
Interview: Marivilia Carrasco



Will Mexico's next President be chosen by Harvard?

Marivilia Carrasco Bazuá is the secretary general of the Mexican Labor Party.

EIR: Within about three months, the ruling PRI party's candidate for President of Mexico in 1988 will be announced. Can you explain the importance of this choice?

Carrasco: The next President of Mexico, if he succeeds in taking office peacefully, will face the most critical situation, in the economic, political, and national security domains, that any President has faced since the founding of the political system in 1929.

The great responsibility which the candidate selected by the PRI will face, will be to uphold Mexico's constitutional order, territorial integrity, and democratic life. This will be impossible if the country is not rescued from the bankruptcy into which it has been thrust by the criminal conditions of the International Monetary Fund. His first task will be to throw out on the street the corrupt bureaucracy of the Banco de Mexico, presently run by its director, Miguel Mancera Aguayo, the country's financial czar, and to decree emergency economic measures to get the productive capacity moving again, which has been paralyzed for the past five years. To do all this, the country needs a leader, not an administrator, who will take up again the principles of the Mexican Revolution with Venustiano Carranza: "The Mexican Revolution, must be a Latin American revolution."

EIR: How is the President selected? Could you describe the Mexican political system in this respect?

Carrasco: The Mexican political system arose in 1929 with the creation of the National Revolutionary Party, the forerunner of the Revolutionary Institutional Party (PRI), which brought together all the factions—good and bad—after the revolution of 1910-17. According to the official history, this formula of unity between the revolutionary forces and the oligarchy—which had lost the war—was what pacified the country. The fact is that this "pacification" was a kind of coup d'état, run by a Mussolinian-corporatist faction, headed by Plutarco Elias Calles, President of Mexico from 1924 to 1928. The origin of this system was not the creation of a

coalition of nationalists and conservatives to take turns in power, as supposedly the Republicans and Democrats alternate in the United States. A system was imposed to keep at bay *any* revolutionary political force that might try to take the general principles of the Constitution of 1917 to their ultimate conclusions, basically to bring about the sovereign industrial development of the country. From then until now, every presidential succession has been the result of the tug-of-war between political factions. The Callist Presidents have been administrators of the monetarist mafia of Wall Street, within the limits imposed on them by the institutions of the Mexican Revolution and the immense patriotic tradition of the population. The Callists committed many atrocities, but they were never able to change the Constitution, in particular Articles 30, 27, 28, and 123, which establish the concept of democracy, the fact that the natural resources of the soil and sub-soil belong to the nation, and state direction of the economy, and labor law.

Only three Presidents—of those so far in power—have broken the rules of the game of the so-called "Mexican political system," imposed by Calles and the Wall Street bankers: Lazaro Cárdenas (1934-40), Luis Echeverría (1970-76), and José López Portillo (1976-82). Under these Presidents, we Mexicans wrested from the international usurers, among other things, our petroleum, the Agrarian Reform, and our banks, although the latter for only a very short period. This explains the "mystery" which surrounds the selection of each Mexican President; whoever aspires to realize the constitutional project of developing the country by means of intrigue, under these rules of the game, has to keep it secret until he gets power. "Whoever moves too early, will not come out in the photo," goes a Mexican saying popularized by the politician who is the shrewdest operator of the Mexican system, Fidel Velázquez, the octogenarian leader of the powerful Confederation of Workers of Mexico (CTM).

EIR: Mexico has basically a one-party system, in which the presidential candidate of the PRI is considered a shoo-in. This has been much criticized from certain quarters in the United States who favor more "democracy." As the secretary

general of a small party, what is your view of these criticisms. Do you think Mexico should evolve away from single-party rule?

Carrasco: Absolutely not. I don't think the one-party system is Mexico's problem. The problem of democracy is that one of the central mandates of the Constitution has been violated, which establishes in Article 3 that ". . . democracy is not solely a juridical structure and a political regime, but a system of *life founded upon a constant economic, social, and cultural improvement of the people.*" My emphasis. Despite the deviations of "Callism" which I mentioned, for decades the immense majority of the population has voted for the government of the PRI, because, until the Miguel de la Madrid government, the PRI represented this impulse toward the constant progress of the country. Over the last five years in particular, this went into crisis definitively, because the government capitulated before the usurious international banks and accepted economic programs which set Mexicans' standard of living back 20 years. A period was inaugurated of *constant worsening* of the economic, social, and cultural conditions of Mexico's 80 million inhabitants. This would provoke a political crisis for any government in the world.

A great smokescreen has been thrown up from the United States in order to box in the nationalists not just of Mexico, but of Panama, Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, etc., who might sympathize with the President of Peru Alan García, and with the Democratic pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche in the United States, who are convinced that the only way to develop the Ibero-American countries is to create a Common Market and to form an ad hoc monetary system to finance great projects in infrastructure and agricultural and industrial development. The campaign alleging that "Mexico is corrupt" or "Mexico is a communist dictatorship," has been orchestrated by the personnel of the now-famous Project Democracy, such as Sen. Jesse Helms, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Elliott Abrams, and Oliver North, who, among others should be put on trial—and we hope they will be—for having tried to impose a dictatorial regime in the United States itself!

These U.S. forces go around supporting the Nazi-Communist opposition in Mexico, with the apparent purpose of bringing them to power, but in reality to strengthen the "Callist" group inside the government and to force the PRI *itself* to be the one that "reforms" the Constitution, liquidates the presidentialist regime, and eliminates the patriotic forces inside and outside the government. With the exception of my party, the Mexican Labor Party, the so-called opposition forces are nothing but an instrument of the drug-trafficking mafia, the U.S. State Department, and Moscow, whose *explicit* objective is to end once and for all the institutions of Mexico and particularly its presidential system. They don't want to run the risk that another Cárdenas, another Luis Echeverría, or another López Portillo could arise.

EIR: What are the principal issues in the 1988 presidential election? Will they be resolved in the next three months by the choice that is made, or will there be further debate between now and the election? Does Mexico have a "lame duck" period in which the outgoing President cannot initiate any policies of importance?

Carrasco: The main issues in the presidential election of Mexico are not very different from those of the presidential succession of the United States. Let us take, for example, the matter of national security. What will happen if Gorbachov succeeds in imposing a deal by which the United States pulls its troops out of Europe, in a New Yalta framework? The place where these troops will be deployed is Central America, on the border with Mexico, or some other country of Ibero-America. In the economy, for example, the U.S. government's support for the International Monetary Fund's policies has complicated the situation in the United States itself, because it has led to millions of unemployed seeking jobs, who emigrate to the United States because they can't make a living in their own countries.

The same thing can be seen with the AIDS pandemic. Mexican experts say that Mexico is three years behind the United States in the spread of the disease, with the dramatic difference that half, let me stress, *half* the population of Mexico is undernourished. In the last four years, the epidemics of malaria, scabies, and dengue have gotten out of control, and leprosy has reappeared. Public health conditions are accelerating the threat of AIDS in a frightening way. If that weren't enough, under such conditions of crisis, the Soviets are deployed in an irregular war against the continent's governments, including Mexico, with troops of narco-terrorists to provoke coups d'état. Whoever is elected the PRI's presidential candidate cannot avoid these questions and the economic problems during his campaign.

Even before the new President takes office, in September of 1988, not only Mexico, but also Argentina, and Venezuela, at least, will be incapable of paying the service on their foreign debt. This situation may totally change the course of events. As far as a "lame duck" period is concerned, that depends on the President. Luis Echeverría and López Portillo refused to play the "lame duck" at the end of their terms, and took the most far-reaching decisions at the eleventh hour, exerting their power of government right up to their last day in office.

EIR: There is a saying, "Poor Mexico, so far from God and so close to the States." The U.S. presidential elections are in 1988, like Mexico's. Can you say what the impact of the U.S. presidential race will be on Mexico's, and perhaps vice versa?

Carrasco: The real saying should be, "Poor Mexico, so far from God and so close to Harvard," because the present generation in the government was all trained there. Their

tendency is to adapt to the strategy of the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

However, there are great expectations among Mexicans around Lyndon LaRouche's electoral campaign. The LaRouche revolution has had a singular impact on many Mexican political sectors who see LaRouche as the only hope of changing the disastrous foreign policy of the United States. The selection in Mexico of a candidate capable of confronting the Wall Street banks, will influence the LaRouche campaign in an important way, no doubt about it. Likewise, the LaRouche campaign, and in particular, his celebrated *Operation Juárez*, has had broad impact on the debate around the Mexican succession. Beyond these processes, the influence and impact of the United States on Mexico is always very great, and in the hands of clowns such as Elliott Abrams, there is no hope that relations between the two countries will improve.

EIR: Please name the principal contenders for the PRI nomination, and tell us as much as possible about each of them. The Wall Street press seems to have supported several different ones, at different times. Are only members of the Cabinet *presidenciables*?

Carrasco: Wall Street has various cards up its sleeve, and its hands in all the sleeves of the Cabinet of Miguel de la Madrid; Interior Secretary Manuel Bartlett Díaz and Secretary of Planning and Budget Carlos Salinas de Gortari are its favorites. They are two heads on the same Trilateraloid hydra.

Carlos Salinas de Gortari represents the "Harvard Boys" of Samuel Huntington. He is the founder of the "Centro Tepoztlán," the Mexican branch of the Trilateral Commission, together with other lesser presidential contenders in the Cabinet such as Manuel Camacho Solís, Secretary of Urban Development and Ecology, who controls the "Greenies" of Mexico from behind the scenes. The role of Camacho is to condition the candidate of the PRI, so that he will eliminate the country's nuclear development program. To this group belongs as well Health Secretary Guillermo Soberón Acevedo, who acts as the priest of the gnostic meetings of Aztec fundamentalists held in the "Centro Tepoztlán." They are the ones pushing the "structural change" to turn Mexico into an appendage of the U.S. post-industrial economy under a bucolic, stupefied society, with emphasis on the creation of Hong Kong-style sweat-shop factories and labor-intensive projects, which is a euphemism for World Bank slave labor. However, these present their program in the style of Gorbachov's *perestroika*. They figure as the "left" wing of the game.

On the "right" is Manuel Bartlett Díaz, and his team trained at Oxford and the Sorbonne. His "card" for dealing with Wall Street is that he is the shrewd "politician" to make the Mexicans keep swallowing the same hateful medicine of

Salinas de Gortari and the International Monetary Fund. Bartlett Díaz is the epitome of "Callism"; his function is to control the political groups of right and left, whose efforts converge on liquidating the presidential system, and setting up parliamentary cretinism. These are the equivalents of Robert McFarlane, who want to do away with a federal republic in the United States. They are extraordinarily dangerous and unscrupulous men. Bartlett is backed by the old Nazi drug-running mafia associated with ex-President Miguel Alemán [1946-52]. Bartlett would mean, among other things, a re-run of the attempt by Plutarco Elias Calles, at the end of the 1920s, to "Protestant-ize" Mexico following the imperialist schemes of the wretched Theodore Roosevelt. This policy led Mexico into its second civil war of this century: the Cristero Rebellion of 1927. Roosevelt was the U.S. President who proclaimed the imperial policy against Ibero-America under the battle-cry of finishing off the Catholic Church and replacing the Catholics with "other Christians" to dominate the continent. This policy today continues on a forced march in Mexico under the aegis of Bartlett.

The other strong candidate is Alfredo del Mazo, the Secretary of Energy, Mines and Semi-Public Industry. His program is a variant of the same post-industrial society, although in contrast to the other two, it seems that the bankers are not sure they could control him through byzantine maneuvers, probably because he has had to defend the only nuclear plant in Mexico, Laguna Verde, whose opening is under fire from the environmentalists backing Salinas de Gortari and Manuel Bartlett.

Others mentioned as pre-candidates are Public Education Secretary Miguel González Avelar, and the Regent of the Department of the Federal District, Ramón Aguirre Velázquez, who are considered to be available in case the three frontrunners get knocked out by the maelstrom of the crisis enveloping the country. In that case, their programs are a question mark.

The tradition is that the *presidenciables* all come from the Cabinet of the incumbent President, and it does not appear that this election will be any exception. But the leader of the big labor confederation CTM, Fidel Velázquez, who represents the political muscle behind the nationalist, pro-presidential system faction, has said that the only requirement of the next President is that he be a patriotic Mexican. We ourselves second that.

EIR: How do you rate the presidency of Miguel de la Madrid?

Carrasco: I only want to add two things to what I have already said: that he still has the opportunity to oust Miguel Mancera from the Banco de Mexico; in the year-and-a-half of government remaining to him, he can still do many things for the good of the country. *And* finally, we hope that he will know how to choose his successor well.