

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

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

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

LaRouche: Good to be here.

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

LaRouche: Yes.

Q: Why?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: The society as we now know it.

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

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

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

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

That's the problem.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



EIRNS/Richard Magraw

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: This would be a joint agreement?

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



EIRNS/Dan Sturman



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That's the situation.

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

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

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

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

LaRouche: Thank you. Good to see you!