

EIR Feature

LaRouche: 'I do know how to stop this depression'

An interview with Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This interview was conducted on Sept. 20, 1992, by the Radio Todelar network of Colombia, and was broadcast on Todelar's 28 member stations. Luis Enrique Rodríguez López, of the Sunday program "Todelar Reports," was the interviewer.

Q: Today we have a very special personality as the invited guest of our Sunday program. We are talking about Lyndon H. LaRouche, independent candidate for the presidency of the United States, and at the same time a political prisoner in a U.S. jail.

Lyndon H. LaRouche is a 68-year-old man, an opposition political leader in the United States, and he was sentenced to 15 years in prison in January 1989. He is married to Helga Zepp-LaRouche, a German citizen who is fully with him and supports him in his cause.

LaRouche, from behind bars, decided to run for President of the United States, to try to bring about profound changes favorable to that power, especially regarding the handling of the economy, and which would at the same time help the Third World countries beset with poverty and social stagnation, largely due to their growing foreign debt.

In this presentation of "Todelar Reports," we shall speak with Lyndon H. LaRouche about the foreign debt, the drug trade, coffee, the economic movements today being felt in Europe, the Maastricht Treaty, which in fact today is at the center of events in France—in short, we shall talk about various subjects of great interest to Colombians.

Of course, we shall also refer to the presidential campaign in the United States, to the views of Lyndon H. LaRouche regarding the most likely candidates for President, George Bush for the Republican Party, who is seeking reelection, and the Democrat Bill Clinton.

Lyndon LaRouche, the political prisoner and the independent candidate in the U.S. presidential elections which will occur next Nov. 4, is our personality on



A mass rally in Mexico City in support of President José López Portillo's nationalization of the banks, Sept. 13, 1982. It was this adoption of Lyndon LaRouche's policy recommendations that triggered the panic button among U.S. establishment circles, leading to the prosecution of LaRouche. Inset: LaRouche speaks at the congress of the Mexican Labor Party in May 1982, outlining his program for economic reform.



"Todelar Reports."

But before we begin our dialogue with Mr. LaRouche, who by the way will be speaking from a telephone inside the prison where he is being held, let us first listen to what *EIR*'s magazine *Resumen Ejecutivo* says about the status of the LaRouche case.

Announcer: "The LaRouche case has been presented to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, and was formally presented to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations Organization, by the International Progress Organization (IPO) in February 1991. The IPO petition, numbered 1503, states: 'Documentation exists to suggest that those in government who want to eliminate the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche and his associates misused their access to state power in order to silence the spread of beliefs it judged to be "extreme" or "threatening" to the prevailing political trends.'

"At the meeting of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation—the so-called Helsinki Accord—held July 19 in Copenhagen, Denmark, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark presented LaRouche's case, and said that 'there was no intention of having a fair trial,' and that LaRouche and his co-defendants were tried for 'economic crimes that did not exist, because this was a political movement, it was not a for-profit activity and wasn't intended to be a for-profit activity, it was a political movement.'

"In an *amicus curiae* brief presented to the U.S. federal

Appeals Court, more than 1,000 legal experts and lawyers from throughout the entire world denounced the violation of LaRouche's constitutional right to an impartial trial. In a public statement signed by several of these, they said: 'We are troubled by the violations of due process and of fundamental rights which appear to have occurred in this case. We further believe if the rulings of the [District] Court are allowed to stand as precedent, this represents a potential threat to any politically-active citizen of having their voices be silenced by abuse of the prosecutorial and judicial systems.'

"Given the political and constitutional importance of the LaRouche case, and also given the importance of Lyndon H. LaRouche for Ibero-America, from his support for Argentina's fight for the Malvinas and for Panama's sovereignty to his concepts on economic integration of the Ibero-American nations and the fight against drugs, we call upon the OAS and the U.N.O. to investigate this violation of human rights in the United States and we stand in solidarity with the request of his attorneys for a new trial and for Lyndon H. LaRouche's immediate release from prison."

Q: This is the text of the position held by *Resumen Ejecutivo* regarding the freedom of Lyndon LaRouche, today a candidate for the presidency of the United States of America. . . .

Our first question to Mr. Lyndon LaRouche is the following: What were the charges that led to your conviction and jailing for 15 years in your country?

LaRouche: Yes, the charges that were made up involve \$294,000 in loans, but the charges are irrelevant. The purpose of putting me in jail was to put me out of circulation, after they had tried and failed to arrange my assassination. That is, they tried to assassinate me in October 1986 in an operation that involved several institutions of the state and federal government in Virginia. But the White House intervened to prevent them from conducting the assassination. So they stopped it. Therefore, after that they had to put me in prison as the alternative, because they could not pay the political cost of having me killed. Then they made up the charges, which are entirely a fraud, which were constructed with the purpose of putting me in prison, actually for 10 years. They think I would be dead or too old or something after those 10 years.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, the purpose of your imprisonment was so that you would not participate in politics; nonetheless, you are doing so as a United States presidential candidate.

LaRouche: Actually, they are not trying to take me out of politics. It's something more serious. As many people recall, in 1982, particularly the spring and summer, most of the countries of Central and South America were in trouble over the debt. In the middle of August of 1982, the Mexican debt blew up, and the entire international monetary system nearly collapsed that month. . . .

Q: Since when, and why, have you defended causes that apparently go against your country, such as the foreign debt, U.S. expansionism, etc.?

LaRouche: The problem is that the debt of these countries is not an honorable debt. Under natural law, the law of equity, this is not a honorable debt. These countries have paid the debt many times over. The debt grew because of unlawful and immoral policies of the international financial institutions. Now what's happening is this: In the past week, the international financial system has collapsed. Nothing can save the Anglo-American financial system centered on the International Monetary Fund [IMF]. It cannot be saved. It's gone, it's finished; what is left of it cannot be saved. Nothing can save it. The policies made by the United States government and others, especially in October and November 1982, crushing Mexico, and crushing the other nations of Central and South America, have led to the destruction of the United States itself. Now we have come to the point where my policies are vindicated and the policies of my competitors are discredited. I *do* know how to stop this depression, they do not. They are not willing to accept the policies that would stop it. I am running because I can stop this depression and no other public political figure in the United States could do it.

Q: . . . And what would happen if some countries, some groups of countries, would stop paying the debt as you

propose? What, concretely, would happen to the economy of the United States? And what would happen to the banks?

LaRouche: The banks are already dead. The commercial banks of the United States are already bankrupt.

Q: But, there are some people who say that you defend some interests that are foreign to the United States, and that your policy would directly affect the U.S. banks. Is this true?

LaRouche: This is a question of equity. If we continue to try to maintain this bankrupt banking system, we are going to murder hundreds of millions of people and we would collect interest payments against the lives of hundreds of millions of people. It would be more criminal than Hitler to

Who is Lyndon LaRouche?

Lyndon LaRouche has been a controversial international public figure for two decades, because of his opposition to neo-malthusian economic and population policies; his campaign for global monetary reform based on equity for the Third World; and his role in exposing the powerful financial interests which control international drug-trafficking.

Since Jan. 27, 1989, LaRouche had been held as a political prisoner of the Bush administration, serving a 15-year sentence at the Rochester, Minnesota federal prison as a result of one of the most shocking judicial railroads in U.S. history. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights announced on Feb. 7, 1992 that it is investigating his case as a possible violation of human rights by the U.S. government.

LaRouche was born on Sept. 8, 1922 in Rochester, New Hampshire. He attended Northeastern University from 1940-42 and from 1946-47, and served in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II. He was married on Dec. 29, 1977 to German political leader and author Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

LaRouche describes himself as an economist specializing in physical economy, and lists as a leading accomplishment of his adult life his contributions to the advancement of economic science. He is the discoverer (1952) of what is today known as the LaRouche-Riemann method of economic analysis, the most accurate method of economic forecasting in existence. His work in economics is an advancement of the American System of Political-Economy (of Gottfried Leibniz, Alexander Hamilton, Friedrich

pay the debt in the present terms.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, there is European monetary disorder today; in fact, today, Sunday, they are deciding in France the future of the Maastricht Treaty. How would this European monetary disorder, that is the situation on the stock markets of London, Paris, all the major world markets, the situation in Italy and so forth, how does this situation directly affect Colombia?

LaRouche: What has happened in Europe is simply a result of the U.S. system. And the collapse of the U.S. system has led to the breakdown in Europe. The effect on Central and South America, if these countries accept these IMF conditions, and do not resist, then we will begin to see the condi-

tions of Ethiopia and Somalia, in one country after another.

Q: You have said, Mr. LaRouche, that the foreign debt is a bomb for your country, the United States, that could be triggered by the Third World nations. Please explain, for those listening today to Radio Todelar, what it would mean for some Latin American countries to stop paying the foreign debt.

LaRouche: What I proposed in 1982, in principle is correct today. The debt is injustice. We recall how this debt developed. The Argentinian debt is completely fraudulent. That agent of Henry Kissinger, Martínez de Hoz, created an illegal debt in Argentina. But in general, this debt was created, in the present form, beginning in 1974-75 with Eurodollar

List, and Mathew and Henry Carey). He is the author of the 1984 textbook, *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?* and the 1992 trilogy *The Science of Christian Economy*, written while in prison, among hundreds of other books, articles, and economic policy proposals.

In 1974, LaRouche founded and became an editor of *EIR*. In 1976, he was among the founding members of the Fusion Energy Foundation, a nonprofit scientific foundation which worked to achieve the rapid development of nuclear energy technologies, a revitalization of the space program, and increased American participation in experimental work on the frontiers of science.

In 1977, LaRouche first publicly proposed the U.S. crash-basis development of anti-ballistic-missile systems based on new physical principles, what later became the Reagan administration's Strategic Defense Initiative. In the months leading up to President Reagan's March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI, LaRouche collaborated with the National Security Council in formulation of the policy.

LaRouche ran for the presidency in 1976, 1980, 1984, and 1988, and campaigned for northern Virginia's 10th Congressional District seat in 1990.

He names as a leading enemy the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) and its collaborators within the U.S. Department of Justice and federal executive—a combination he has nicknamed the "Get LaRouche task force." This group's animus toward him developed following an April 1975 visit by LaRouche to Iraq, at the invitation of Saddam Hussein's Baath Party. LaRouche proposed a Middle East peace plan based on Arab-Israeli cooperation for the development of the region. En route back to the United States from this trip, LaRouche proposed his International Development Bank program for global monetary reform and development at a press conference in West Germany.

In 1978, LaRouche commissioned the book *Dope, Inc.*, which exposed the "citizens above suspicion" on the financial side of the global drug traffic, and traced ADL ties to the international drug cartel. A bestseller, *Dope, Inc.* is now in its third edition.

Goals for America

LaRouche has emphasized the need for a return to classical art, music, science, and culture as an antidote to today's prevailing moral degeneration and cultural pessimism. He has outlined three goals for our nation: 1) eradicating poverty across the globe; 2) establishing a durable peace among nations; and 3) colonization of the Moon and Mars.

During February and March 1992, in two national television broadcasts, LaRouche presented to American voters his unique program to reverse the economic depression, with the creation of 6 million new jobs within the first year of his presidency. LaRouche's approach features the reshaping of the Federal Reserve System into a new National Bank of the United States, to direct \$300 billion of low-interest credit each year into government-funded infrastructure projects of water management, transportation, energy production, health care, and education services.

In conjunction with this economic recovery program at home, LaRouche urges deepened economic collaboration with western Europe and the nations now emerging from under the yoke of communism in large-scale development programs to end the famine and disease now engulfing the Third World. The Bretton Woods economic system which has enslaved the developing sector and created economic crisis in the West, and the Versailles system upon it was based, says LaRouche, are rotten beyond repair, and must be replaced with a just, new world economic order.

refinancing. Then the IMF forced the devaluation of the currencies of these countries. Debt was pyramiding by using fraudulent tactics . . . by using political muscle to force countries to take on this indebtedness, and then forcing the application of conditionalities that completely looted these countries. What we have to create today is an equitable system of economics and finance among the nations of the world. Not like a debt-collecting world system, but a system of friendship and cooperation among sovereign nation-states.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, in line with this response and given that you surely know the Colombian case very well, what relation do you see between the drug trade and the Colombian economy?

LaRouche: Yes, I know. Colombia was counted as an exceptional case, as was explained by former President Belisario Betancur in 1983 at the Non-Aligned meeting in New Delhi, India. The President and other people in Colombia thought that the Colombian situation was special and was not in the trouble that many countries in Ibero-America were in. But, since then, because of the drug problem, the collapse of the economy, the civil war conditions under narco-terrorism and so forth, Colombia has moved right into the same kind of problem, generally, that the other countries have, financially.

Q: During this period, Mr. LaRouche has spoken extensively of the efforts Colombia has made to eradicate the drug trade, and the lack of international support not only from the government of the United States but from the international community in general. Here, some specialists constantly say that Colombia makes the sacrifices while the United States and other countries do absolutely nothing to eradicate the drug trade. What has the United States government done, from your viewpoint, to combat the drug trade, this drug plague, as Colombia has done until now?

LaRouche: First of all, remember that drugs have no real value. When you produce drugs, you may collect money, but you produce nothing of value. To produce drugs, for example coca, means *not* to produce vegetables, not to produce food. So the people starve while the narco-traffickers collect money. Guns come in for the narco-traffickers to kill the people that have no vegetables. So, for the drug trade, there is no legitimacy. The drug trade is as evil economically as it is evil morally. And a country that tolerates it, as the United States has done—and we know that sections of the U.S. Defense Department adapt themselves to the drug traffickers, the Colombian traffickers—in that sense is responsible for the situation in Colombia, by helping the traffickers.

Drug traffickers take some \$600-800 billion a year out of the mouths of children around the world. Money that could not go to industry, money that could not go into farming, money that could not go into housing and development, goes to the profits of the narco-traffickers. That has looted the

economy in Colombia, as it has looted every other economy involved, including the economy of United States. If we do not ourselves get rid of the drug trade, the nations involved will not survive.

Q: If the United States has not yet done anything, then what is the way to halt the terrorism that Colombia is experiencing today, the violence and terrorism that Peru also is experiencing?

LaRouche: According to my informed opinion, the United States government has not fought against drug trafficking. The United States has done selected prosecutions for propaganda purposes, of a few celebrated cases, but the United States government has acted to *prevent* effective action against the drug traffickers. This is a matter of policy. Remember that during the late 1970 petroleum crisis, petrodollars were the world financial system. From the beginning of the 1980s, narcodollars and weapon dollars were the basis of the international financial system. And those in the United States government that may not be involved directly in drug trafficking, are otherwise involved in supporting a monetary system which itself depends upon narcodollars.

Q: . . . We have here the prologue to *The Power of Reason*, an autobiography which political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche has written; he says that it was on Jan. 27, 1989, scarcely a week after George Bush was inaugurated President of the United States, that he became an internationally known political prisoner.

Announcer: "In accord with today's civilized standards for legal frameups of political critics of those in power, my friends and I were charged and convicted on nothing but the customary allegations of 'conspiracy.' The case was tried before a judge who has been compared with the Nazi Roland Freisler, before a corrupt jury stacked with members of prosecutorial agencies.

"The rushed trial was a near-copy of France's notorious Dreyfus case of 1894. The Alexandria sentence of Jan. 27, was immediately the outcome of a 'get LaRouche' project set into motion by former U.S. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, beginning August 1982. Kissinger collaborated in this project with several members of a powerful, corrupted President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), and PFIAB's Vice Chairman Leo Cherne.

"1982-83 was not the first period Kissinger and Leo Cherne's cronies had conspired to terminate my existence. The released U.S. government records of such uses of the FBI, and other agencies of U.S.A. and foreign governments, trace practices back to the first year of Kissinger's stint at the White House. Nor was it the first time they had coordinated such activities with the Soviet KGB. Nonetheless, from 1982 on, there was a difference.

"The chief difference was that I had become much more

significant by 1982-83. As the New York Council on Foreign Relations' William Bundy said to a French journalist, in 1981, as paraphrased in that journalist's report: 'LaRouche is dangerous, he has infiltrated the corridors of power, he has spies everywhere, and one should not underestimate his influence!' referring to my activities around the nation's capital. Or, as President Reagan's National Security Council Economic Adviser, Dr. Norman Bailey, stated in an NBC-TV interview on March 4, 1984, LaRouche had 'one of the best private intelligence services in the world.'

"There were two very special issues which frightened Kissinger and Cherne, and which provoked Moscow to jump into Kissinger's bed on all four feet. The first was my book-length analysis and proposal for dealing with the 1982-83 debt crises, *Operation Juárez*. The second was my intensive 1982, international campaign to sell President Ronald Reagan what he later named the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Kissinger, Cherne, and Moscow were my deadly enemies on the issues and implications of *Operation Juárez*, and, wherever Cherne stood, Kissinger and Moscow hated me because of the SDI.

"It may, and should be reported here, that during a period from January 1982 until April 1983, I was conducting private 'back-channel' discussions with an official of the Soviet government, on behalf of the U.S. government. The principal topic of these discussions had been my proposal for strategic ballistic missile defense based upon 'new physical principles,' an attempt to 'feel out' possible Soviet reactions to such a change in superpower relationships.

"Unfortunately, these discussions bridged the spring-summer 1982 period, when Moscow brought the 'Brezhnev period' of Soviet history to a close by nominating Soviet KGB chief Yuri Andropov as Leonid Brezhnev's designated early successor. Whereas Brezhnev might have welcomed President Reagan's March 23, 1983 offer, it turned out that Andropov saw that offer as a threat to the strategic master-plan he had developed in collaboration with Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov.

"So, my Soviet interlocutor informed me in early 1983—as I, in turn, so informed the National Security Council—that his government would regret my proposal for strategic ballistic-missile defense. He transmitted the following findings of his government, which, in hindsight, are key for understanding why Moscow classes me as Soviet enemy number one in the world today."

Q: And here are some footnotes to this same prologue of *The Power of Reason*, regarding what has been a difficult moment for our guest today on Todelar Reports, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche who, we repeat, is today a candidate to the presidency of the United States.

Announcer: "From his prison in Alexandria, Virginia where he was incarcerated from Jan. 27, 1989, until moved on July 14, Lyndon LaRouche conducted 233 interviews. Of these,

135 were radio interviews; 40 newspaper, magazine, and wire service interviews; 2 TV interviews; and 56 interviews with foreign media outlets, many of them Ibero-American.

"In December 1988, while the trial against LaRouche and his six co-defendants was being held, the famous violinist Norbert Brainin gave a benefit concert for his defense.

"In February 1989, the International Martin Luther King Tribunal was founded in Rome to hold hearings on the advance of totalitarian fascism in the free world, of which the case of LaRouche and his co-defendants is a very clear example. The Tribunal later held major international conferences in Paris, Washington and, again, in Rome, as well as national conferences in many nations of the world, among them Thailand and Peru, along with regional conferences in dozens of U.S. cities.

"Italian Senator Vincenzo Carollo of Italy and General Paul Albert Scherer, former head of military intelligence of West Germany, traveled to Washington to criticize LaRouche's treatment and to warn of Soviet motives in the affair. Two heroes of the French resistance, Marie-Madeleine Fourcade and Jean-Gabriel Revault d'Allonnes issued statements in defense of LaRouche's impeccable honor, whose cause they linked to their own sacrifices in the fight against the Nazis. Amelia Boynton Robinson, leader of the civil rights fight in the U.S. and collaborator of Dr. Martin Luther King, compared the conspiracy against LaRouche with that behind the King assassination.

"In February, Brigadier General (ret). Friedrich von der Heydte, professor of constitutional and international law at the Universities of Mainz and Würzburg, issued his analysis that there exist important parallels between the recent trial of LaRouche and that of the infamous Dreyfus case, from the last decade of the nineteenth century in France.

"In late April, more than 100 Ibero-American legislators signed a manifesto, which was published in several major U.S. newspapers, including the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, in which they demanded that the injustice against LaRouche and his companions be corrected."

Q: We hope that these excerpts from the autobiography of a political prisoner, *The Power of Reason*, give a little better insight into this individual; who is our invited guest today, independent U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. . . .

Let us now speak of the Peru case. In recent days, there has been the important news of the capture of Abimael Guzmán, leader of the terrorist group who was captured by the Fujimori government. How do you view this situation of violence in Peru, the capture of Abimael Guzmán, and the current situation facing President Fujimori?

LaRouche: I think that Fujimori has demonstrated what the solution is. This is like a very bad disease. When you postpone medical treatment for a very bad disease, the longer you postpone the treatment, the worse the disease becomes,

and the more radical the treatment you need. What you see in Peru, for example, you see a group of bandits, called Shining Path, whose pedigree goes back nearly a century. I know very well: These bandits are out to destroy Peru, and its people. They don't have a justification to exist as an organization. They are a criminal organization worse than the Nazis, worse than Pol Pot in Kampuchea. They are committed to destroying Peru. By waiting to destroy Shining Path, Peru has put itself in a precarious situation. But I have observed from reports, that the taking of the prisoner, the criminal Abimael Guzmán, who we all know to be a criminal, and has been for many decades, was seen with great enthusiasm and hope by the people of Peru. Hope among the poor peasants, even though they grow the coca, hope that they can be free from slavery to the narco-terrorists of Shining Path. Yes, the problem is a dangerous one. But, the very existence of society in these countries, like Peru and Colombia, depends on defeating the narco-Hitlers.

Q: What will happen if Bush is elected President of the United States? Or what would happen if Bill Clinton, the Democratic candidate, is elected? And, of course, Mr. LaRouche, what would happen if you defeated the candidates of the traditional U.S. parties?

LaRouche: First of all, I think we can now accept and recognize that Bush is a very sick man. It is possible that he could be reelected, but that's becoming increasingly doubtful, although it is not certain that Clinton would be elected. So, we have no final answer to those questions yet. What we do know is that both, George Bush, whatever his administration would be, and Clinton, whatever his administration would be, would be fascism, in the sense of Mussolini in Italy in the 1920s and the early 1930s. Mussolini fascism is the official program of the Democratic leadership behind Clinton and is essentially the official program of the kind of Republican forces behind George Bush. It was once the program of Ross Perot, who as a candidate was exactly what he was before. Ross Perot's program is also fascism.

So, if any of these come to power, one can expect that the United States would be worse under the next President than the previous President. If I were elected, or if my election campaign did have significant success—not total success, but significant success—that could change the situation. Because very few people in the United States want to vote for either Clinton or Bush. Clinton's support comes from the fact that people hate Bush, and support him not because they like him, but because they hate Bush more. If American people express this disdain for both candidates by voting for the LaRouche candidacy in a protest vote, that may help to bring about a new situation, a favorable situation in the United States. That is what I'm trying to do.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, let us return to Latin America. You have just defended Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori. But there

is much concern because he carried out certain actions which are not democratic, what is being called a self-coup. Do you support Fujimori despite the fact that he shut down the Congress, and do you believe that he is good for Peru, Colombia's neighbor?

LaRouche: First of all, remember that I have respect for the sovereignty of nation-states and I am very sensitive to the sovereignty of the states of Central and South America, especially because I know the recent experience. Therefore, I am very careful about criticizing, especially publicly, certain qualities of certain governments, because I think the sovereignty of the people under the nations is a prime consideration.

Now, for what Fujimori's government has done together with the military against the terrorists, I join with the Peruvian people in rejoicing at this action. Obviously I am critical of what the Fujimori's government has not done. I also understand that a nation of 20 million people, a very poor nation, a nation under great pressure, is unable to act alone in the present circumstances. What I look at is not so much the criticism of Fujimori that could be made; I look at a process which could be spreading throughout the sovereign politics of the hemisphere. I see Brazil, I see a transformation of Brazil, which I believe is in the process of sweeping throughout the hemisphere. I believe that this transformation of Brazil will unleash changes that have been waiting to happen over the last 10 years. I think that a great movement of hope from within the people of these countries is possible. I think that such a movement of hope among sovereign people would lead to the best kind of transformation in quality of government in that region. People who are inspired and inspire their own government, will bring upon themselves the necessary improvement in government. Where the governments must live under great depression, economic depression, and must live under terror, you cannot have a good government.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, you speak a little of self-determination, this phrase which has been so defended in states like our own. How is it that, in the name of self-determination, which has been defended by Latin Americans, and especially by the democratic governments such as that of Colombia, there can continue to be poverty, there can continue to be a situation of economic and social stagnation such as that which all the nations of Latin America have been suffering?

LaRouche: I don't use the term self-determination. That was a term introduced by certain sociologists whom I don't trust. I don't trust the word, because I don't trust them. I speak of sovereignty of the people, that is the participation of the people in the process of government through representatives who actually represent the people. It is very difficult to maintain the government if you have both grave poverty and the living conditions that you have in many countries today, and if you also have no hope. If people are very poor, but they know they are participating in the government

through their representatives, if they feel they are building that nation, they would make sacrifices willingly if they see that those sacrifices are necessary to realize a good result. However, if they have no hope and no reason to hope and they live under terrible and ugly conditions, then you have the conditions for dictatorship.

Q: Let us talk about coffee, Mr. LaRouche, an issue that is of great importance to Colombians, because coffee is the backbone of our country's economy. The United States did not collaborate in the renewal of the World Coffee Pact, and this has caused, in Colombia and in the coffee-producing countries in general, serious economic trauma. Why, in your view, did the United States not collaborate in this pact? Or is it that perhaps the United States seeks to definitely shatter the Colombian economy and the economies of the developing countries?

LaRouche: I would say the United States is trying to destroy the Colombian economy, and knows it is trying to destroy the Colombian economy. What has been done to the price of coffee? Any coffee grower, any economic official of the Colombian government, or any private economist or other specialist knows exactly what the effect is of this fall of the coffee price: that the farmer cannot afford to grow coffee. This means that the farmer may be able to afford to grow heroin for the Cali cartel, but not coffee. This means that coca will spread where coffee was, and that is the intention of the people in Washington.

There is another aspect that is not just that specific. Yes, we should have, as we had before, protection arrangements on agricultural products of various nations, including coffee. These protection agreements should be made orderly, so that various nations understand the other nations' protection requirements. And there should be protection, as there was before, for the price of coffee. That was just, and it was unjust to remove that understanding.

Q: But yesterday, the National Coffee Growers Federation in Colombia issued a communiqué for the meeting that will be held tomorrow between producers and consumers, in which it notes that a major portion of the coffee profits goes to the roasters and the U.S. and European traders. The National Coffee Growers Federation notes, for example, the fact that when the international coffee pact broke down in 1989, the price of coffee paid to producer nations like Colombia was approximately \$1.15 per pound; now it is \$.50 or less per pound, indicating that the prices have fallen substantially for the producer countries. But the same is not true in selling coffee to the public. In 1989 and today, the price for a pound of coffee sold on U.S. and European markets has been more or less the same. Those who trade it, who process it, and, finally, who sell it to the public, are those who in the end remain with all the profits. So, Mr. LaRouche, what do you propose so that the farmer who produces the coffee, who

gives all his sweat for a good coffee like the Colombian, can continue to earn money and so that this money doesn't remain in the hands of the intermediaries?

LaRouche: I know a little bit about the situation of agriculture in the Imperial Valley, and I know the production potential there. I also know the situation of agriculture in the United States. And I believe in protectionism. I believe we should not protect the international traders, but we must protect the individual farmer. I think every specialist knows, in this area, what the definition of the productive farmer is. For example, the definition of a productive farmer for a coffee grower in the high-altitude region of Colombia is different from the definition of a productive farmer in the grain district of the United States. But every country knows what that definition is in its own area. We need agreement on protective prices that go directly to the producers and make sure that these producers are able to continue to improve the production, in quality and quantity. And we will all benefit from such an agreement.

Q: Mr. LaRouche . . . do you have any special message for our Colombian people at this point, with less than two months to go to the United States elections?

LaRouche: Well, my best wishes. I have suffered in my spirit a great deal, because I know the conditions of the Colombian people, because many Colombians are my personal friends, and friends of my friends. I have suffered much because I know what is happening, and I wish a change for the better very soon. And I will do anything possible within my limited powers.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, what is going to happen with Colombia? How do you see the future of Colombia, and how can you help us, should you become the next President of the United States?

LaRouche: Everything that I can. For example, as you know, perhaps, I have tried to deal with the problem of narco-terrorism. I have tried to deal with the problem of the external enemies of the internal order of Colombia and other countries, to expose them. And politically I will use my influence, in policies in many countries, to bring about a just economic order which would afford to every nation-state economic growth, for better quality of life for people. In the case of Colombia, as some people know, there are certain development projects with which I have been associated, through my friends—canal projects and other projects that I believe are urgently needed to move the country on an industrial expansion basis. To accomplish this, I will do the most I can do, even in my circumstances. And I hope that would be helpful.

Q: Finally, Mr. LaRouche, do you believe you are going to go directly from jail to the White House?

LaRouche: If I am elected, I can. No question about that. The United States Constitution is absolutely clear on that. . . .