNS/Sergio Oswaldo Barbosa Garcia

Members of the LYM in Mexico sing, during a meeting with LaRouche April 1. "You must have as much unity as possible among the nations of the Americas. And education in the Youth Movement is crucial, scientific education. Singing! You've got to have more! Very important."

mentation of the so-called illegals in the United States, and then use Mexico's representatives inside the United States, the diplomatic representatives, to maintain responsibility for this relationship. Because it's a complicated situation. You can't make a simple formula, but you can always have a humane approach to solving whatever the problems are, and it has to be dictated by both governments together.

So therefore, the question is, the thing that would be on the table would be the economic issues and the social issues, especially with the illegals in the United States, and arrangements under which the two governments are in systematic cooperation dealing with border problems, and dealing with humanitarian problems. With a good government, a good change in government which could occur, fine. The danger is, that the Bush Administration might go the other way. And we have some very nasty people inside the United States, even though they're a minority.

Youth Dialogue With LaRouche

LaRouche: [Addressing the youth] Okay, well, we have some more fun. The future lies with youth. So, you must have more youth. That's the future!

In politics, the question is, is how many people in politics do you have who are going to be the future leaders? Because the citizen votes for the future. The past, they don't like. The present is sometimes worse than the past. So, the people want

to see the future, you have to produce young people, who are leaders, who can be recognized by the people as being the leaders into the future. That's the only thing that's worth doing.

The Role of the Youth Will Be Vital

Q: A message from the youth of Mexico, that we're really happy and excited to have you here, organizing explosively here this whole period of time. We've created a lot of optimism over these last few weeks.

LaRouche: Well, you've got more than that. You've got also a very important development in Argentina, which is going to be more and more integrated with the same thing here. So what we're building essentially, is a nucleus of a new movement in South and Central America. The unification will come through activity of youth, like you have a very small group in Argentina, but they're very active, very effective, and very important. So you just take the whole thing, and put it together. *There is a basis of a movement of unity, for cooperation among the nation-states of South and Central America.* That's the future. And the sense that you have a sense of that organization and that kind of cooperation among nations, is going to work.

Because, if we don't do it, young people have no future, hmm? Right now, youth have no future, young adult youth—*none!* You have to create a future, which means changes in economy. And, we can do something on education, a few other things, but there has to be a change. We have to reverse

the downward trend of the past years. And the only way it's going to work, is you have to have unity among enough countries to represent power. You must have as much unity as possible among the nations of the Americas. And education in the Youth Movement is crucial, scientific education. Singing! You've got to have more, to sing! Very important.

So, that's what I think is crucial. And so therefore, [addressing older supporters present] you who have been around for a little bit longer, who pretend you're tired, who pretend you can't do anything any more, that you're too tired, you're too old, or too thick—you've got to come back into activity around these youth! You have to build a future.

And no one understands it better than an old man, like me! People who are older than I am, are generally dead, so I have to do the speaking! So, that's what we're doing.

'We're at a Breakthrough Time'

Q: In the history of the world, the youth have made the changes. It's not the other way around, that the older generations change the youth and make the program.

LaRouche: No, the older generations—first of all, you have a problem now with generations which is worse than is the usual case. As you know, you went through a change from a productive orientation. Mexico's an example, where 1982 is crucial, Summer of 1982: The orientation toward the future was destroyed throughout the Hemisphere, with what happened in Argentina, and in Mexico. The orientation toward building a future was lost.

Now, you see, this goes with the 68er phenomenon in the United States and Europe, and also the 68er phenomenon here. You have a generation who are now between 50, 55 and 65, they generally are running society. They have a cultural problem: They don't believe in the future! They believe in their retirement and comfort, but not the future. The only thing that'll activate them, is seeing youth move. But, the older generation wants to hold the youth back! "Don't try to change too much."

So, only if you have a youth movement, of young adults, 18-25 and so forth, *they have no future, except the one we make*. So therefore, this is the problem we have to overcome: The so-called Baby Boomer generation is a block against progress, because of the habits of these years. So therefore, we have to have a change, a social change, and the only way is by letting the youth have more authority. Don't try to run them; don't try to direct them. Yes, guidance, assistance. But they must have more authority. They have to *take* more authority, and more responsibility. You don't just give people authority, you give them responsibility. And they have to meet their responsibilities. It's called in Germany, *Auftragstaktik*. Once you train people intellectually, you don't give them orders every five minutes; you don't look under their beds all the time—you wouldn't want to! All those dirty socks!

What you have to do is get them to take the responsibility

for initiative. So they have to have a sense of responsibility, and freedom to exert leadership on the basis of responsibility.

The problem is, the Baby Boomers try to *run* the youth, dominate them. It's a mistake. Use good military training, of the German military training: *Auftragstaktik*. Give people responsibility, and the ability to *be* responsible. Let them do their work.

And it'll work. I think we're at a breakthrough time. The thing is, you know, there's a difference in South America, for example: Chile and Argentina are no longer at war. We got rid of the fascist, Pinochet and Co., the Nazis. We have problems through the Hemisphere, *but!* you have cooperation among dissimilar governments in South America—with problems, but nonetheless. We haven't *had* that cooperation since '82. So, now you have an environment which is favorable to going back to the kind of thinking we had in 1982.

Just come to life. Come out of the hole! Come back to life! Be optimistic. Anyway, that's what I have to say.

LYM Press Release

The Future Is Now: Oil For Nuclear Technology

The following statement was issued on April 12, 2006 by the LaRouche Youth Movement in Mexico, as a call for a conference to be held in Mexico City on June 7, co-sponsored by the LYM and Executive Intelligence Review.

One of the stupidest statements ever made on the subject of economics, is the infamous cynical remark by the British oligarchy's pet economist, John Maynard Keynes: "In the long run, we are all dead." Meaning that economic decisions must all be based on immediate monetary criteria for the here and now, with no regard for the future.

Keynes, of course, is right . . . if you think man is just an animal. But man is *not* an animal. Man has cognition; he creates; he can build the future. And we—the LaRouche Youth Movement—are that future, and we are building it.

To state the central point clearly: Mexico, like the rest of Ibero-America and the world, must go nuclear, now! And we have to do it the way former Mexican President José López Portillo proposed it back in the late 1970s and early 1980s: establish an oil-for-technology exchange to rapidly propel Mexico into the nuclear age.

U.S. statesman and Democratic party leader Lyndon LaRouche worked closely with López Portillo on precisely such a policy back in the 1980s. Today, LaRouche heads the



Mexico's one nuclear plant at Laguna Verde. The LaRouche Youth demand that "Mexico, like the rest of Ibero-America and the world, must go nuclear, now!" They are calling for an international seminar on energy in June.

www.icjt.org

growing movement in the United States to stop the Cheney-Bush Administration's imperial economic policies, and return to the outlook of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, including cooperation with Mexico's sovereign high-technology development. In March of this year, LaRouche elaborated on these ideas during a visit to Monterrey, Mexico:

"We need a policy for the reconstruction of Mexico. Now, this coincides with the world situation. Everyone in the world, who understands the world's problems, has now come to a general agreement on a rapid return to investment in nuclear power. This is not only because of the price of petroleum. Petroleum has a limited future as merely a fuel; it has an important future as a chemical feedstock. We will tend to go, instead, toward fuels which are produced by nuclear fission. As a general agreement, we're going back to nuclear power, and more or less rapidly: This is China, this is Russia, this is France, this is Brazil, and so forth. As a general understanding, we are going back to a nuclear-based economy.

"Now, of course, in Mexico the greatest problem we have is water. That is not a Mexico problem, that is a worldwide problem; but it's especially a problem for Mexico, because of the dry areas of the North, especially between the two Sierra Madres.

"Now, there's only one way that we can get an adequate flow of water for human consumption and similar things, agriculture, and that is with nuclear power [to desalinate sea water]. There are sources of water in Mexico in the South which you can bring across the mountains into the area between the Sierra Madres, or along the West Coast, the Pacific Coast, up to the PLHINO [Northwest Hydraulic Plan]. That's possible. But that's not enough.

"You look at the ratio of use of water in the agricultural areas close to the U.S. border: You have a critical situation

there, in terms of water use. In Mexico City, you have a catastrophe in water. In most of the rest of the country, you have important problems.

"Now, two things are in the future on nuclear power, right now. As you know, back in the early 1980s, Mexico had a policy for building 20 nuclear plants.

"The second thing is, we will go into a new kind of industry of producing hydrogen-based fuels. This is already under way as a policy within certain countries and within their industries. For example, Japan is going toward hydrogen-based hybrid cars. Now to produce hydrogen-based fuels, by fission power, requires about 800 MW power to get the intensity of power needed; whereas, you can use a 120 to 200 MW plant for all kinds of things, [desalinating] water, and so on.

"Also, we need, of course, transportation, and Mexico should actually have a rail line from the Mexican border to Mexico City—it's an insult not to have it! If you're going to unify the country, you have to do it! And it would help to move things around. This will be popular. Argentina will go in that direction. Brazil has already adopted the intention. Other countries will.

"So, what we're going to need, first of all, is we're going to make the Mexican population in the north of Mexico stable: This requires water. It requires new cities. It requires making these areas, areas of development, not areas of cheap labor. Whereas, you have a crisis already, in the number of people from Mexico going into the United States as virtual slave labor, which is a security risk in this area; therefore, we have to think about building up northern Mexico, but with things which involve power and water to transform the environment. It can be done, it's not a great intellectual challenge, just a lot of work.

“So, we need a clear perspective, a shared conception of objectives among the nations of the hemisphere.

“If you are to invest in Mexico, you have to invest in the future of young people, because all your important investments in Mexico, capital investments, have a life of 25 years investment, or 50 years investment; a nuclear plant, 30 years investment, 35 years investment; water systems, 50 years investment. Who is going to do this? You’re talking about a society which is going to be under the management of young people who today are 18 to 25 years of age. But the very youth you need for this, young adults, are largely demoralized, because they don’t see a future. So you should call these young adults the future, the generation of the future. Not only a generation to inhabit the future, but a generation which will *create the future!*”

LaRouche is right. In order to plan what we must do today, we require a clear concept of what the next 50 years must be.

Mexico’s oil industry must be rebuilt from the destruction imposed by the International Monetary Fund and the bankers since 1982. The oil industry, under López Portillo, was used to provide the resources to fund education, health care, and the building of essential infrastructure. Now it is used to pay the foreign debt that has been illegitimately imposed on the country. And the bankers’ plans are to remove Pemex’s revenues from the government’s control—in order to steal them for the bankers—and to privatize the state oil company Pemex altogether.

It will take about five to seven years to rebuild Mexico’s oil industry back up to the level of 1982. That must be done, at the same time that we move toward a nuclear-power-based economy. Oil and nuclear are complementary—if we view them from the standpoint of the next 50 years.

So, contrary to John Maynard Keynes and the financial oligarchy he represented, in the long run we are *not* all dead—at least not those of us who live today for our immortal contribution to humanity.

So act like a man, not an animal. Join the LaRouche Youth Movement to change the future today. Come to our international seminar on “Oil for Nuclear Technology,” to be held in Mexico City on June 7, 2006.

HOTLINE

**LaRouche and EIR Staff
Recorded Briefings**

—24 Hours Daily

918-222-7201, Box 595

Gaza: Humanitarian Catastrophe Looms

by Dean Andromidas

A humanitarian catastrophe is threatening the lives of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and West Bank, because of the policies of the Bush Administration and the Israeli government. The ongoing criminal blockade by Israel of the Gaza Strip has begun to create mass hunger in the population of 1.2 million people, the vast majority of whom are dependent on emergency food aid from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

The refusal of the Bush Administration to recognize the new Palestinian administration led by the Hamas party, which won elections on Jan. 26 that were deemed totally fair, and without violence, by former United States President Jimmy Carter, is not only hypocritical, but a crime against humanity. Not only is the United States withholding recognition of the new government, but it has joined Israel, an occupying power, in pressuring the international community to follow its policy, including cutting off all official aid to the Palestinian National Authority (PNA). The European Union announced on April 7 that it will also be cutting aid to the PNA worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

Food Supplies Cut Off

At the beginning of April, David Shearer, head of the UN Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, informed the Israeli Foreign Ministry that Gaza was on the verge of a humanitarian disaster. This warning was backed by a report by UNRWA, stating that the lack of basic food supplies because of the Israeli closure of the border crossings, has caused a significant increase of hunger. This situation comes on top of the degradation of the population of the Gaza Strip since Ariel Sharon came to power in 2000. According to the World Bank, poverty increased from 22% of the population to 75% over the last five years. Some 25-40% of the workforce is unemployed, and 44% of the population is expected to survive on \$2 a day.

The Israeli government refuses to transfer custom duties it collects on goods shipped through Israeli ports destined for the Palestinian National Authority, amounting to \$50 million a month, which is crucial for paying the salaries of PNA workers: not only security personnel and administration, but also teachers, hospital and health workers, etc. The PNA employs no fewer than 140,000 people, who sustain over one-third of the population. In Gaza alone, 73,000 people are employed by the PNA. Thus the failure of the transfer of these