

# LaRouche Speaks to The Philippines

*Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed by Philippine radio host Butch Valdes, the head of the Philippine LaRouche Movement, and several members of the Philippine LaRouche Youth Movement, on nationwide "Radio Mindanao," for one hour on Sunday, May 14, immediately preceding Mr. Valdes's visit to the U.S. The following are excerpts from that interview. Subheads have been added.*

## **The Philippines and Ibero-America**

**Butch Valdes:** Mr. LaRouche, the Presidents of Argentina, Bolivia, Venezuela, and Chile have clearly taken steps to address their economic problems in various ways, from unilateral declaration of moratorium on foreign debt payment, re-nationalization of oil and natural gas expropriation, to outwardly defying the IMF and multinational corporations. Is this a correct move? Why have other leaders not done the same?

**Lyndon LaRouche:** Well, this is a very significant phenomenon. As you know, the Philippines is actually part of the same process, with different characteristics somewhat, from what happened in South and Central America. People moved from Europe during the time of the struggle for freedom in the 16th and 17th Centuries, into the Americas. And you had a similar development in the Philippines, where you had a previously existing population, as in Mexico and Peru, which had its own pre-existing level of culture, and you had an integration with people from European sources, who migrated into there and had an influence in there, from Spain, or later from the United States, in particular. So this is the characteris-

tic of parts of the developing world, the Americas and the Philippines, which have great similarities—despite all the differences we know about.

And so, what there is, is a certain kind of optimism built into a certain stratum in South and Central America, which is not found in the same way in Europe. It moved into South America: You have the dictators, the thugs, the reactionaries, the Synarchists, people like that, but at the same time, you have a layer of cultural optimism, and a sense of oligarchy-free self-government, self-rule, which you do not have even yet in Europe. So, we have special characteristics, as opposed to other parts of the world. And therefore, despite the distance across the Pacific, we have certain affinities which can be easily adduced. You can see the similarities. And if you look from the Philippines at these developments in South America, and also to some degree Central America, in Mexico, for example, you see that there's a similar degree of potential optimism.

With the breakdown and discrediting of the Bush Administration, and a general breakdown of everything, these tendencies in South America are tending to come together, as a united force in the hemisphere—at least the southern part of the hemisphere—and they're more optimistic than you will find in other parts of the world. That's what you're seeing.

Otherwise, you have in Europe—it's a much more oligarchical worldview, much more inclined to go along—you know, they still have this great respect for barons, and princesses, and dukes and duchesses, and kings and queens, that we don't have in the United States, and we don't have generally throughout the Americas. So that's our advantage: We are the part of European civilization that escaped from Europe, in order to be free of the oligarchical tradition of feudal Europe. And therefore, we have certain advantages, cultural advantages, because of that. And that's what you're seeing, is the advantage.

We're very close to these people, that is, our work is very close to people in South and Central America. We're in touch with people who are representative leaders in the governments and so forth in that network. We're very much in support of the efforts for unity of efforts and cooperation among these states. So, we're part of it.

We sense that the Western Hemisphere, the Americas, is a special part of the planet, and we—myself and others—feel a special affinity from the United States with the history and with the people of the Americas as a whole.

## **Nuclear Power and Desalinization**

**Valdes:** Well, for years now, you have emphasized the importance of nuclear-energy development, if countries are to survive and develop. Presently, leaders from all over are beginning to realize the need for an indigenous source of energy to alleviate their dependence on imported oil, or to forcibly take over oil fields. Would you like to comment on this criti-

cal problem?

**LaRouche:** Well, take it from the standpoint of the Philippines: You have a land area which is subsiding because of the draw-down of fresh water from subsurface sources. So, you have a sense of the threat there, that the land will sink below the level of the seas, because of the draw-down of the fresh water from beneath. We have, all over this planet, that similar kind of situation. For example, the Ogallala system in the central part of the Southwestern United States. We're having a water crisis, a fresh water crisis. We have a water crisis, where we don't have water to begin with. But, on the other hand, as in Australia, they're drawing down fossil water; in southern India, they're drawing down fossil water.

So we can not continue to operate, managing for a growing world population or national populations, on the basis of existing approaches to water supplies. Therefore, the only solutions we have to this are two: One, in the first approximation, nuclear power. You don't just measure nuclear power in watts or calories. You measure nuclear power, its output, in terms of energy-flux density—that is, the concentration of power per square kilometer as such. And therefore, this has a chemical significance: That is, in order to accomplish, economically, certain chemical processes, you have to have an *intensity of power* at the point of production, to apply to solve these problems.

So therefore, in dealing with the world water problems alone, without nuclear power, you *can not* solve these critical problems of water, or a whole series of other, related problems. Therefore, there is no option *but*, right now, nuclear fission power, especially the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. One example of that is India. India has a large store of radioactive thorium; it's one of the principal stores of available radioactive thorium on this planet. And therefore, years ago, when Germany had developed the Jülich model of high-temperature gas-cooled reactor, we emphasized the fact that the Jülich model is especially well-adapted to a radioactive thorium power production process. India is now moving, at least some people in India, in that direction. What they need is one breeder reactor or more, a breeder-reactor program, in order to activate the thorium reserves. In that case, India will then have a possibility of having small nuclear plants of 100 MW or more capacity, and station them in various parts of India, as well as the larger plants for other areas. In this way, you can bring the application of nuclear power, as a source to solve the local problems in many parts of India, problems which otherwise would not be solved.

So, we've come to a phase, where in order to have replacement fuels for petroleum-based fuels, in order to have solutions for water problems, and also certain mineral problems, we need nuclear power. So everyone who understands what's going on, is saying, "We're going back to a high-tilt nuclear power program." And we're looking forward, within a quarter-century, 25 years from now, to supplementing the



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

*Lyndon LaRouche:  
"The Americas and  
Philippines have  
great similarities—  
despite all the  
differences we  
know about."*

nuclear power installations we make in the meantime, with the development of operational thermonuclear fusion power sources, which will deal with other problems, chemical problems, that we have to solve on this planet.

### **Bridge between East and West**

**Valdes:** Okay, we have a question from one of the LYM (LaRouche Youth Movement). His name is Ver.

**LaRouche:** Aha!

**Q:** Hi Lyn. Well, here's the question: How do we organize the population, particularly in the Philippines, where you have, I think, quite a different culture. You have afraid Boomers, which wish us to do nothing, and youth which are timid, well, very timid. They know the problems, but wish to do nothing about the situation and rather keep quiet. How do we deal with that? And there's not much time—we're about to launch into a new dark age.

**LaRouche:** You've got two problems. First of all, as I said, the Philippines is a culture, which is in an Asian context. And there are distinctions as a result of the history of the development of the Philippines. The Philippines is much closer, culturally, in its dynamic, to the Americas than it is to Asia. It's one of its peculiarities.

Therefore, the development of the Philippines has depended upon a sense of the affinity with the Americas. It sees itself as being somewhat like the Americas. The loss of much of the high-tech capability, which was formerly associated with the U.S. military bases in the Philippines, such as the naval base and the air base, that has essentially been undermined over the past quarter-century. So, there is that estrangement.

My view is that, similarly, because of the very principle, that if the young people of the young adult age in the Philippines feel themselves linked to the United States in some efficient way, as people in the United States who think the same way in general, can discuss and communicate with people in the United States, and also in some degree in Europe, that this will give a morale factor, of building the morale

among the younger generation, the young adult people.

Also, what's needed, as we do elsewhere in the world, we find that if you have a program which is based on two things: on Classical song, that is, Classical musical composition, which has an effect on the mind; and also the history of the development of science, especially starting from ancient Greece, from the Pythagoreans, Plato, and so forth—that these two factors will give you a selection, where you will get response from *some* people among the younger generation, and the reaction from *some* people among the younger generation will then be an attractive force for the larger generation. That's the experience we've had in the United States; it's what we have in Europe. But in the United States, of course, we have about six years of working on this particular approach. We now have some very rich results, very good results. We have young people who are now showing themselves to be actually emerging as actual political leaders and other leaders in society.

So that's what's needed—the sense of unity with the youth generation of their own age throughout the world, especially the Americas and parts of Europe; and a sense of their own development; a sense that there are emerging young leaders, leaders of the future emerging among the youth generation inside the Philippines; and some idea of what the programs are which would save the world, civilization, now threatened, and includes saving the Philippines, which, as we all know, has gone down considerably over the past 25 years. And bring them back, go back to the idea that existed still in the immediate postwar period—shall we say, the time from MacArthur's return to the Philippines. That sense that there was progress ahead, there was development ahead. That the development of the economy of the Philippines, and the culture, was going to be successful. And over the past change in culture worldwide, in the 1970s, especially, and the 1980s, that sense of connection was lost.

So, therefore, my approach is to try to bring back an historical sense that there was something good, which has been to some degree lost. Let's rebuild it, and that will start the Philippines back on the direction toward progress, which it was struggling for with some significant success in earlier decades.

### **Wait for the U.S.?**

**Valdes:** Okay. Many, of course, here, will be wanting to get to know: What should countries like the Philippines do, in preparation for this global financial tsunami? Is there any move that an individual people like ours can make, in preparation for that? And do we have to wait for the U.S. to be able to solve it for us?

**LaRouche:** No, there are several levels on which you can respond to a thing like this. First of all, you know, the human mind is a wonderful thing, when properly used. And if a people is encouraged to take emergency measures to defend their culture, to maintain things, functioning more or less, then the

worst crises can be resisted. You see examples of this, and the attempt to do that in Europe during the so-called Dark Age, in the middle of the 14th Century, in which there were hold-outs, in which some areas were able to resist these conditions, because they fought.

And therefore, if a people is encouraged to use human ingenuity, creativity, and solidarity, they can take measures which will ameliorate the dangers of a great crisis. The worst thing is when a crisis hits a population which is totally demoralized and passive, and submits to whatever happens. But if there's a determination to resist—for example: If there's a determination to maintain food supplies, if there's a determination to continue to fight disease, for sanitation, a determination to keep the morale of the people up, these qualities can mean that certain pockets in the world will be more *resistant* to the crisis than other parts.

I think the Philippines has a potential in that direction, because of its multicultural character. It has resources and a history to draw upon, in bringing unity. I think the sense of unity, of the defense of the nation and its people, among people within the Philippines population is the most important thing for the Philippines to think about now. Because just sitting around to wait for the United States to save them, is not the answer. The answer is, of course, the United States *has* to take the initiative, to get the world out of this mess. But in terms of: How do you deal with an oncoming crisis which the United States may not have stopped? Then, the solidarity of the people, their cooperation, their high degree of morale and mutual support, and their practical sense of what to do, is the key weapon of defense.

### **Technological Optimism**

**Valdes:** Okay, another LYM question, Lyn, from Gayle.

**Q:** Hi Lyn. My question is: What is the unique role of the Philippines in the establishment of the New Bretton Woods system? Is there any? And how do you think this can be done by, first, the Philippine government; second, the ordinary people; and last, by the Philippine LYM?

**LaRouche:** Well, first of all, the peculiar characteristic of the Philippines is, number one, is that it is in a sense, an extension of European civilization: in the sense that like Mexico, and like Peru, in Central and South America, the population was based on an indigenous population which existed prior to the coming of the Spanish, prior to the coming of European civilization, but has adopted, because of the influence of Christianity and so forth, has adopted the characteristics of a European culture; in the same sense that Peru has, in the same sense that Mexico has. So therefore, it's an outpost of that in Asia.

Now, it also has the potential for high-technology development, both in its cultural heritage, and also in some of the resources which are concentrated because of the way minerals are distributed in the planet. So there are many industries

which are vital, as part of the world system, which would be quite naturally developed in the Philippines. There is also an agricultural potential of some significance, which is important. So therefore, the Philippines, if properly developed, if the opportunity for development is there, can become an outpost of a contributing role of European civilization in Asia. And the Asians, in a sense, need that. So there is a very important relationship, potentially, between the Philippines and the Asian continent, which many people, of course, in the past have recognized. I think it's the case, now, too. It's very important.

But the key thing for me, is that the people of the Philippines must have a sense of their own potential future. They must have a basis for optimism about their future. And then they will be able to *see* these things, these opportunities, these potentialities. Then they will be mobilized to act for them. I think the basic thing, problem that I've seen over the past 25 years or so, is a demoralization of the people of the Philippines, to feel they don't have the option of going in this direction. If they do sense they have an option of going in this direction, if they believe in it, then I think you'll see a very significant role of the Philippines in the total Asian hemisphere.

### The Presidential System

**Valdes:** Okay, I have to ask these last questions that have been sent to us here, Lyn. "The people in our government, who want to push the shift of our government structure from the Presidential system to the European-inspired parliamentary system, can you comment on a move like this objectively?"

**LaRouche:** Yes, it's a mistake. A terrible mistake. Of course, if you have a bad President once or twice, you may say, "Let's get rid of the Presidential system." But then, you have to think about the future and the past, and you have to think about what system works better.

Now a European parliamentary system, for this time in world history, is the *worst possible decision you can choose*, apart from pure anarchy. Because parliamentary systems, by their nature, tend to be controlled by higher-ranking private authorities called central banking systems. And therefore, you have a government which really doesn't govern. Because the wealthy bankers, or wealthy banking system, is able to actually run the society, because it tells the government what it can do and can't do. And a parliamentary system, by its very nature, is one which is impotent under the thumb of an independent, so-called, central banking system.

So, in the U.S. system, you have the best form of government which has ever been created on the planet, constitutionally—when we follow it! In our government, a monopoly on the creation of money is created by the Federal government, with the permission of the House of Representatives. Therefore, we are not a monetary system, we are a credit system. We create credit, which is the debt of government, we create

that in order to promote long-term investments, chiefly long-term investments. In what? In things which are 25- to 50-year investments, in basic economic infrastructure, or in providing capital for capital-intensive development of agriculture, industry, and so forth.

But the government must regulate the banking system. It must not allow any corruption to come in, such as the hyperinflationary influence we have now. It must protect the people and their interest. And a President, who is functioning in that kind of system, the American System, the system of our Constitution—often violated, admittedly—*that is the best system*. So, our problem in the United States has been to rush to the defense of the Constitutional design of our government, because *if* we maintained the intention of that Constitutional design against all kinds of corruption, then we would have a government which would be fair, and it would be effective and could respond to its own errors by solving these problems. And that is the best kind of government.

And the Philippines has a reflection of a model of the American Constitutional system, which is the best kind of government in the world. Now, if you've got a problem with it, you have to fix the problems, without killing the form of government. That is, as they used to say, "Don't throw out the baby with the bathwater!" And the baby is the Presidency. Don't throw the baby away. It's the baby which is the assurance of your future.



## Political Prisoners in America??

You bet there are.

Michael Billington was sentenced to 77 years in prison, for refusing to go against the truth. Read *Reflections of an American Political Prisoner: The Repression and Promise of the LaRouche Movement*.

ORDER FROM:  
**Ben Franklin Booksellers**  
 P.O. Box 1707  
 Leesburg, Va., 20177  
 1-800-453-4108 toll free  
 or 1-703-777-3661

**\$20** plus shipping and handling  
 Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$ .50 each additional book. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.  
 We accept MasterCard, Visa, Discover, American Express.

www.benfranklinbooks.com e-mail: benfranklinbooks@mediasoft.net