

Hundreds of Mexicans carry on dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche

Although Lyndon LaRouche was prevented from personally making presentations in Guadalajara, Mexico City, and Monterrey, the nearly 1,000 Mexicans—most of them university students—who came to hear him, were able to pepper him with their questions by telephone. Extensive excerpts of the exchanges in Guadalajara and Mexico City appeared in the Oct. 6 issue of New Federalist. Below we excerpt one question from the Mexico City forum on Sept. 22, and one from the forum on Sept. 24.

Q: My name is Eloy M—, and I am a student of economics at [the National Autonomous University of Mexico] UNAM. Do you believe honestly that the governments of both Mexico and the U.S. have a solution to the International Monetary Fund?

LaRouche: Not at present. But, as you notice, the heat around my name indicates the fact that people in the United States, and in other parts of the world (as you will read in the *Asian Wall Street Journal*, for example) in various governments, including powerful governments in Asia and Europe, and in the United States—a number of people have come to recognize: that my view of this economic process which has been unfolding in the past 30 years; that my analysis of this process has been correct, and that the arguments of my opponents on this, have been wrong.

Now as you know, not everybody in government is stupid, and when they recognize that I'm right, and they recognize that the system is finished—as at the highest level I think they all do—then you find that in the government of the United States, at the high levels, and in major countries of Asia, people want to know what I propose. And I propose certain things, with the understanding that *they have no rational alternative but to accept what I propose*.

The problem here, in statecraft, is best understood by thinking of Shakespeare's play, *Hamlet*—and *Hamlet* is one of the great plays for anyone to study closely, who wishes to deal with problems of statecraft. Let me describe Hamlet to you in these terms, and I think my answer will then be clear to you. Hamlet, Shakespeare's Hamlet, was a swordsman, a *real macho*, who is running his sword through people left and right. He would solve every argument with his sword. He returned from wars, to find that his father, the King, had been

killed; that he, the heir to the throne, had been cheated of the position of King, by his uncle, who had married his mother. The country is going to Hell. It's about to be invaded, and conquered; and what is this *idiot* focussed upon? He's focussed on the question, can he take revenge on his uncle. He's not concerned with the nation. He's not concerned with the survival of the nation. He's concerned with his petty obsession with personal revenge.

Then he comes to the Third Act, where he has this famous soliloquy. And he says: "To be, or not to be." Shall I follow my traditional way of acting? This obsession with revenge, which leads to my own doom and the doom of my nation? Or, shall I take the other alternative? But what will happen in the future? *I don't know*. If I take this other road, can I be guaranteed that this will work? I can't do it. I'll stick to the old ways.

So, in the end, Hamlet is dead, and the nation is conquered. And then the last character in the play, Horatio, steps forward and speaks to the audience; and he says to the audience, while these events are fresh in your mind, let's reconsider them, so that none of us makes these mistakes again.

The fact that an idea is a stupid one, has never proven an efficient way of causing someone who is obsessed with that idea, to give it up. However, in a time of great shocks—for example, the attack on Pearl Harbor in the experience of the United States—suddenly people will abandon obsessions, and come back to reality, and react on reality.

What had happened is, back during the 1960s, with the Cuban Missile Crisis, when everyone was terrified that the world was going into nuclear warfare, and other things, there was a great flight, worldwide, away from reality, into fantasy. If you look at the character of television entertainment, and the numbers of hours that people spend on it, most of the world's population, especially in Europe and the Americas, in the past 30 years has been engaged in a flight into unreality. What has been practiced as the accepted ideas of economics, and so forth, over this period, is complete unreality, complete fiction, fantasy. You see a debt building up, \$100 trillion of U.S. equivalent, which has not got the form of investment. It's a gambling debt, several times the total annual product of the world's economy.

And you had until recently, many people in various parts

of the world believed that this kind of system could go on forever. Complete fantasy! What happened, as you saw with the reaction to the murder of Princess Diana—you saw this in England, and you saw this also in the United States—there was a sudden *explosion of hatred* against the British royal family, both in Britain, and in the United States. Almost like a Pearl Harbor effect: a sudden change in popular opinion.

My politics is based on reality. It is my view, that, in a time of crisis, people are presented with an opportunity to escape from fantasy into reality. And by the reaction . . . I would say that the possibility of acceptance of my proposal on these relations between Mexico and the United States, is reasonably likely, and especially, if the people of Mexico want it.

Q: My name is José María G—. What is your opinion of the democratic process we're undergoing in Mexico? People are very happy, because for many years they have been told that democracy would be the solution to their problems. I want to know if you feel this is true. . . ?

LaRouche: . . . The word "democracy" is one of the most abused words in the vocabulary of the fantasists today. "Democracy" has come to mean an absence of truth. . . .

What happens is that "democracy" becomes the biggest enemy of human rights. I'll give you an example of this. One of the most hideous people in the United States, one of the worst criminals, is the most influential of the associate justices of the Supreme Court, Antonin Scalia. He is a man who professes to be a Catholic, but who is actually a satanic Manichean, who says that he has personal morality but the ideas of the marketplace should determine what the law should be. And this man has been chiefly responsible for the execution of Mexican and other nationals in the United States, many of these people with evidence that they were innocent. He has denied people the right to have evidence of their innocence heard, and has rushed them to execution in the interest of serving democratically selected procedure rather than truth.

In the 20th century, including the Nazis, the worst crimes against humanity were always committed in the name of the people. Like the case of Robespierre and Saint-Just, in the case of the French Jacobin Terror. So, one has to ask what the word "democracy" means? I suggest we stop using the word "democracy." It's probably the biggest piece of sophistry and fraud that's ever been invented. Let's use a word, or terms, which describe what is morally, truthfully correct.

The function of the modern nation-state was, for the first time, beginning in the 15th century, to create a state in which no longer were 95% of the population either slaves, or serfs, or, like the victims of the Aztec mass heart-rending, worse. Up until the 15th century, in all known cases, every culture was morally degenerate, including feudal cultures in Europe on this account. The reason that the modern nation-state de-

veloped was because of a Christian principle. Not only did the Christians adopt the policy of Genesis 1, that all men and women are created in the image of God, that no one can be treated as an animal, but Christianity for the first time established the principle that all human beings are equal in this respect.

So, the point is, there are certain rights, human rights, which every individual has a right to claim, which must not be denied to any individual. And this right includes the right to be educated and to participate in formulating the policies of one's society. But the process of deliberation which decides policy, must be a process which is aimed to find the truth. The purpose of a criminal trial or a civil trial should not be to interpret law and procedure. The purpose of the civil or criminal trial must be to find the truth. First of all, what is truthfully the reality of the issue at trial, and second, what is the truthful result of the trial, the decision which will serve the interests of society and the principles of society?

The politics, when it becomes slogans and so forth, becomes a parody, a travesty of democracy, of human rights. There must be a search for truth in the political process, a search for truthful justice for all people. No judge must exist who is not a representative of the Good Samaritan. From that standpoint, the growth of what is called "democracy" around the world, is a growth of evil.

I'll give you one more example. The idea of democracy that is spread is literally Manichean, as the case of Justice Scalia typifies. Scalia is not a Christian, he's a Manichean. He says that the world belongs to the marketplace, just like Adam Smith, like the Mont Pelerin Society. For example, the leader of the Mont Pelerin Society, the founder, was Friedrich von Hayek, who created it under the sponsorship of Winston Churchill. And Von Hayek traces his policies of society to a Satanist, Bernard de Mandeville, a literal Satanist, who says that good comes from evil, that the human individual is naturally evil, that by the democratic interaction of evil people, good comes. That's the argument of François Quesnay, the Physiocrat, that's the argument of Adam Smith, that's the argument of Margaret Thatcher. And that is the argument of Scalia. That is the argument of the Manicheans, or the Bogomils and other forms of Manicheans, who say that the world belongs to Satan. Only in personal life, outside the real world, in spiritual life, is there any good. That's the Manichean.

Democracy, as taught today by the National Endowment for Democracy in the United States, for example, means precisely that Manichean form of Satanic belief; whereas, the objective of society is to give everybody participation in the process of finding truth and finding the good, and to provide truthful justice for every individual. And that's where we stand. If there's one thing, the most evil thing spreading in the world today, it's a cult around the word "democracy," which means Satanism.