

# Mexican Newspaper Reports: 'Everyone Wants to Know What LaRouche Thinks'

by Gretchen Small and Dennis Small

On Sept. 16, five days after the United States was attacked at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, *Diario del Yaqui*, a leading regional daily in the state of Sonora, Mexico, prominently featured a commentary entitled: "Everyone Wants To Know What LaRouche Thinks." That single headline aptly sums up the most significant political response across Ibero-America to the shocking developments of Sept. 11.

Like their counterparts in the United States, most Ibero-Americans responded to the terror assault, with a mixture of fear and a sense of foreboding. There was an immediate outpouring of horror, outrage, and sympathy and support for the United States and the American people; but it was coupled with apprehension over what the Bush Administration would do in response, and where it would all end. In the principal countries of Central and South America, where LaRouche's ideas are already well known, his views were urgently sought out, both publicly and privately, in the aftermath of the attacks. As a result, LaRouche's ongoing evaluation of the transformed strategic situation, and what nations and citizens must now do, has been ricocheting around the continent, from country to country.

## Caught In A Deadly Vise

Like the population at large, every single government in the region now feels caught in a deadly vise.

On the one hand, they would like to back the United States against the horrendous assault. But they are being told by Washington that this means that they must put their hand on the sword and swear fealty to whatever the Bush Administration might choose to do, both politically and economically. This means surrendering their national sovereignty to the new global power, and accepting London and Wall Street's deadly economic policies in the face of global financial disintegration.

John Maisto, the National Security Council's director of Inter-American Affairs, was brutally frank in comments he made to Andrés Oppenheimer of the *Miami Herald* on Sept. 16: "This is a defining moment for the hemisphere to take an unequivocal stand on international terrorism that goes beyond rhetoric. . . . Now is the opportunity to take an effective stand."

To make sure there was no confusion, Oppenheimer added: "Based on interviews with senior U.S. officials, I would bet that President Bush will ask Latin America for something more than condolences for the loss of more than 5,000 innocent civilians in last week's terrorist attacks. . . . I don't know whether he will ask for troops, greater intelligence cooperation, guaranteed oil and food sales, or all of the above, but he will definitely want something more than moral support.

"I doubt that many Latin American countries will want to end up in limbo, or on the side of failed totalitarian states such as Afghanistan, Iraq, or Libya," Oppenheimer concluded suggestively.

The first concrete action demanded of Ibero-America by the Bush Administration, was the invoking of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known by its Spanish acronym TIAR, the mutual defense treaty signed in 1947 which the United States violated in 1982 when it provided military aid to Great Britain's war against fellow treaty member Argentina in the Malvinas War. Like Article 5 of the NATO charter, TIAR establishes that "an armed attack against an American state will be considered as an attack upon all the American states, and in consequence, each of the signatory parties commit themselves to aid and participate in the response, exercising legitimate individual and collective defense."

The other jaw of the vise, is that those same Ibero-American governments are also now facing a growing political movement that *supports* the cold-blooded murder of more than 6,000 Americans and others on Sept. 11, and intends to spread similar devastation around the globe. Most bone-chilling were the remarks made by Felipe Quispe, a leader of Bolivia's coca growers: "We need these kinds of actions to destroy the enemy. [We] send our fraternal and revolutionary greetings to those who carried out the attack. Imperialism is killing the world."

A similar, if more circumspect line is coming from the forces gathered around Franco-British money-bags Teddy Goldsmith's World Social Forum, which held its founding meeting in Pôrto Alegre, Brazil at the end of 2000. For example, Brazilian Liberation Theology guru Frei Betto, the editor

of the pro-terrorist *América Libre* magazine, put out an article lamenting the Sept. 11 attacks, but arguing that “if the U.S. is today attacked in such a violent and unjust way, it is because . . . it humiliates peoples and ethnic groups.” The United States “disseminates terror,” Frei Betto argued; and, after all, “violence begets violence.”

A statement issued by Colombia’s premier drug cartel, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), took the same line: U.S. society is indignant, the FARC said, “but who is responsible? Its own government, its imperial state which sows death and violence across the globe and asphyxiates by every means the struggles of its peoples for self-determination.”

### **LaRouche: A Pathway Out Of The Morass**

Gripped in the jaws of the vise, with the world financial system crashing in around them, with every economic and political assumption in shambles, it is dawning on Ibero-American policymakers that new assumptions, new policies, are demanded of them, if their nations are to survive. Thus is the attention of many now rivetted on Lyndon LaRouche.

Over the week of Sept. 17, LaRouche personally, and his representatives, have been prominently covered in diverse mass media in a half-dozen countries in Ibero-America. There have been prominent radio interviews in Mexico, Peru, Argentina, and Venezuela, and press coverage in those same countries and in Brazil, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic as well.

On Sept. 17, Guido Lombardi, the top anchorman of Peru’s number-one national radio station, Radio Programas del Perú, interviewed LaRouche. In the brief interview, broadcast live on both RPP and Channel 6 Television, LaRouche was blunt:

“This is the second time that we’ve had a terror attack within the United States, a serious terror attack. The first was, of course, in Oklahoma City. Here, we face something which is somewhat similar in some respects, but it’s far more serious. It may be connected to the same people who were actually behind the Oklahoma City bombing, in one way or another.

“But the problem is, that the nature of the very attacks themselves means two things. This could be done only by a rogue element operating within the environment of the U.S. security services, and we must assume now that they will strike at least once again in the near future. As in the last attack, the initial victims will be population centers, or population groups, in the United States. At a later point, the assassination attacks may head for key leading figures of the United States. But this is primarily against the institutions of government of the United States. It’s very serious.”

That same day, Argentina’s Internet news agency, *Urgente Digital*, sent its subscribers a wire containing a slightly shortened version of LaRouche’s statement, “Shoot the Neighbor’s Cat” (see *National*), advising its subscribers

that “the following communiqué was distributed by a polemical U.S. politician. . . . What he says is interesting, because many of us have compared MSNBC’s moderate coverage of the terrorist crisis with CNN’s bellicosity, which reminds us of the reports of how Randolph ‘Citizen Kane’ Hearst provoked the U.S. war with Spain over Cuba, in order to sell more papers.”

Noting former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger’s proposal, made to journalists at Frankfurt, airport in Germany, to go to war against Afghanistan and several Arab nations, *Urgente Digital* asked: “Isn’t this an exaggerated response from Richard Nixon’s and Gerald Ford’s former Secretary of State, in chapters of the Cold War that were better forgotten? . . . The issue of the domestic connection hasn’t been covered in the United States, because if what the FBI says so far is true, the American state is non-functional, and incompetent, with all the mistakes it apparently committed.

“Or, is there something else going on?”

### **Heaviest Coverage Is In Mexico**

The densest coverage of LaRouche has been in Mexico. In a Sept. 6 interview with ABC Radio, before the onslaught, LaRouche had warned of an upcoming “launching of international terrorism in a new expanded form,” a terrorism run by “high-level intelligence agencies” which threaten the sovereignty of Mexico and each of the countries of Central and South America. Thus, when the hijacked airplanes struck their targets, ABC Radio put LaRouche back on the air, acknowledging that he had forecast a new expanded terrorism (see *EIR*, Sept. 21, 2001).

Our concern, LaRouche emphasized, “is to defend our sovereignty and to have governments which promote the general welfare of all of the people. The opposite force is those who have never accepted the idea of the perfectly sovereign nation-state republic. The same forces behind globalization today.”

The impact of these two LaRouche interviews was amplified when, on Sept. 14, *El Sol de México*, one of Mexico’s largest newspaper chains, published a full-page of edited extracts from the two interviews, under the stark headline, “The Attacks Are Similar To A Coup d’État: Lyndon LaRouche, Jr.” LaRouche’s Mexican associate, Marivilia Carrasco, now a regular commentator for ABC Radio’s morning news show, has been able to provide almost daily guidance to ABC’s listeners.

Mexico’s leading TV channel, Televisa, in President Vicente Fox’s home state of Guanajuato, covered a Sept. 12 press conference given by local LaRouche associates on LaRouche’s warning that “panic doesn’t win wars” in several of their newscasts that day. In Monterrey, where a LaRouche associate has a regular radio news program, 220 people showed up for an emergency forum on “Terrorism in the U.S.: Clash of Civilizations To Cover Economic Collapse,” held on Sept. 13 to present LaRouche’s view.