

# Mexicans Listen To LaRouche, As Fox Fumbles In Washington

by Valerie Rush

On Sept. 6, U.S. economist and 2004 Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed by one of Mexico's most prominent radio talk show hosts, Federico Lamont of Radio ABC, during which he not only discussed in depth the nature of the global financial crisis now taking place, but also emphasized the importance of U.S.-Mexican collaboration to boost Mexico's industrial development as a growing and sovereign nation. Economic and social chaos across the border would pose a serious security threat to U.S. national interest, LaRouche stressed.

The exclusive interview with LaRouche took place at the same time that Mexican President Vicente Fox was visiting President George Bush in Washington, for a high-profile but contentless state visit which not only failed to address the urgent crisis now afflicting both economies, but gave Fox precisely nothing to bring home to a nation panicked by zero-growth economic figures, collapsed industry and agriculture, and soaring unemployment rates.

Commenting on the Mexican President's failed visit to the United States, LaRouche observed that Fox's return to Mexico with empty pockets will likely trigger a policy crisis inside the country on the critical question: Will the Fox government cling to the failed free-trade, neo-liberal policy which is destroying the country, or will Mexico seek out an alternative policy to ensure its continued existence as a nation?

This was precisely the issue addressed by LaRouche in early August, during his bombshell video-conference address to a high-level audience organized by the National Institute of Public Accounts in the Service of the State, in Mexico City. In that Aug. 2 presentation, LaRouche had elaborated on the systemic crisis of the international financial system, and on his unique proposals for a bankruptcy reorganization of the world monetary system.

Coming amidst a growing awareness inside Mexico that the rapidly declining U.S. economy is taking the already-ravaged Mexican economy down with it, LaRouche's comments caused a stir in policy circles at every level, and has triggered a wave of media interest in his proposals.

In fact, the Sept. 6 radio interview was but the latest in a month filled with radio, television, and press coverage of LaRouche's views, and interviews with various of LaRouche's associates inside Mexico. For example, Mari-

vilía Carrasco, the president of the LaRouche-affiliated Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) in Mexico, has been giving nearly daily broadcasts on Radio ABC to discuss LaRouche's ideas on everything from the economy to terrorism. During Carrasco's early September broadcasts, including several originating from Washington, D.C., where she was attending the annual Labor Day conference of the Schiller Institute and International Caucus of Labor Committees, announcements were repeatedly included on the upcoming Sept. 6 LaRouche interview.

Radio ABC has since broadcast another exclusive live interview with LaRouche, on Sept. 13, in the aftermath of the attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C.

## LaRouche: Mexico's Economic Growth Is Vital To U.S. Security

*The following is an interview by Mexico's ABC Radio with U.S. Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, on Sept. 6, 2001.*

**Q:** Good morning to you, Mr. LaRouche. We are very pleased to have you speaking with ABC Radio. Why did you, in the early 1980s, forecast the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Soviet Union?

**LaRouche:** Well, it was February 1983 when I first made that observation, in the course of a back-channel discussion I was having with the Soviet government. It was in connection with the proposal for what became known as the SDI. At that time, there were many people in the Soviet government who were interested in the proposal. But Andropov, who had just then become the secretary of the Communist Party, had a sort of "kindergarten," a group of young advisers who included buddies of Berezovsky, the now-famous international swindler—these became known as the Russian liberals.

What I did, when I heard that Andropov was going to reject the SDI proposal when Reagan made it, I said, "Well, tell them in Moscow that if they continue with this Andropov alternative to discussing this with Reagan, under the current Andropov program, the Soviet Union will disintegrate within approximately five years." Then, in 1988, I gave a press conference, later televised, in Berlin, Germany, at which I announced the imminent collapse of the Soviet Union. And I set forth a program which I proposed they should take, to rebuild the economies which were going to be shattered by the Andropov-Gorbachov program.

Now, the reason, of course, for the problems in the Soviet system is the same as in the United States, or right here in

Mexico. The middle-1960s change from a protectionist system to a liberal system, is really the cause of the present collapse of the world financial system. So, Andropov is gone, but we still have the problem today. Boris Berezovsky is threatening the assassination of Russian President Putin. For me, it's a small world.

**Q:** Why do you now talk about the disintegration of the current world financial system, and why do you say that it's a systemic, rather than a passing, or cyclical, crisis?

**LaRouche:** By a system, I mean, for example, what in a geometry class you might call a system of Euclidean geometry. No theorem in the system can exist which does not agree with the assumptions of the system. The difference is that, in a cyclical crisis, the system is capable of functioning, but something is happening which is going to result in a correction. Some perturbation has caused it to have a problem. The systemic crisis means that the basic principles on which the system is operating, doom it.

In this case, we're talking about a system that was put into place in the beginning of 1966, approximately, with the Nixon campaign. Then you have the case of 1971, the floating rate exchange, which has really destroyed the system. Now eventually, we're going to have to go back to the kind of system that we had under the old Bretton Woods system, or we are going to die. But mostly, the systemic crises take about a generation or longer, before the effect of the crisis hits home. That is, if you adopt the wrong system today, it might be 25 years before the system crashes as a result.

**Q:** What's your view of the wave of layoffs going on in the United States right now, especially in the IT [information technology] and service sector, and how does this affect the rest of the U.S. economy, and the world economy?

**LaRouche:** First of all, the so-called IT, or information economy sector, was a speculative—computers can be useful, that's not the problem. But when you come up with this theory about an information society, information produces no food, produces no machinery. People produce the physical goods we need. This was a fraud which was created in 1995, essentially. This industry never made any real profit, it made only gambling profit. And trillions of dollars have now been lost as a result of the collapse of this system. We now face the threatened collapse of a real estate bubble in the United States. Consumer spending in the U.S. is dependent upon this real estate bubble. We're on the edge of a collapse of this real estate bubble.

At the same time, we have the crisis in South America, in Brazil, in Argentina, the Japan banking system, Poland, Turkey, and other countries. So, the system is about to crash. This is not a little problem. This means that the entire financial system of the United States is about to collapse into a deep depression. And my concern is that, under these conditions, knowing that the U.S. economy is collapsing, and knowing

the degree to which the Mexican economy has become dependent upon the United States, my concern is that the U.S. should be cooperating with Mexico on long-term capital programs for developing internal employment inside Mexico.

This is also a problem for other countries, but in the case of Mexico, this is really a question of security for the United States. We cannot have Mexico plunge into internal chaos. The internal security of Mexico, its economic security, is a matter of the security of the United States.

**Q:** What can Mexico expect from the United States, in terms of its current policies, such as NAFTA [the North American Free Trade Agreement] and other free-trade agreements? Will the United States respect these agreements with Mexico? They don't seem to have done that in the case of the truck agreement and so forth. And second, can you tell us a little about the Bush family, father and son. Is the son, like his father, part of a drug-trafficking ring, and does this have something to do with the reasons that you were sent to jail?

**LaRouche:** Well it does, on the latter question. That was the reason I was framed up. The older Bush supported my being framed, but it actually came from higher circles than Bush. The New York and British banking circles, for example. Henry Kissinger, for example. The *Washington Post* and *New York Times*, the people behind that.

The present Bush has no particular comprehension of any of these problems. He's a figure who sits there and makes decisions. He's not a thinking figure. His father was not really a thinking figure, he was not an intellectual, by any means.

Now, this NAFTA problem, and the idea of extending it, is going to collapse. And these people are going to tend to go crazy. When the United States is collapsing, and when nobody in Washington at present has any conception of doing anything that's going to work, the crisis is going to become worse before they improve their understanding.

Now, this NAFTA thing is just an example of that—the trucking business. This is simply a very small part of the overall picture, but it's an internal political issue in the United States. The politicians are trying to control some of their voters, around these kinds of issues. When they're concerned about an internal problem, they don't care what the effect is going to be on Mexico.

The other part of this issue is that only with long-term capital investment can a modern economy function. This means that the nation-states, such as the nation of Mexico, must have long-term understandings, which enable the nation to create for itself recognized credit on international markets. But the NAFTA system is going to decay, it's going to disappear. The alternative is to go back to the principles we had before 1971.

If the United States were to insist on creating a situation in which Mexico could use its sovereign credit to create long-term infrastructure development inside the country, then you could foster, you could have a revival of things, such as used

to exist around Monterrey. Employment would increase, agricultural opportunities would increase inside Mexico, and so would industrial employment inside Mexico.

One of the biggest problems today inside Mexico is the dependency upon exports to the United States, and export of people as labor into the United States. On this NAFTA question, that's the way I'm looking at it. NAFTA has overall been a disaster. And therefore, we have to admit that NAFTA is collapsing. We have to take a different approach. We have to look at what is happening in Mexico now with the collapse of the U.S. markets, and with the collapse of employment in the United States. Obviously, the internal growth of the Mexican economy is extremely crucial for Mexico, and for the security of the United States.

**Q:** Two final questions. The first is, can you please go into the issue of the drug ties to Bush, Sr. in particular; you've spoken about Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega and his meeting with Bush, Sr. when he was in the CIA, and do these connections have anything to do with Bush's son, the current President of the United States? The second question is, with regard to the globalophobics, and the upcoming meeting in Washington, D.C. of the IMF [International Monetary Fund], the World Bank, and so forth, and the plans for protests. What do you have to say about this, given your remarks also that the IMF and so on are a dying system?

**LaRouche:** Yes, Bush was involved in this business. You have to understand that Bush, Sr. is not a genius. He was never able to make any money on his own. His family, his uncle and so forth, always intervened, to enable him to have money. He's not a genius, and never was. He's not even capable of being an evil genius. He's not very honest. He does dirty things. But he was not the author of these things, and he was not really that significant in the CIA. He was only there for a short period of time. He was put in that position by Henry Kissinger.

Now, what he did is, Bush took jobs to build up his career. Remember, the drug industry in Central and South America was built up during the middle of the 1960s, and became much bigger later. The Colombia FARC case is an example of that. This also involved the use of extraordinary military measures; that is, not so-called "conventional" military methods, but using hired gangs. And after 1971, the United States was in economic decline. And more and more, certain sectors of the U.S. military were relying on drug revenues to finance their operations.

For example, the Afghanistan operation was a big drug-running operation, set up under Zbigniew Brzezinski, under Carter. At the end of 1981, Bush, as Vice President, received a special position in the national security apparatus. And he was running operations, in Guatemala and so forth, under this position. What became known as Iran-Contra and the drug operations there, were a part of this. And agreements were made, under Bush's tenure as Vice President, with certain

drug lords in Colombia. Bush was crazy enough to think like this: that the U.S. would ally with certain drug lords against the FARC, and on the basis of that, he got cooperation in terms of financial support, not necessarily him personally, but for the operation. There were conservative generals in the Colombian military who were saying, "No, we're not going to fight the narcos, we've got to fight the FARC, the communists. That's crazy. The FARC are the biggest narcos there, and the most dangerous ones."

So, Bush was a fool, but a corrupt fool, in all these things. But I don't think you could say this came from his own personal motivation. He's like a hired assassin. A hired assassin kills people when he receives his orders. But other people tell him to do it. Bush, Sr. has a certain ego. His son, too, but in a slightly different form. And he'll do things out of personal anger, and a desire for vengeance, and things like that. What he did with Noriega was a combination of a personal hatred of Noriega, because Noriega refused to do something that Bush wanted. And Bush said, in effect, I'm going to kill you. And that's why Noriega is in jail today.

Look at the sovereignty of the republics of South America, of Central America, back in 1982 and after 1989. The sovereignty of each of the countries of South America had been greatly impaired, and the process behind Bush was responsible for that, not so much Bush personally. Essentially, he's a guilty asset, but he's not the author. I wouldn't say anything good about Bush, but I don't want to exaggerate my charges against him.

Moving to your other question, regarding the demonstrations in Washington. We had, as Mexico also experienced, a wave of international terrorism in the 1960s. There was an attempt to destabilize Mexico as part of this. Fortunately, it failed. In the 1970s, there was the first mass-scale launching of international terrorism. None of this was spontaneous. These were high-level international intelligence agencies running all of this international terrorism. Half-crazy, deluded fools were used in the streets in order to accomplish the purposes of somebody behind the scenes. The assassination in Germany, for example, of the banker Jürgen Ponto. The assassination of Aldo Moro in Italy. These terrorists crimes of the 1970s sometimes used fools as covers, but it came from the highest levels of international circles, and could not have occurred without them.

We had the same thing revived again in the middle of the 1980s in Europe. You had an international operation launched into Mexico, to break up the sovereignty of Mexico. And the major financing of this sort of thing inside Mexico, was done through drug trafficking. Drug trafficking is the logistical base for the deployment of large-scale terrorism. What is coming into Washington is the fourth step, that I know of, of the launching of international terrorism in a new expanded form. We first picked up on this in the case of the Seattle demonstrations against globalization. There were a lot of angry people, but they were actually run by intelligence circles.