

## Editorial

# *LaRouche campaigned for the world*

While most U.S. presidential campaigns have become scripted media affairs, intended to play upon the lowest-common-denominator, soap-opera conditioned, gut reactions of the average American, LaRouche has made each of his campaigns arenas for the development of policies crucial to the very future of mankind. In 1976, in his first bid for the presidency, he appeared on national television on Nov. 1.

A review of that speech shows that he was absolutely on the mark, in forecasting a financial collapse. He also warned of the kind of austerity which has already been imposed on major sections of the world's population, including also the residents of U.S. cities. He said then: "Certain forces within the United States are committed to attempting to save this bankrupt monetary system. The methods to which they are resorting are consciously modeled on those used earlier by Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's finance minister, particularly during the 1933-36 period."

In particular LaRouche singled out for attack George Ball's call for triaging a portion of the world's population, as is now happening with the willfully created cholera epidemic, and he pointed to the policy of William Paddock—who was favorably cited by Ball. Both Paddock and Ball were advisers to Jimmy Carter.

Paddock argued for the necessity of reducing the population of Mexico by as much as half. Here is how LaRouche described Paddock's plan, in his telecast: "He proposes to do this, and Paddock is very explicit on this, by the methods used by Hitler in eliminating 6,000,000 Jews and Slavs and others in Eastern Europe during the war: by a forced, labor-intensive, slave-labor system in which those who are no longer suitable for this process of slave labor will be allowed to die."

As a first step, Paddock wanted to stop Mexican immigration into the United States, in order to force economic concessions from the government of Mexico, which had otherwise depended upon the ability of seasonal workers to find jobs in Texas and California.

Well, Carter became President, and then we had Reagan and now Bush, and we see the grim results of the

failure of the American population to elect LaRouche.

In 1980, LaRouche again campaigned, this time for the Democratic Party nomination for President. Yet when President Reagan was elected he—like many other people—hoped for the best. LaRouche presented a proposal to the administration which was the exact opposite of the Ball-Paddock genocidal proposal that the United States destroy its neighbor and ally, Mexico. He proposed that the U.S. export technology in exchange for importing Mexican oil. What is happening today is that the United States is in the process of stealing Mexico's oil industry—lock, stock, and barrel.

On March 26-27, 1981, LaRouche addressed a high-level Washington audience of 100 diplomats, administration representatives, and members of the business and intelligence communities. The *EIR* seminar was conducted on the theme: "The U.S. and Mexico and Central America: Conflict or Cooperation?"

At that time, he proposed that the U.S. gear up production of capital goods for export to Mexico. He estimated that the U.S. could export \$100-200 billion worth of high technology products (in 1981 dollars)—to the benefit of both countries. This would have meant in the United States, reversal of the turn to speculative investment while real productive capacity, particularly in heavy industry, was being shut down. For Mexico it would have meant that oil revenue was not wasted in paying usurious debt service, but instead was invested in upgrading production.

Over the last decade, since LaRouche made this proposal, U.S. productivity has declined relative to Germany and Japan; large sections of industry, state and local governments, and the banking system are actually bankrupt; and living standards have fallen sharply. The United States has turned from a nation with a proud tradition as a productive giant, into a caricature of the Roman and British empires, a nation seeking tribute from the rest of the world, and willing to use brutal force to get it.

Can anyone deny that the world would have been a far better place had Americans elected LaRouche?