

A new Marshall Plan, or World War III

Because, ladies and gentlemen, if there was one message that Mr. LaRouche wanted me *most emphatically* to convey to you today, it is that if, in fact, there is going to be reconstruction and development in the Balkans, or anywhere else in the world, it is going to have to be done through a financing mechanism which represents a distinct and clear alternative to the IMF. It is not going to be “snuck in.”

We have a financial system that is in a state of decay and collapse. And it is not just that the financial system is “too weak” to support a policy of the scale necessary. This financial system is in direct opposition. Its goals are the *opposite* of development. And if you have any doubt about that, look at what they have done on the continent of Africa. And if that looks like development and peace to you, then you go support that policy.

But what Mr. LaRouche wanted conveyed, is that at this moment, nothing but a direct political battle which succeeds in defeating those pro-British, pro-IMF forces within the U.S. government and within other governments, that only that kind of a fight will lead to peace. If we do anything less than that, I guarantee you that the people who control Mr. Blair—although he may not be with us very much longer—the people who control Al Gore (God knows who controls Madeleine Albright; the problem is, it doesn’t seem that anyone controls her)—that they will sabotage any effort toward peace, just as they tried to sabotage the consolidation of a cessation of the bombing.

And for our President, who I know has looked at Mr. LaRouche’s program—and if you look at some of the speeches that he made in Europe this past week, there is no question that he likes the program, he likes the idea of a Marshall Plan as an alternative to World War III and a Dark Age. Who wouldn’t? It’s a good idea. Most people would prefer peace and development over the end of civilization and war.

But our President says, “This is a great idea,” and then he turns to his advisers, and he says, “Can’t we find some acceptable way to do this? Isn’t there some compromise we can work out? I’ve got an idea. Let’s say that this is what we’re going to do. And we can praise the IMF in the process, and we’ll figure *something* out. It doesn’t matter what we say publicly. Let’s just say these various things publicly to try to lull these guys, and then we’ll figure something out, we’ll figure out some way to do this.”

Well, I’m sorry, but it is not going to work that way, this time. There is no compromise that’s going to be made. And that really, I think, is the message that we hope to be able to convey to you today. Because I think that what you’ll see, after some of the presentations that you’ll hear this afternoon, is that the question of a Marshall Plan is not “a good idea.” It’s not just that it’s a noble thing to do, and it would be nice to undo some of the damage that we’ve already done in this region; but that the question of the reconstruction of this re-

gion, and the financing mechanisms necessary for it, and what it would represent for the world, is as necessary to the continued survival of the United States, as it is to the continued survival of Kosovo.

And I think that if people actually manage to get a glimmer of that from today’s presentations, then delivering the mandate to this government that the American people, that the policy institutions, and that other governments will settle for absolutely nothing less, will be far closer to being accomplished. And that is really what Mr. LaRouche wanted me to convey to you today. And I hope that I’ve done that adequately.

Congressman Miguel Bush

Panama is threatened by drugs, subversion

Panamanian Congressman Bush’s speech to the seminar is excerpted here, following remarks by moderator Debra Hanning Freeman. The Congressman’s statement was translated from the Spanish. An interview with him is published on p. 46.

Freeman: I want to tell you something about Panama’s Congressman Bush. I met him for the first time about nine years ago, when then-President Bush—to whom I think you can figure out that the Congressman bears absolutely no relation—held Mr. LaRouche in prison. Mr. LaRouche was at that time a political prisoner. He had been sentenced to 15 years in Federal prison, because he had won the enmity of the Bush administration.

At that time, we asked for help. We asked for elected officials from the United States and from around the world, to speak out against this injustice, and to help us free Mr. LaRouche from prison. And Miguel Bush, who then was a young Congressman from Panama—and Panama had problems of her own, as a result of also having won Mr. Bush’s enmity—Miguel Bush was one of the very first people in the world, to answer that call.

He was on, I think, the first or second delegation of elected officials that came to Washington to lobby Congress to fight for Mr. LaRouche’s freedom. And I think that that speaks to the kind of person he is. It is something for which we will always be grateful.

Bush: . . . There is a silent war being waged, which day by day is killing our citizens, both here in the United States

of America, as well as in Panama and other countries of Latin America. And that is the drug war.

I am particularly pleased today to be here in Washington, sharing with this select audience, some of the concerns that we face in our country. One involves the remaining American presence of military troops past the year 2000.

Uphold the Torrijos-Carter Treaty

About three years ago, we received information from a group of friends in the international intelligence community, that there were plans on the part of certain reactionary circles in the United States, to keep American troops in Panama past the year 2000, in violation of the Torrijos-Carter Treaty. It was evident that, as we approach the zero hour—noon of Dec. 31 of this year—there has been an increase in subversive activities in the part of our region which borders the Darién Province on the Panama side of the Panama-Colombian border.

This scenario, which is really not known in our country, is beginning to create a destabilizing effect in the thinking of most Panamanian citizens, to the effect that without the presence of the United States Armed Forces, the Panama Canal then would be endangered, and the Colombian guerrillas would seize our country in alliance with the international drug-traffickers.

For more than 40 years, the FARC [Colombian narco-terrorists] have transited through and have used the jungle areas of Panama as a resting-place. They have resupplied themselves without creating any unrest in the government of our country, with full knowledge of this fact by the [U.S.] Southern High Command staff; with the tolerance of the Pentagon, and without affecting developments in the country—and, of course, not affecting the good diplomatic relations with Colombia.

We Panamanian politicians know very well what the geopolitical strategy is, including in the economic sphere, which has been imposed by Great Britain as well as by backward sectors here in the United States. From the times of Jeremy Bentham, the Gulf of Urabá has been a sector for exploration and research, because of its tremendous oil wealth, mineral wealth, gems. Given the weakening of the convergent points of production and extraction of raw materials around the world, Urabá constitutes an important piece in the geo-economic and strategic spheres. The increase of British investments in Colombia, shows that there is obscure interest on the part of the British to internationalize the Colombian situation and create what we would call a “domino effect,” which would mean increased paramilitary operations in Urabá. . . .

The Torrijos-Carter treaties should be carried out, should be respected. . . .

The reason I’m in Washington today, for the second time in less than three months, is that I want to bring these war threats to your attention. They are *low-intensity warfare*,

which threatens the peace and security of the hemisphere. As far as drug-trafficking is concerned, we should carry out a uniform battle, with the latest technological advances, with the right equipment to fight this evil, which increases every day, threatening the public order. This is a fight that belongs to all of us, and it knows no borders. . . .

I believe that you, the people of the United States, have a great opportunity, not only of saving this great country, but the world as a whole from madness, like this craziness of legalizing drugs. And I would like to thank the Schiller Institute, and to tell you that the recovery program that Lyndon LaRouche has put forward as an electoral proposal—I don’t think it is only good for this country, but it is also good for our countries, to apply to our own situation, and to the reality of the situation of Latin America. And I want to thank you for this.

Alexander Heina

Croatia seeks ties with United States

Mr. Heina is the Economics Counsellor of the Embassy of Croatia in Washington. The following are excerpts from his speech.

First of all, I would like to excuse Ambassador Dr. Miomir Zuzul, who was supposed to be here with you today and speak, and especially underlining the reason why he is not here: The reason is because he is today in Dubrovnik, Croatia, and he is present at the signing ceremony that Croatia, the Croatian government, has with the U.S. company Enron. . . .



Considering the circumstances in economic terms that Croatia has—I’m of course thinking about the war that happened in Croatia and what has happened in the neighboring countries—Croatia has gone further than anyone would have imagined.

We have received, in the last couple of years, very significant and good economic results. In 1993, there was one stabilization program launched, and since then, we have achieved one of the lowest inflation rates in Europe. For the