

Venezuela's Chávez Fights the Wrong Dope

by Dennis Small

Nov. 30—In the days when the world system of the International Monetary Fund is slipping into a chain-reaction pattern of sovereign fiscal defaults, what marginal nations such as Venezuela under President Hugo Chávez say, has no durable relevance for even the relatively short time ahead. Although it is significant for those who must ask: “How did we allow the present world monetary breakdown-crisis to develop as it has done up to this point?”

Therefore, were the consequences not so dangerous for the region and the world, one might be tempted to brush off the recent actions announced by President Chávez against neighboring Colombia—with which it shares a 2,200-km border—as something lifted straight from a Peter Sellers movie.

In July 2009, Chávez announced that he was freezing diplomatic relations with Colombia and was ordering that Venezuela's sizeable food and other imports from Colombia be reduced to an absolute minimum. The flow of meat, chicken, eggs, and other basic foodstuffs has been reduced by over 70%. The only Colom-



Creative Commons

Venezuela's President Hugo Chávez in Brazil, 2003. The emotionally unstable demagogue has been played by London since he became President in 1998.

bian items entering Venezuela are those that were granted customs permits before August; no new permits have been issued since that time. Prior to the announcement, Colombia was Venezuela's number two source of imports (\$4.2 billion per year), second only to

LaRouche: How Mexico Was Crushed

Remarks by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Nov. 24, 2009.

In the case of Mexico, what happened—the proximity with the United States and the interaction with the United States, especially with getting the Habsburgs out of there, resulted in a long period, which went through the [Franklin] Roosevelt period, where, after all these internal wars that were organized from abroad, you had a development of Mexico which was

different from that of any other part of South America and Central America—because of the American influence, especially from the time of John Quincy Adams and Lincoln.

This occurred again in the 1930s: In the 1930s and the early 1940s, you had the root of a development in Mexico, which was a specific culture, which we knew in our time, in the form of President José López Portillo. López Portillo embodied this influence, this legacy, and it was moving in a positive direction.

When he was crushed, and when Mexico was crushed, and *when the Mexican people, themselves, crushed his reputation*, Mexico was set up for destruction!

the United States. Colombian authorities report that 250,000 Colombian and 100,000 Venezuelan families are directly involved in border trade.

Then, on Nov. 19, Chávez ordered his military to blow up two pedestrian bridges connecting the Colombian department of Norte de Santander with the state of Táchira in Venezuela, arguing that they were being used by contrabandists and drug-runners. The next day, Chávez issued yet another threat of war against Colombia, as he has done repeatedly over recent months and years: “I would go to war with the sister nation of Colombia in tears, but it is not we who have in our hands the option of carrying it out or avoiding it; nor is it even Colombia; it is the United States empire.”

“This situation is typical of the entire region of Central and South America today,” U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche commented in late November. Instead of cooperation among the nations of the region towards a common mission of development, in conjunction with the Four Powers Pacific-centered international alliance LaRouche has designed, Venezuela has gotten into an insane, British-orchestrated conflict with Colombia, centered around the question of drug legalization.

“The entire region has sunk into petty squabbles,” LaRouche said, “which are leading to a catastrophe. There is no sense of mission orientation being provided by the governments or leaders of the region, no mobilization of their populations to better their destiny, no global conception, as there was at better moments in their history,” such as the 1982 cooperation between LaRouche and then-President of Mexico José López Portillo.

The only non-suicidal strat-

egy for any nation of Ibero-America, LaRouche explained, as for every part of the planet, is to turn to the Pacific Basin as the center of world economic recovery, from this point of history forward. For example, if Venezuela wants viable access to the Pacific, in order to build economic ties with Asia and China in particular—as Chávez claims is his intent—it has no choice but to develop joint infrastructure integration projects with the one country of South America which has coasts on both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans: Colombia (Figure 1).

Instead, British imperial strategists have had a field

FIGURE 1



day in Ibero-America, manipulating the cultural fault-lines and weaknesses there to foster conflict where there should be cooperation; environmentalism, where there should be high-technology industrialization; and infantile anti-Americanism, where there should be common cause against the British imperial common enemy.

“We’ve seen, bit by bit, that everything we saw viable in Central and South America back in the 1970s, 1980s, and even the 1990s, has been shot down,” LaRouche recently noted. “You have Venezuela: The biggest drug pusher is now in charge of Venezuela. What can you do with that mess? They’re all intimidated by the drug traffic!

“The problem in Central and South America is a moral problem. It’s a Habsburg problem. Remember, Columbus comes to the Americas with an intention in 1492,” LaRouche continued. This was an intention shaped by the same nation-building worldview of Nicholas of Cusa which later led to the 17th-Century founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in North America. But, whereas, the North American effort succeeded, with the American Revolution and beyond, the South American effort did not. Why?

“Because the Habsburgs took over,” LaRouche explained. “The Habsburgs in Brazil. The Habsburgs in Mexico. The Habsburgs in the rest of South America took over. What did they do? They introduced a culture which is a peon culture, largely: ‘pee on’ the people, is what the Habsburgs did. And you have—like the case of Brazil: Brazil is a powerful country, but it has no morality. You have two classes there: You have a ruling class, one section of people live on one side of town, in all the big cities; and on the other side, what do you have? The majority of the population is completely in a degenerate situation, under degenerate conditions.”

A Pacific Solution

The British have played on this cultural weakness for decades and centuries, but now it threatens the very existence of the nations themselves. “The drug issue is key,” LaRouche noted, “but the drug issue is only symptomatic.”

Consider the way Colombian-Venezuelan tensions have played out over recent years.

The emotionally unstable Chávez, ever since London placed him in the Presidency of Venezuela in 1998, has had a strategic alliance with the narco-ter-

rorist Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the world’s leading cocaine cartel. And he has used Venezuela’s significant oil revenues to finance every government and movement in the region that is working with the British-run financier George Soros to promote drug legalization. Colombian President Alfonso Uribe, on the other hand, is the only leader in the region today who is fighting against drug legalization.

Back in early 2005, Venezuela and Colombia were close to breaking diplomatic relations, over an incident involving Venezuela’s harboring of Rodrigo Granda, a top leader of the FARC. But instead of being manipulated into conflict and possible war, both Chávez and Uribe opted for economic cooperation instead. On March 29, 2005, in the Venezuelan city of Ciudad Guayana, Chávez and Uribe were joined by Brazilian President Lula da Silva and Spanish Prime Minister Rodríguez Zapatero, in a dramatic summit which focussed on regional great infrastructure projects to pull their economies out of poverty, and to lay the foundations of lasting, regional development.

Most notably, that summit turned its eyes to China and Asia, as the option for the future: “This has to be thought about way beyond where it now stands,” Uribe stated at the summit. “It has to be thought about in relation to Asia. There’s no point in our integrating in order to stagnate.” (See *EIR*, April 15, 2005.)

LaRouche, at the time, characterized the summit as a “dramatic shift, a sudden turnabout which includes the Chinese factor in Ibero-America.” Among other things, LaRouche was referring to Chinese President Hu Jintao’s visit to Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Cuba in November 2004, in which China proffered more than \$100 billion in investment and trade deals with the region over a ten-year period. A complementary trip of Chinese Vice President Zeng Qinghong to Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela in January 2005 broadened China’s proposals, as did a February 2005 proffer to Bolivia around a \$1.5 billion natural gas deal.

Within days of that summit, Colombia’s Uribe travelled to China, where he proposed a “strategic alliance” between the two countries, including joint efforts to combat narcoterrorism. which would be similar to the *Plan Colombia* established in 1999-2000 with the United States.

Although much of the \$100 billion of deals discussed by China with Ibero-America in 2004 and 2005

never materialized, top Chinese authorities launched a second major initiative towards the region in late 2008 and 2009. This included tours by President Hu and Vice President Xi Jinping, and the Third China-Latin America Business Summit, held in Bogotá, Colombia on Nov. 25-26, 2009, which brought together some 700 businessmen and top government officials from 14 countries.

In 2008, China became Ibero-America's second-largest trading partner, after the United States, while for some countries—such as Brazil—it was already number one. In addition to trade, China is currently discussing major investment projects in the region.

But there is actually much more at stake. The Eurasia that Ibero-America is dealing with changed dramatically with the October 2009 accords between

Russia and China, which took the first steps towards shifting from the current bankrupt world *monetary* system to a viable, development-based world *credit* system along the lines proposed by LaRouche.

Assisted Suicide

But, where Eurasia has grown stronger since 2005, Ibero-America has grown dramatically weaker, both economically and politically. The region can no longer sidestep the cultural and historical Habsburg problem which LaRouche has so emphatically identified, and still hope to survive.

Over the centuries, the characteristic method employed by the British Empire to commit genocide can fairly be described as “assisted suicide”: Get your intended victims to kill themselves, or kill each other.

LaRouche on Ibero-America's Current Strategic Role

Remarks by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Nov. 13, 2009.

There is presently no movement within Ibero-America which is actually committed to an effective role in dealing with the presently accelerating general, economic breakdown-crisis of every part of the present world economy. The recent [July 2009] election in Mexico is only one case of the present strategic ineptitude of the leading political forces through most among the nations of South America. There have been brighter moments in South and Central America, as during the Spring and Summer of 1982, but they were crushed then, and are not in control there today.

Therefore, if we look at the planet as a whole from inside South and Central America, we should recognize the hard truth that the rescue of this region will be made possible only through a Pacific-, rather than Atlantic-based movement: through an alliance which must be brought into being among the U.S.A. (with certain obvious, and actually possible, improve-

ments in the Office of the President and leadership of the U.S. Congress) and the major Pacific powers of the world, Russia, China, and India. In other words, we must take victory in those parts of the world where the relevant quality of political forces exist, and use that victory of the nations of the planet as a whole.

The strength of Colombia, among many of the best nations, lies in its resistance to the British drug-running interests. Wherever the move for legalization of the drug-traffic occurs, we find either an intrinsically corrupt, or greatly weakened sovereignty among leading political circles. Brazil is the only nation of the region, apart from Colombia, which has strategically significant economic and political influence on the planet at this time; but, we also know the internal problems, even there.

The conditions for leadership from South and Central America must come by way of the leading role of a changed direction from the U.S.A., working in partnership with Russia, China, India, and certain relevant other nations—to be directly associated with that partnership. In that view, Argentina does have some important, and most interesting potentialities as a factor within the Americas; I would hope, despite the limited options actually existing presently through South and Central America, that certain important elements of Argentina's history will come into play again.



Coordinacio de Material Grafico

Mexican President José López Portillo in 1982, radiant as he stands up for his nation against the City of London and Wall Street bankers. When his Ibero-American neighbors did not back him up, his nationalist economic reform policy was crushed, and he was subjected to a decades-long campaign of calumny. He died in 2004.

This is seen most clearly in the Obama Administration’s promotion of health-care “reform” centered on the Nazi practice of euthanasia—which is marketed under the guise of “assisted suicide.”

Or, take the case of the late Mexican President José López Portillo (1976-82), who allied with LaRouche to defend his nation against destruction at the hands of predatory financiers, and to issue a clarion call to the world to establish a New World Economic Order to replace the bankrupt IMF system. López Portillo was defeated, and his country was ripped apart in the aftermath, to the point where it has virtually lost all sovereignty today. But even worse is the fact that, since that time, most Mexicans have been induced, through massive propaganda and brainwashing, to *attack* López Portillo and his legacy—a form of hara-kiri against the very best of their own nation and history.

A similar thing was done nearly 20 years later to Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori, after he had defeated London’s Shining Path narcoterrorists, and called, on Sept. 1, 2000, for the formation of “the United States of South America,” premised on the

physical integration of the continent around great infrastructure projects—a strategy again influenced by direct contact with the ideas of LaRouche. Fujimori was toppled before the end of the year, through a British-orchestrated corruption scandal, and, here again, the Peruvian population was manipulated to turn against Fujimori and tolerate his current imprisonment.

This same British cultural warfare strategy of “assisted suicide” is expressed in a more fundamental and destructive way, in the infantile anti-Americanism which the British—and their dupes on Wall Street—have, for centuries, spread intentionally, not only in Mexico, but across all of Ibero-America. In so doing, they have stolen from Ibero-Americans the very best part of themselves: the relationship to the *ideas* which gave birth to the United States and the American System of political

economy, the ideas of Nicholas of Cusa and G.W. Leibniz, on which their own nations’ greatest moments were built.

In the case of Mexico, that relationship was at the heart of the 1810 War of Independence and its heroes such as Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos—who were enemies of the Habsburgs and friends and followers of the young United States. It was seen in the mid-19th-Century strategic alliance between Benito Juárez and Abraham Lincoln, to overthrow Habsburg Emperor Maximilian in Mexico and decisively defeat the British in the Americas. And it surged again in the mid-20th-Century relationship between U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Mexico’s President Lázaro Cárdenas, who worked together to deprive the British of their stranglehold over Mexico’s oil, and cooperate on Mexico’s development.

It is that alliance, and that shared philosophical outlook with Cusa, Leibniz, and others against the horrors of the Habsburgs, which today marks the only path to survival for the Americas. That is a reality which even Hugo Chávez is going to have to face.