



‘I Do What I Must To Stop The Murder of a Country’

The following interview with Lyndon LaRouche was filmed on April 2, 2004, in Leesburg, Virginia. The interviewer was Argentine journalist Romina Manguel, and selections from it were used in the movie documentary “Debt,” directed by the well-known Argentine television personality and journalist Jorge Lanata. “Debt” was released on Oct. 7, 2004.

Q: Some people accuse you of being crazy, or messianic in the battle against the International Monetary Fund. Is this because they are trying to discredit you?

LaRouche: Well, this is because they are afraid of me. Since I have a record as the most successful long-range forecaster over recent decades, internationally, and because I’ve taken on the hard core of the issue, since ’71, since I had this famous debate with Prof. Abba Lerner at Queens College, I’ve been considered the number-one attack dog against the Schachtian policies of the IMF.

Q: I’ve been told that the expression, “the debt bomb,” is something which you coined. Did that “debt bomb” explode in Argentina?

LaRouche: Well, it is in the process of exploding worldwide. We have to realize, we’re dealing with a world system, which tends to dominate nation-states. Even though the IMF is essentially a creation of Anglo-American financial interests, it essentially functions as a world government, in effect. And a lot of governments, since 1971-72 have discovered that. Especially since 1982, in the Americas, with the targetting of Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico, all in the same period, in the Spring of 1982 into the Summer, indicated this was going to result in *mass-murder*.

Q: You’ve spoken about how the original spirit of Bretton Woods has been lost. What would be the role today for the IMF? How should things function?

LaRouche: My intention, were I President, today—I would put the IMF into bankruptcy with cooperation of a number of governments in the world. It is a creature, whose authority and existence depends upon the consent and support of governments. Therefore, if those governments determine that the IMF is bankrupt, and the recent Argentina crisis demonstrates that, when you take the debt of Argentina and Brazil, com-

bined, to the IMF, you see how close the IMF is to bankruptcy. Therefore, what we have to do, as nation-states, is to put bankrupt financial systems into bankruptcy receivership for reorganization. There is no solution for the world’s problems today, without such a drastic reorganization in bankruptcy of the existing, leading financial institutions.

Q: We’ve had a lot of discussions here in Washington, with people inside and outside the IMF, and no one talks about the idea of shared responsibility. Everyone points to Argentina as the responsible party. I’d like to know your view on this.

LaRouche: Well, of course, what’s being done, is against Argentina. It’s an example of fascist models of terrorism: The idea is to take one nation at a time, make a horrible example of that nation, then move on to the next nation and do the same. In this case, the targetting of Argentina, in the most *recent* phase, by the so-called “vulture funds”—this was a prelude, if it had succeeded, to go after Brazil next. And then, to do similar things to countries around the world. This was their intent.

Some of these intentions are being pushed *this* year. Others will be unleashed after the next election, *if* George Bush were re-elected, with Cheney as his Vice President.

So, this is only the first step. It’s like the attack on Iraq: The war against Iraq by Cheney—Bush doesn’t understand what it’s all about, but Cheney gave him orders, and he carried them out—was intended to be a prelude to an attack on Syria, on Iran, a breakup of Saudi Arabia, and going on and on; a nuclear attack on North Korea with mini-nukes, and then eventually coming around to China, and other countries.

The intention here is by the international financier system, which is controlled, at least on the Cheney side, by people who are an integral part of the left-over Nazi SS system, which was brought into the world system by Allen Dulles and company, through negotiations with [SS General Walter] Schellenberg, through this fellow in Switzerland during that period. So, we have, inside the world apparatus, inside NATO, inside the U.S. government, inside the British government: We have elements of the third generation of the old SS system, the Schellenberg security element, which was brought into the Western control apparatus, as an intelligence function, by Dulles and company, immediately after the death



Mothers and children in Argentina searching through garbage for food. LaRouche points out that at the end of World War II, Argentina's standard of living "was fourth highest in the world. Now, what is it, today? Starvation. Why? It's the IMF policy. It's the policy of free trade: the idea that you must drive every economy down to the level of the poorest people of the world, or lower."

of Franklin Roosevelt. That's what we're up against.

Q: In the past, you've been quoted saying that the IMF has been committing "genocide." Can you explain how this policy is being carried out in Argentina, in particular, but also in other countries?

LaRouche: To understand this in terms of the IMF, you have to consider a couple of problems that are generally not recognized by leaders of the generation presently in charge of governments. They don't understand economics. They believe in free trade. Now, free trade does not work. Free trade leads toward genocide, by its own nature.

The essence of production and economy, is physical, not monetary. And therefore, you must have monetary systems which respect the *physical* realities of production and consumption, not simply money as such. The British system was "cheapest priced"—cheapest priced by putting every country into competition with the cheapest labor of the world. The result is, that in the United States, we have lost most of our employment in production. It's left, because it's not cheap enough. In the meantime, we have put many of our people into unemployment: The lower 80% of our population is out of employment, or miserable, and we're doing the same thing to other countries.

Take Argentina: At the end of the war, in terms of standard of living, it was fourth highest in the world. Now, what is it, today? Starvation. Why? It's the IMF policy. It's the policy of free trade: the idea that you must drive every economy down to the level of the poorest people of the world, or lower.

The result is, you do not preserve, maintain, standards of living, which are necessary to maintain life at the level of existing technology; you also destroy the capital investment, not only in productive firms—farms and industry—but you also destroy the essential infrastructure of society: water systems, power generation and distribution systems, mass transit systems, hospital systems, health-care systems, educational systems. You destroy the *physical structure* upon which modern life depends. The result is, you squeeze and you begin to kill people by methods such as starvation, withholding of health care, spread of diseases without protection against them, that sort of thing.

That becomes, at a point, intentional. For example, this was expressed by Kissinger, in 1974, in a draft document, when he was still National Security Advisor, in which he indicated, especially for Africa, that we must not let the Africans use up the natural resources in Africa, *which we intend for our future*; therefore, we must keep the African population *down*, and we must deny them technological progress. We must *reduce* the African population.

The *same policy*, which we see in sub-Saharan Africa, is being conducted now, against the countries of South America: They're all targeted. This is deliberate genocide. To destroy the population, to break its will, to depopulate the area: Why? To preserve the large natural resources, of South America, in particular, for future generations of Anglo-American entrepreneurs.

Q: So, if I understand you correctly, you're saying there's a

direct relationship between the children in the province of Tucumán who are dying of hunger, and the policies of the IMF?

LaRouche: Absolutely! You see the same thing in many parts of the world. You see it in Africa. Look at Africa: Sub-Saharan Africa is in worse condition, in most parts, than Argentina. Also, Brazil—look at it! Look at Uruguay; look at Paraguay. Look at what's happening in Bolivia. The drug policy, with the *cocaleros*—not just as *cocaleros*, but because of U.S. policy—is going to try to destroy what's left of Bolivia, which once had a basis for growth. We give the Bolivians *no alternative*, but to grow drugs, because they're denied any alternative way of making a living, the peasants. Look at what we're doing to Peru. We're destroying Peru, under the present government, which was installed by the United States: the Toledo government. It's a puppet government. Look what's happening in Colombia. Look at what is about to break out in Venezuela, which will be another genocidal experience of civil war. Look at the threat to Brazil.

So, you see Africa; and Africa is the image of the future of South America and Central America—unless we stop it.

Q: I've read that you say that Argentina is being transformed into a new Auschwitz. Can you explain why that's the case?

LaRouche: Well, the point is, is—let's take the case of what Hitler did to the Jews, for example. Now, the Jews, particularly after the influence of Moses Mendelssohn in Germany, who was the leader of the Renaissance of the Jew: The Jews in Europe, at that point, mostly were slaves, virtual slaves, thrown on the countryside with no rights. Some Jews had privileges by patent, to have a life, as bankers or something else, that the local government considered important. But, the typical Jew was put into an itinerant, poor-man, desperate condition. The Jew was not recognized as having personal sovereignty, as a human being.

Now, Moses Mendelssohn's campaign, on behalf of the Platonic conception of the human soul, struck the conscience of Europe, especially in the German-speaking sector, and, under Joseph II of Austria, under this influence, there was the first political freedom for Jews. From that point on, as a result of this, and the spread of this into Eastern Europe, in the so-called Yiddish Renaissance in Eastern Europe, this made the Jewish population of Central Europe and elsewhere, one of the most important assets, economically and culturally, of the German nation, in particular.

So, why would somebody in Germany want to kill so many Jews, from Central and Eastern Europe in particular? They were the great assets of Central Europe, or part of the great assets. There was no rational motive—even greed, or any other reason for this murder.

The point is, that Hitler was a Beast-Man, who believes that he can rule the planet—like Cheney, similar to Cheney—he can rule the planet, by acts of such terror, that people will be terrified into willful submission, at any desire, any demand,

he makes. So, the sacrifice of the Jews in particular—they weren't the only victims—but their sacrifice was intended to send a message to the world, "You crawl, and submit—or else! We are capable of doing *anything!*" And, this is the kind of problem we have.

And, what we have now, in the right wing, the extreme right wing, which is presently controlling the Presidency of the United States, but not just the Presidency; or, similar people in Britain. Or, what happened in Spain, recently, in Madrid: The same kind of thing. These old Nazis came out, and pulled a typical operation in Madrid, typical of what we had from 1969 to 1980, in Italy—same kind of thing. *This is the method of these guys.*

Q: What happens when a country breaks its relationship with the IMF?

LaRouche: Ah! Well, the IMF, of course, is an institute of a concert of governments. Now, we're approaching something analogous to the sound barrier. Remember, long ago, there were attempts to drive a propeller aircraft faster than the speed of sound. And they would get closer and closer, but then the aircraft would fall, collapse, disintegrate. Until we found out how to do it.

The world is now functioning above bankruptcy, largely on the basis of printing money, comparable to what the German government did in 1923, the Weimar government. They printed money massively. For a period of time, this inflationary printing of money, to pay its debts, the war-reparations debts, this seemed not to disturb the system fundamentally. But then, from June of 1923, throughout October-November 1923, there was a hyperinflationary explosion, which ruined the reichsmark, totally.

We're now in a similar situation: The United States government and the Japan government, through the yen-lending policy, have been pumping vast amounts of inflationary money into the world system, most of it going in the direction of the United States financial markets. This is now coming to an end. We are approaching the sound barrier, the point at which the rate of hyperinflation becomes so steep, that even money-pumping pressures will not stop it. By the time the Fall arrives in this quarter, it's already likely, that the entire international financial system will have collapsed. We're on the verge of it, right now. Because, we're approaching the sound barrier limit. The rate of hyperinflation has accelerated so rapidly, the system is ready to explode.

And leading European bankers and others agree: Only the U.S. government officials and the Democratic Party leadership *pretend* that this can't happen until after the next election. But everybody knows it's about to happen. Some people hope that it will be postponed until *after* the U.S. elections in November. But, this quarter, the second quarter of this year, is already—we're right at the threshold of an explosion.

The other factor is credit derivatives, financial derivatives, which are gambling side-bets. For example, the Bank



IMF Managing Director Rodrigo de Rato y Figaredo. Argentine President Kirchner told Rato during their first meeting: "My Finance Minister . . . spoke well of you, but I didn't believe him."

for International Settlements reported that in the year 2000, as against a \$40-odd trillion net world product, the turnover of derivatives was \$8.7 *quadrillion*. So, with this great churning of short-term credit, of this nature, piling on against a market, whose net product is about \$40 trillion—this won't work. We're now at the outer limit of explosion, which will bring down the system.

At that point, we either go to the worst kind of fascism imaginable—a killer form of fascism from the United States and other governments, or, the heads of state, especially the President of the United States, declares the Federal Reserve System, and the IMF, *to be in bankruptcy*. And puts it in receivership, under government control, freezes its assets, and manages them, to organize a recovery.

The purpose of recovery, of course, is to get a *real* economy, of the type that existed in Europe and the Americas during the 1950s-1960s. To get that kind of economy started again, on the Roosevelt model, we can do it. It requires the will. But, what this means is: Such a reform would absolutely break the power of the international financial agencies, typified by their representatives, Felix Rohatyn, and George Soros, and so forth. These powerful financier agencies which were behind Hitler, are the enemy today, and it's coming to a collision: Does the nation-state, which is responsible for the general welfare of the nation and its people—does it have the *will*, to defend the people, the nation, the economy, against these *predators*?

And, that's what the issue is. That's what the danger is. The predators, the financial agencies, who control the Nazi-types, are deploying the Nazi-types of today—including some real, live Nazis, left over from Hitler—are deploying them, today, with the idea of dictatorship and *war, terror*, to intimidate the nations into submitting to the will of the bankers. If the will of the bankers is imposed, what you're seeing in

Argentina, will be the fate of every nation of the Americas—including the United States.

Q: Two questions: First of all, the perception that they try to create is, that if you break with the IMF, you'll be left outside the system, and this is a pressure they have on you. And second, on an earlier point, in what sense is the policy one of creating an Auschwitz in Argentina?

LaRouche: Well, it's just like saying, in the first case, you say to the cow, "If you try to leave the slaughterhouse, you will freeze to death." It's that kind of situation. It's a lie.

See, the question here is power. The question is political power. They're chopping nations apart, one at a time, or one or two at a time—weaker nations, or weakened nations. They isolate them, and chop them up! But *all* the nations are threatened!

The importance of the United States, in particular, and to some degree, Russia; Russia still has a sense of being a world power—not in the sense of physical power, but in the sense of its sovereignty. If nations such as that say, "We are not going to accept this"; if the President of the United States were to say, "We're going to put this system into bankruptcy," then you would see all hell breaking loose, probably an assassinated President, and a few things like that. This has happened before. But, it's come to a question of power: Where is the concert of governments, which is strong enough, and courageous enough, to do what is necessary—which is elementary, which is Christian, which is human?

Q: Or else these governments are accomplices of the IMF in their activities?

LaRouche: They try to eliminate governments that are not, as you may have observed. Remember you had a transition in Argentina, when the crisis hit, some years ago. And they used terroristic methods to intimidate a government of Argentina into resigning. And they got more complicity from the following governments, not because they were governments, or people, who lacked courage—but they were terrified! And were certain, of definite death—all of them!—if they were to resist.

What happened with the Kirchner government, was the resistance was sufficiently strong, that the IMF knew that if they forced Argentina into a default, it would start the chain-reaction which would blow up the whole system. And after that, of course, [Brazilian President Luis Inacio] Lula, who had stood on the sidelines discreetly while this was going on, when Kirchner won *that* battle, Lula suddenly said, "I will now join you."

So, the thing here, is political! Whereas the courage exists among governments, to cooperate to resist this evil, because an attack on *one* nation, is an attack on *all* nations! And nations have to understand, they can not stand by the side and see their other nations being destroyed, one at a time. They must unite, in a common purpose, to re-establish the principle of human rights on this planet.

Q: Can you name those governments in Latin America, that were most complicit with the IMF?

LaRouche: They all were! After 1982, after what was done to [Mexican President] López Portillo—remember, I was involved in this. I was involved in the fight against this U.S./Malvinas War—the backing of the British in the Malvinas War. I got into trouble, because of that. But, we fought.

So, in the course of that, the nations of South and Central America became concerned with this. And in the Spring of that year, I met with President López Portillo of Mexico, in the context of my discussion of this Argentina/Malvinas problem. He asked me, at that time—he's now recently deceased; he's been a friend of mine ever since—he said, "What are they going to do to my country?" because he knew this was not just Argentina. And I told him. I said, "By September, they're going to bring down the Mexican financial system. That's their intention." So, he and others, created an environment where I wrote a report, called *Operation Juárez*, which was a proposal for a U.S. policy, toward the nations of Central and South America, with the United States: debt reorganization, and so forth; financial reorganization of the Western Hemispheric system.

They killed him, essentially. He went to the United Nations in October, and gave a short address, which is memorable, and you might want to look at it, closely. Because it states, in principle, what the problem is. He was like a man, who was about to be shot, who was permitted to see his last words in testament, before he's shot before the firing squad, which was, in this case, the United Nations. But, what he said, announced when he's dead, it still rings around the world, especially the Americas, as a statement of policy and courage! When they took a man—and remember, the Argentine government withdrew from its alliance with López Portillo, on this issue. The Brazilian President withdrew from the alliance with López Portillo. He was left hanging, all by himself, with his friendship with me, and the friendship of a lot of people throughout the hemisphere—but no support. And Mexico has been destroyed, step by step, since that time.

Q: Does the IMF care if the money it is lending to countries, is lent to corrupt governments? Do they take into account the issues of corruption in their lending policies?

LaRouche: Well, they tend not to lend to governments, that are not corrupt.

It's that simple! For example. Take the case that the way the Toledo government was imposed on Peru. This was done under the Clinton Administration. It was done under the pressure from George Soros. And it was done, to stop the anti-drug operations of the government of Peru. It was done, also, in the context of [Peruvian President] Fujimori's speech in Brazil, which implicitly was Peru's commitment to cooperate with Mercosur on the development of the Americas, and the defense of the Americas. At that point, they said, "*Kill him!*" And they put in Toledo.

Governments that are honest, will tend to be shot, or driven into exile; so that the people who remain, are those who are favored by the State Department, the IMF, Soros, and so forth. Therefore, the selection of leaders is based on the estimate of their susceptibility to corruption. And therefore, once they think they've got "their boy," or "their dog" in the government, they say, "Nice doggie," and they give it a bone.

Q: Is this why Argentine President Carlos Menem maintained such good, close relations with the IMF, during his Presidency?

LaRouche: Well, he was told by former President George Bush exactly what his options were, when former President Bush was Vice President of the United States. He was told what his options were. And he betrayed his friends, his wife was not happy about it, and so forth. And he is now driving his race car through the stratosphere of politics.

Q: What's the price that one pays for fighting, or confronting, the IMF? What price did *you* pay, personally, in your fights with the IMF?

LaRouche: Well, you see, to fight like this, you have to have a sense of immortality. And most people, in the decadent culture which has taken over the world, in the post-war period, especially since the middle of the 1960s—in this decadent culture, people do not think of the future, they don't think of the future consequences of their living, and their actions. Therefore, they're not willing, like a soldier, to put their life at risk for purpose. And it's this kind of weakness, which is made famous by *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the Third Act soliloquy—"the undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveller returns"—turns him into a coward. So, what has happened? We have produced nations of cowards, under leaders who are cowards. Because at the very best, they may *mean* to do something nice, but they won't *do* it, because they're afraid, like Hamlet. And they would rather go out, and kill and be killed, than face the challenge of dealing with the real problem.

Q: Do the people at the IMF think or realize that the numbers they're dealing with translate into the death of individuals, of children, and so on?

LaRouche: Their answer will be, as I had from a Bank for International Settlements fellow I talked with many years ago on this question of Africa: He said, "Well, you have to realize that many people sometimes have to die, for the sake of a policy."

The IMF bureaucrat, is a perfect copy of the bureaucrats in the Gestapo. "This is my job. This is not personal. *I'm just doing my job.* This guy is in the way. My job is to eliminate him. Eliminate him!"

Q: What do you think about Anne Krueger? Is she going to stay on in her current role at the IMF? Is she going to leave?



*IMF First Deputy
Managing Director
Anne Krueger:
“You don’t say,
‘What did you eat,
today, Annie?’ You
say, ‘Who did you
eat, today?’”*

What about Krueger?

LaRouche: Freddie Krueger’s mother?

She is a Beast-Woman. I think everybody knows that. That’s her function, is to be Beast-Woman. To be totally irrational, totally aggressive, a savage beast, a cannibal—hmm? And therefore, you ask, well, you don’t say, “What did you eat, today, Annie?” You say, “Who did you eat, today?” She’s that type of personality.

She is like a thug. She’s like a mafia hit-man. She’s used, because of these inhuman qualities, which she’s managed to find in herself.

Q: Do you think that Argentina will pay the debt? Do you think Argentina has to pay?

LaRouche: It *can’t* pay the debt! What’s it going to pay the debt with? With the bodies of dead children?

I mean, the point is, Argentina needs to be given bankruptcy relief, that is, reorganization in bankruptcy. Declare national bankruptcy. Have the creditors put through bankruptcy, and restart the nation.

Now, to that purpose, Argentina has to have a forgiveness, for the time being, of its total foreign debt. First of all, the margin of debt of Argentina, is largely not legitimate: That, if you go back to 1971-72, historically, Argentina has more than paid its total debt which it actually incurred, from that time to the present! So, it owes nothing. And it will cost nothing, therefore, in honest accounting, to simply say, “Let’s freeze the debt.”

Now, let’s look at some of this stuff. Maybe we’re going to pay it, maybe we’re not going to pay it, but our major thing, is to get Argentina *growing* again. That means, first of all, large-scale infrastructure projects, for which there’s a drastic need, today, in order to increase employment, and to begin to get some viability, in the economy: to restart agriculture, to take care of the food problem, which is most crucial; to open up the essential institutions. And *use* this stimulant, in the

public sector, through international credit and national credit, to have growth in the economy, which will spill over into the private sector. This has to be done with an idea of getting back to the standard of living which existed prior to all this nonsense.

Q: Why should we think, in the context of everything that we’re discussing here, that if the IMF disappears, it would be replaced by something better than the IMF?

LaRouche: No, it has to be positive. There are not, in life, there are not truly negative solutions, to problems of this type. It has to be a positive solution. It has to be a positive alternative.

For example. In European culture, the transition from feudalism, or the medieval period, to the modern civilization, occurred as a result of the great collapse of the Lombard banking system—which was actually the Venetian system—in the middle of the 14th Century, which was called the New Dark Age. And we are approaching a New Dark Age of that type, now.

The result though, was a positive one, because of the influence of many things, including the influence of Dante Alighieri; the influence of Petrarca; the influence of Boccaccio. . . . We had a Renaissance, in the 15th Century, centered on Northern Italy, around Florence, but spreading out to the neighboring countries. We had the birth of modern civilization.

Then, we had a period of religious war, from 1511 to 1648, which we came out of through the Treaty of Westphalia, which was actually organized by Cardinal Mazarin of France—actually an Italian, but a French Cardinal.

So, it’s *positive* solutions: The American Revolution, the United States’ creation, was a *positive* alternative to the chaos which then existed in Europe. The collapse of France with the French Revolution—orchestrated from London, naturally—to eliminate a competitor: This put Europe through hell. So, there have been various struggles, over a period of time, to develop the modern nation-state, with its commitment to the principle of the common welfare, general good, the common good.

It’s the assertion of solutions, which express the common good, which inspire people, who had become desperate and frightened, to see hope for rebuilding a nation, rebuilding society. Yes, we have to react to the crises; we have to recognize that a crisis which discredits existing values is an opportunity, as well as a threat. But, the question will not come from continuing the chaos; the solution has to be positive: It has to be leadership, by government, and by other forces, which produces *positive* alternatives to the terrible crisis, and the policies which cause those crises, as happened with the Renaissance.

Q: In light of the fact that 18% of the IMF’s funding comes from the United States, do the people of the United States



President Néstor Kirchner rallies the population against the IMF and the 'debt vultures' in the province of Buenos Aires, earlier this year.

care about what the IMF does to Argentina, or Nigeria, or other countries?

LaRouche: The people of the United States, up to the present moment, are living in a fantasy-land. And the degree of fantasy in the United States is far worse, than it was 40 years ago. The problem is this: The lower 80% of the family-income brackets of the United States have been pushed out of reality. They essentially are treated as human cattle. Their conditions of life become worse, and worse, and worse. Family life is broken up, all kinds of things are destroyed.

The upper 20% are living in a different kind of fantasy-land. They think, "We are the Golden Generation. We are the wonder children." They're now in their fifties, sixties, with worn-down sexual capacities, and having fantasies to replace their former activities. "No! The world will go on, forever. I will die, but I don't 'go there.' I don't think about that. I have my fantasy-life! I have my entertainment! I changed my sex, three weeks ago. I'll change it again, four weeks from now." This is the condition of the people who are running the United States, from the top, in public and private institutions, in their fifties and early sixties: They have *no understanding* of economy; they believe in free trade; they believe in globalization; they believe in all this nonsense.

But, the poor people, the lower 80%, look up . . . and say: "There's nothing we can do about it. We're defeated every time. Everything has been taken away from us. We have to beg." And the poorer part of the population, is like the poorer people in ancient Imperial Rome, living on the bread *and mass entertainment*. Look at the delusions, which are associated with the behavior of a population, which depends upon mass entertainment, of a degraded type, to keep them-

selves entertained.

So therefore, what happens is, until we can introduce a positive factor into the minds of the population, especially the lower 80% in the United States, they are not realistic; they're not in the real world. They see themselves as human cattle, kept in a pen, and can do nothing outside the pen. They vote for candidates, but that doesn't mean anything. They're voting for the gladiator in the arena. They are not emotionally involved in the reality of the consequences of what their voting will do.

So now, therefore, you come to a time of danger and blessing: The danger is, we're about to plunge into a New Dark Age through the instrumentality, chiefly, of a general financial collapse. The whole monetary-financial system of the world is about to disintegrate. It can not continue in its present form. Therefore, at such a point of crisis, is there a leadership which can step in as Franklin Roosevelt did, in the United States, in the 1932 campaign, and his Presidency in 1933, which presents an alternative, to a frightened, desperate people, which gets them to open their eyes and say, "Yes, there *is* a future." And that's what's needed.

The problem for Argentina, is that Argentina is strategically a weak nation, particularly when isolated. Therefore, the moral responsibility lies chiefly with us in the United States, to intervene in this crisis, to make a change in our choice of government, our choice of people in government; and to be able *to react*, as Roosevelt did, to the impact of the crisis, *to turn the corner* and go upward in a new direction. That's the only chance.

But what is useful is the relationship of other nations *to* this process inside the United States. For example, in Europe,

especially in the Americas—as in Mexico, which is still a keystone nation of South and Central America, and among some people in other parts of the world. There *is* the possibility of mobilizing humanity to say to the United States, “Will the President of the United States make the fateful announcement which puts this system into bankruptcy, gives us the commitment to go in a new direction, in a direction, which we pioneered before, which worked, if imperfectly, but it was better than what we have now?”

Q: The IMF seems to have some sort of secret. Everywhere they go, and talk to people, nobody seems to really know what’s going on inside the IMF. What’s the IMF secret? Do you know?

LaRouche: The IMF secret is not allowing people they talk to, to tell the truth about what the discussion was.

Q: What should Argentina do? What’s the message to President Kirchner? What does Argentina do, under these circumstances you describe?

LaRouche: Well, what it can do, it has to be political and international. Now, I think a mistake was made in this decision on the former issues, because, what’s going to happen now, is they’re going to move to try to eliminate Kirchner. They’re going to try to find issues—we call them “wedge issues” in U.S. politics—to create a splitting off of some of the support from Kirchner, among the patriots, on the issue of this question of the former leaders of Argentina. That will work, in the short term; particularly, if Kirchner is not able to do something positive, which takes the attention *away* from that issue, and puts it on more positive issues of national interest.

But, the other side of this is that people inside governments, without breaching the principle of sovereignty of government, must cooperate with people in other countries to create an international consensus among such circles, to put pressure, from international forces, on *all* governments, and to scare governments—such as in the case of Argentina-Brazil relations—to take neighboring governments and other governments, and to indicate to them, *they must cooperate, and not abandon their friends*. And they must have a sense of mutual support, mutual defense. Without that all-sided approach to organizing public interest, public will, or public opinion—internationally, as well as in one’s own country—and integrating that in this way, it is *impossible* for a country like Argentina, to have an effective outreach to counter what’s coming down on it.

Q: Over the last couple of months, there have been activities carried out in front of Argentine embassies and consulates by the LaRouche Youth Movement in different parts of the world. What’s the idea behind this?

LaRouche: Very simple. It’s twofold: First of all, when youth of that type, our youth, act for a principled cause, they

become stronger. They become morally stronger and more effective. It’s a part of their development. It is also a necessary action by *me*, which they conduct on my behalf, to defend a country, which is being murdered. I step in, where I can, to do what I can, to stop murder. And the Argentine people are being murdered. I must do what I can, in my way, to influence the process, somehow, to defend the country.

Q: When we visited the IMF, we were given a little game they give to children. It has various circles. One of the circles says, “Group A, Obligations of IMF Membership.” And “Group B” says, “Benefits of IMF Membership.” So, their idea is, there are obligations and there are benefits. Could you give an example of each—are there examples of each?

LaRouche: Well, I don’t see, really, any benefits, since 1971-72. There are really no benefits. For everything that’s offered, more is taken away, by virtue of the offer.

The IMF obligations? The IMF has obligations only to the financier oligarchy, which operates, with the support of government, *as* the IMF! I mean, [former World Bank Chief Economist Joseph] Stiglitz, for example, with his—Stiglitz is not a courageous person. But, he did say some things, as a bureaucrat would to make himself look good, but not actually do anything about it. So, Stiglitz is typical: These people come in as functionaries. They’re like bureaucrats. They know who their boss is. If they don’t find out who the boss is, they’ll be discharged—soon. So, they have a secret understanding, which is not so secret, of who the boss is: The boss is the international financier oligarchy, of the Venetian tradition. And their obligation is to pull tricks of management, to serve the interests of this Venetian-style, international financier oligarchy. That’s their obligation.

Their other obligation is to try to fool people, into thinking this is the rules of the game. You know, for example, you have to think about children. Think about how children are managed. Society creates games. Society teaches children rules of the game. Children are told that they have to be “fair.” To be “fair,” you play by the “rules of the game.”

Now, children survive that sometimes, and they grow up to be adults, to break free of childish behavior. But some people never stop being childish. You come in, and say, “The IMF rules of the game are the following.” “Oh! Yes! Yes, Teacher! We’re going to play the game! We’re going to be fair! We’re going to be fair!”

And the function of the IMF is to tell the poor children, who are governments, “Hey, children! This is the game! These are the rules! If you play by the rules, *you might have a fair chance to win the game!*” And, that’s the—you know, governments become like fish in a fishbowl. They’re struggling to find the best place inside the fishbowl, and they don’t know that the content of the fishbowl is about to be dumped down the sewer.

Q: Thank you, very much.