

economic theory, but a mental disease.

EIR: What response do the rural producers of Sonora, and nationwide, have to your proposals?

Miranda Peláez: The fact that we are arguing for a programmatic proposal that seeks a fundamental and lasting solution to the crisis of our sector, and of the economy in general, has given us tremendous influence nationally. Because we have clearly presented the fact that our choice as producers is very simple: Either we die under economic liberalism, or we get rid of this madness so that we can survive as producers, and as a nation. There are ever-broader strata within the productive sectors that have come to understand this. Last January, we participated in a national meeting of agricultural producers in the state of Guanajuato, and our proposals were endorsed by producers and organizations from 22 states of the republic. Our proposals were promoted by producers movements from Baja California, Sonora, Sinaloa, Jalisco, Guanajuato, Chihuahua, and we have received the decisive support of producers from the state of Chiapas.

EIR: Do you believe that President Ernesto Zedillo hears your proposals to change economic policy?

Miranda Peláez: President Zedillo is trapped by the pressures of the international creditor banks which continue to demand greater sacrifices and austerity from our country. And he is also trapped by his own liberal beliefs, and unless he abandons them very soon, he will become a tragic figure in our history, just as [former President] Carlos Salinas de Gortari has become. On the other hand, our movement is not waiting to find out whether he has heard us or not. Our movement has assumed responsibility for creating a correlation of forces so that the President can truly exercise his executive powers and can impose an emergency program that can protect our primary sector and the nation's productive plant in general.

EIR: What is the significance of the response of the producers from Chiapas and the San Cristóbal Civic Front, given the problems created by the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN)?

Miranda Peláez: I believe that it is extremely important that we not turn our backs on Chiapas. According to the available information, it is clear that the so-called EZLN has nothing whatever to do with the Indians, nor does it defend them, and it does not rely on national backing. The EZLN enjoys the support of foreign interests and organizations, and the government should treat them like a foreign invasion force. What it seeks is to strip our nation of its resources through a separatist movement in Chiapas; to take away our water and oil which are abundant in that region. And we know that no important program of economic growth can succeed if we lose those resources. We understand that if we lose Chiapas, we lose Mexico. Thus, our links with the producers of Chiapas must be understood as a matter of life and death for our nation.

Greenie 'poison' threatens Germany

by Rainer Apel

Talks about a ruling coalition between the Social Democrats and the anti-industrialist Greens of Germany's industrial powerhouse, the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW), began on May 31. There is strong opposition, especially among labor-related Social Democratic Party (SPD) members, but the opportunist SPD leadership is expected to opt for the Greens.

Hans-Olaf Henkel, president of Germany's Industry Association, in an interview May 26 with Germany's national picture daily *Bildzeitung*, warned that the Green program is "poison for the safety of jobs. I only hope that Bonn isn't running after the Greens and imposing a national energy tax on us."

"Jobs will be killed, because energy-intensive branches like steel or chemical would have to transfer entire production sites abroad," Henkel said, urging Germans to keep in mind that "being one of the biggest industrial and exporting nations, we must not strangle ourselves by eco-socialism." An SPD-Green political pact, Henkel warned, would mean "another Morgenthau Plan colored red-green, which would turn Germany into an agrarian state—as it was the plan of the then-finance minister of the U.S. against us after the war."

Rudolf Scharping, the national SPD chairman, responded in *Bildzeitung* on May 28 that he saw no basis for cooperation with the Greens, should their party program, especially their proposals for an energy tax and their obstructionism against army, police, and counterespionage remain unaltered. Scharping said he saw no common ground on a national level—but avoided a clear statement concerning NRW.

Encouraged by the increase of ecologist votes in the two state elections on May 14 (10% in NRW, 13% in Bremen), the Greens called for a drastic increase of gasoline prices to make car-driving unattractive. They proposed that a liter of gasoline which costs DM 1.65-1.70 now, shall cost DM 0.50 more this year, and another DM 0.30 each of the next 10 years. By 2004, the price of one liter of gasoline would be DM 5. One tank fillup would take 10% of an average monthly worker's income.

The gasoline tax is only one aspect of the overall national energy tax which the Greens envision, to be raised on all raw materials, machines, and products that are processed, produced, and consumed. The energy-intensive sectors of industry would be punished. Hoechst, the chemical-pharmaceutical giant, already announced its intent to stop all production of chlorine paraffins in Germany and produce abroad. This will affect about 6,000 jobs directly, and two or three times more in the supplier industry.