

LaRouche to Nader: Voodoo Won't Save California

Lyndon LaRouche, who has announced his intention to seek the Democratic Presidential nomination in 2004, issued the following statement on Jan. 23, in response to Ralph Nader's demand that California Gov. Gray Davis "let the state utility companies go bankrupt."

The voodoo trick, of suffocating and burying a man, and resurrecting him as a zombie, is not the way to improve the performance of California's energy deliveries to its people and institutions.

You may not like the choice of George W. Bush as President, but, you must act as I do in this matter. He is the President, and we must not forget that his problems may become, more or less automatically, those of our nation as a whole.

This new President has done, as I had stated my fears on this point before his inauguration. He has, for this moment, painted himself into a deadly political corner on the California energy-crisis. He is presently trapped, at least for the moment, in a choice between Enron's profits from its looting of our nation's energy sector, and a collapse of a state economy, that of California, equal to that of the sixth largest nation of the world, and the most developed part of our U.S.A. Therefore, our new President's stated position on the matter, if he sticks to it, could be, even probably, the blunder which detonates a chain-reaction collapse of the already tottering and financial-derivatives-bloated world financial system.

We must re-regulate the existing industry, and reestablish the rule of the general welfare of the nation and population as a whole. We must save the industry, not lurk like voodoo priests, waiting for the time to call the dead to rise from out of the cemetery. We must act to save the industry and its service to the general welfare now, before President Bush's recently stated wrong-headedness on the issue, if uncorrected, sinks his Presidency, virtually at its start.

acts not only on the level of teaching: it is enough to read the Pope's messages of Jan. 1, or his Jan. 13 message to the diplomatic corps, a message in which he speaks to the world, to nations, to governments, to the countries of the world, but also to the supranational institutions and all the world which wants to hear.

But this world which mobilizes is still too limited, and I believe, though I say it with the full responsibility of the institutions, that if something more, something more advanced is to be mobilized, it must come from civil society. Then there will be institutional realities ready to act, but if this movement doesn't exist, if there is not a sense of interpreting a widespread will, then the risk is that some steps forward may be taken, but, as you know, moving forward in international situations is extremely complicated and slow. . . . It seems that time has two dimensions: the normal dimension, that of reality, where people die of hunger, that of children, and, on the other side, there is the world of diplomacy, of the agreements and their slow progress.

It is important, therefore, that in the university environment (good for the people who organize and allow these meetings!) there is debate, and qualified opinion is formed among students, teachers, and the people who gravitate around the university. . . .

I like to underline, especially for young people, and not because I want to sing the praises of the Parliament and the government, but to say that Italy, on the whole, moved because there was a public opinion which pushed us to move. The movement that there has been in Italy for a few years

now, the Jubilee campaign, the campaign by the Catholic Church, have made an important point, and this has been recognized. And you should also see—I'll cite this historical parallel, about the movements and the associations—an important step was taken at the [1999] G-8 summit in Cologne, when the associative movements, Msgr. Charrier for Italy, went to the eight great countries to say, "with this document, we say that the initiative under way today, at the level of the IMF, for the highly indebted countries, is insufficient," and in that summit a decision was made. So there is a track in which official institutions and international voluntary institutions confront each other.

Now, Italy has passed a law which everyone sees as advanced. The government proposed the law, the Parliament improved it, in my view. The speaker on the law in the Parliament was Giovanni Bianchi, who played the strongest role. What I did, was to reject an amendment proposed by one of my colleagues in the government, who didn't accept certain aspects. These aspects, which were then kept in the law, had to do with the fact that our law is good not merely because it established a large amount for the reduction or elimination of the debt, but because it has certain passages which say that Italy can go at a faster pace, with a schedule and also a form that is different than those of the Paris Club. . . . This is the law of the Parliament. Naturally, some people at the Treasury Ministry said, "No, it's not possible, we have to follow the reforms," and to me, it seems that, to the contrary, this proposal of the Parliament, which I signed onto, was the sign that it is possible to do more. . . .