

*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,

---

## 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*



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.