

The Achilles Heel of the Mexican Republic

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 7, Number 25, July 1, 1980. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

During a period of approximately a half-century, a combination of Spanish Hapsburg and Jesuit operatives reduced the 16th-century population of Mexico from over twenty million to less than two million persons. Today, forces allied to the Carter administration are in an advanced stage of deployment of an “Iran Model” destabilization of Mexico, a project whose objectives include William Paddock’s proposal to approximately halve the population of Mexico by the end of this present century—20 years hence.

The psychological “Achilles heel” of the best forces of the Mexican government is that government’s misguided toleration of the variety of “Aztec fundamentalism” associated with French fascist Jacques Soustelle, and with such “left-wing” accomplices of Soustelle as the notorious Carlos Fuentes and Octavio de la Paz—the García Márquezes of Mexico. Today, as during the Hapsburg genocide of the 16th century, it is Mexican Catholic Bishops’ agents of the Jesuit order who are in the forefront of promoting the pagan cult of “Aztecism” in Mexico. As long as the López Portillo government fails to confront Jesuit-orchestrated “Aztec fundamentalism,” the government remains intrinsically more vulnerable to the operations around Ayatollah Méndez Arceo, Ayatollah Carlos Fuentes, *et al.* than was the Shah of Iran to the allies of Club of Rome genocidalist Bani-Sadr of Iran.

The weak flank of present-day Mexican nationalism generally is the growth of a “Third World” variety of nationalism in which the pre-civilized ethnic “roots” of the majority of the present population are made the biological-ethical replacement for morality.

From the standpoint of the most elementary morality, the Aztec culture, featuring the excision of living hearts of masses of sacrificial victims, was a culture most deserving of urgent destruction. In fact the majority of the population of Mexico at that time supported the handful around Cortez precisely because of their need to free the peoples of Mexico from the degraded bestiality of Aztec culture. If Aztec culture is judged from any moral standpoint, the obligation to hate the Aztec ways, and to cheer at the liberation of Mexico from such beasts is overwhelmingly clear.

When the bestial doctrine of “ethnicity” is substituted for elementary morality, a different view of the Aztecs may be promoted, as the immoral Jesuits of Mexico do presently. When

the bestial doctrine of “ethnic nationalism” is used in place of simple morality, the consequence is a tendency to defend whatever one’s biological ancestors did, and to regard any disruption of even the most hideous of those ancestor’s social orders by “outsiders” as an affront to the bestial misinterpretation of the principles of “nationalism.”

Such was standard practice of the evil Jesuit order over the period of the 16th into 18th century—until the order’s long-overdue and proper outlawry by the Papacy. That is the tactic employed by the pseudo-Christian Jesuit cult internationally today.

The policy of the original Spanish colonists of Mexico was the development of the indigenous Mexican population as the basis for a moral, republican order. With the accession of the Hapsburgs to the throne of Spain, the Jesuits were deployed to aid in the genocide of the Mexican population by promoting “nativist” anti-scientific cultism, fomenting the instabilities which aided the genocidal slave-labor programs of the Hapsburgs and the usurious bankers holding the Hapsburg debt.

This “Indian tactic” of the Jesuits was characteristic of their operations through both of the American continents. It was the Jesuits who destroyed the early pattern of collaboration between American Indians and both English and French settlements—beginning in New England with “King Philip’s War,” a Jesuit creation. It was Jesuits who promoted the scalping and related bounty practices among indigenous populations of both North and South America, as well as Jesuit Sitting Bull, promoting the warfare which aided in the virtual extermination of the incited Indian populations.

The Jesuits of today are back in the same business. Pol Pot of Cambodia—who murdered approximately half of the population of his nation, under Peking direction—was a product of Jesuit training. The same Jesuit educators who developed Pol Pot also educated and control Iran’s Bani-Sadr—a Bani-Sadr dedicated openly to the same genocidal deurbanization program of Pol Pot for Iran. In addition, many of the most prominent leading figures of the Muslim Brotherhood internationally—Jesuit-trained Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “Islamic fundamentalism”—were, according to their personal dossiers in our possession, not only Jesuit-educated, not only Jesuit-sponsored prior to the establishment of the Khomeini dictatorship, but have continued to be “advised” by Jesuit operatives down to the present week.

That is not “interpretation”; it is a simple cut-and-dried fact of the *curriculae vitae* of such key Muslim Brotherhood personalities.

The principal root of the problem of relationships between the republican state and the Catholic Church in Mexico is simply the fact that the Papacy has never succeeded in freeing the Mexican Church from Jesuit control.

The republican faction in Mexico—as in most former Spanish colonies—was in fact created by the Catholic Church’s Augustinian forces—the actually Christian tradition of Apostolic Christianity. Any study of source materials bearing on the Mexican *republicanos* of the early 19th century, through Benito Juárez’s time, shows the powerful connections to the faction of Cardinal Richelieu (e.g., The Oratorians of the “French” faction of Greater Spain of the 18th century), and during the early 19th century to the Catholic freemasonic organizations directly tied to the Marquis de Lafayette. Despite the secularist character of the modern Mexican constitution of the great Obregón, the variety of “humanism” one encounters most frequently otherwise among the Augustinian currents of Apostolic Christianity is the dominant moral quality of modern Mexican *republicanos*.

The hostility between the Mexican state and nominal Catholic Church in Mexico arises because, at the top, there is in reality no Catholic Church in Mexico. There is only—at the top, at least—a pseudo-Catholic Church run top-down by the gnostic Jesuit order. Thus, although leading republican circles of Mexico are distinctively Augustinian Catholic in their moral heritage, as distinct from Protestant, the Jesuits have effectively prevented the development of any viable Christian Church in Mexico through their virtual monopoly over the principal institutions of organized religion. We repeat: *in effect, there is no organized Catholic Church in Mexico.*

If that fact could be more generally understood, the often irrational hostility to the Catholic Church in general among Mexican republicans could be neutralized.

One of the prominent consequences of this current circumstance is the powerful, wrong-headed prejudices among secularist Mexican republicans which prevent them from giving any proper acknowledgement to the Catholic roots of the Mexican *republicano* movement. This comprehensible, but irrational and wrong-headed anti-Catholicism renders those republicans susceptible to John Locke, Jeremy Bentham and related British-style varieties of empiricist “materialism.” In Mexico, as in most of the Catholic cultures of Latin America and Spain, the endemic consequence of this arrangement is the typically Latin American form of existentialism. This is most commonly associated in Mexico with the “macho” self-image of the infantile male, and the complementary, often savage psychological sadism of the similarly-disoriented, female, driven to infantile manipulative forms of behavior-controlling self-image.

The Latin American of better moral-political qualities is thus imprisoned within a state of mind and judgment aptly described by Dante Alighieri in the “Purgatory” canticle of his *Commedia*. In their public-policy conscience, such republicans are often among the best policy-thinkers in the world—the heritage of Obregón is a noble one. Since, however, their irrational (if comprehensible) anti-Catholicism cuts these people (at least, most of them) off

from their moral roots in Augustinian, Apostolic Catholicism, their rejection of such matters as the doctrine of consubstantiality cripples the higher powers of judgment of most of even the best republicans. By rejecting inquiry into their Augustinian Catholic heritage, by adopting personal hostility to all that “smacks of” that Augustinian Catholic heritage of Mexican republicanism, they compensate by seeking out secularist doctrines to fill up the empty place in themselves so defined. Hence, they become at best, Kantians. Adapting this Kantian self-image, and also attempting to make “practical political” adaptations to the rampant “macho” varieties of existentialism within influential factions of the general population, they become susceptible to “materialist” interpretation of Mexican nationalism provided by the Jesuits.

Thus, out of justified hatred of the Jesuit enemies, they tend to become the lawful political-psychological prey of the Jesuits.

The lawful consequence of the summarily described disorientation of their moral-philosophical outlook as a whole is a susceptibility to replacement of morality by the Jesuit doctrine of “bioethics,” the cult of Aztec-worship.

The Diego Rivera Phenomenon

The nadir of the Mexican variety of political “bioethics” is the muralist Diego “Iago” Rivera, one-time Trotsky enthusiast and subsequently a principal suspect in the assassination of Trotsky.

A page from Rivera’s own writings speaks for itself (see box [below]).

In respect to incidentals, one gains from this an insight into Rivera’s cannibalistic consumption of the body of his one-time adopted “father” Trotsky. In respect to broader questions of relevance for today, Rivera reveals the inner character of the tendency toward “nationalistic” admiration of the bestial Aztecs among parts of even the relatively best circles of leadership in Mexico today.

The occasional softness of even President López Portillo toward the cult of the evil Aztecs is an expression of the toleration of such modern accomplices of the Jesuit Jacques “Iago” Soustelle as the lower-case “riveristas” Carlos Fuentes and Octavio Paz. This softness prevents the Mexican leadership from effectively assessing and combatting the present-day, Jesuit-controlled Ayatollahs of the ongoing “Iranian destabilization” of Mexico.

The Truth about American Indians

Contrary to the present-day versions of the Columbus and Pilgrim Fathers mythologies, there was a steady traffic between Western Europe and North America over thousands of

years—an occasionally interrupted traffic, especially after the Norman Conquest, but one which had been revived by the Portuguese fishermen long before the first English settler arrived at the New England coast. Indeed, the Pilgrims passed by Portuguese settlements on Cape Cod and were greeted by “white Indians” who lent them considerable assistance, and other cooperation after the touch-down at Plymouth Rock. Similarly, the Scandinavian colonies in Newfoundland, dating from about the 11th century A.D. were part of a considerable colonization and intermarriage with native Indians by Scandinavian and Irish settlers, extending southward and into the water system centered upon the Great Lakes.

The notion that the indigenous peoples encountered by the Spanish and English settlements were in some respect a “natural” primitive culture, corresponding to some natural upward direction of selective evolution of cultures, is utter nonsense.

Apart from such commerce between Europe and America during the pre-1500 and pre-1600 Christian era periods, the testament of accredited American anthropology is in totality fraud compounded by fraud. On this point, the Mormon doctrine is the relative truth of the matter, and the official anthropologists are predominantly miseducated quacks.

Plato’s version of transatlantic commerce, supplemented by the golden historiographical plates turned up by the great Humboldt concerning trans-Pacific commerce, are massively verified by the available archeological and related evidence. On this subject, and on the related issue of Helgoland copper culture, British official anthropology occupies itself in hysterical, obsessive fits.

From some point buried within the pre-Christian era into the period of 16th- through 17th-century discovery, the history of the Americas is one of a long spiral of ebbs and flows toward degeneration of a once great civilization, into a vastly reduced population degenerated into pitiable forms of savagery.

For example, at about the same time that the hideous Confucian obscenity known as Chinese culture was developing out of the second century B.C. vast book-burning in China, a similar book-burning occurred in the area involving modern Peru. The indigenous Americans had had the use of the four-wheeled cart, but during some part of the Christian era, the existence of such carts was restricted by some ancient James R. Schlesingers and Ralph Naders (or “Ralph Nadirs”) to children’s toys!

All this is correlated with the existence of the transatlantic *atlan* language, as proven by philological studies of language groups on both sides of the Atlantic. The evidence of the trans-Pacific links to cultures which used to exist in ancient China is also indisputable.

The degenerate state of native American cultures at the time of the arrival of the European colonists is, as Plato warns us, a proof of the combined moral and material disaster which befalls even a great civilization if it permits itself to be plunged into a downward spiral of technological and moral devolution of the sort exemplified today by the UNO's Club of Rome and the "Brandt Commission."

The native American cultures degenerated into the Indian savageries admired by the anthropologists because those peoples lost the moral fitness to survive.

The great cultures seen in relics of the distant past of the Americas were not introductions from extraterrestrial visitors, but the relics of the achievements of ancient cultures which abandoned the moral fitness to survive. The evidence proves not that extraterrestrial visitors must have introduced such relics, but that, contrary to the British, and in agreement with Plato's reports in his *Timaeus* and *Critias*, the struggle of civilized man is more ancient than the lying British anthropologists are willing to have admitted.

It was Christian culture imported from Europe which restored civilization to the American continents. It was also, of course, the gnostic cultists, the Jesuits, who did more than any others to cause the contact with European culture to be as much genocidal to the indigenous peoples, as it has become otherwise predominantly beneficial to the state of civilization on these continents.

There, in a nutshell so to speak, we have a warning of the consequences for Mexico if its leading republican forces tolerate the Aztec cult-worship associated with the collaborators of the Jesuit fascist Jacques "Iago" Soustelle. To tolerate the embrace of an evil culture, the Aztec culture, a culture which expresses the moral and technological devolution of humanity, is to embrace so the Jesuit ayatollahs presently using the "Indian card" as spearhead of Zbigniew Brzezinski's effort to impose the "Iran model" of Paddock's proposed genocide upon the nation of Mexico.

A Mexico which tolerates admiration of Aztec culture is a Mexico which will be destroyed because it has lost connections to the moral fitness to survive.

BOX:

Who was Rivera?

In 1904, wishing to extend my knowledge of anatomy, a basic requisite of painting, I took a course in that subject in the Medical School in Mexico City. At that time, I read of an experiment which greatly interested me.

A French fur dealer in a Paris suburb tried to improve the pelts of animals by the use of a peculiar diet. He fed his animals, which happened to be cats, the meat of cats. On that diet, his cats grew bigger, and their fur became firmer and glossier....

At first the story of the enterprising furrier merely amused me, but I couldn't get it out of my mind. I discussed the experiment with my fellow students in the anatomy class, and we decided to repeat it and see if we got the same results. We did—and this encouraged us to extend the experiment and see if it involved a general principle for other animals, specifically human beings, by ourselves living on a diet of human meat.

Those of us who undertook the experiment pooled our money to purchase cadavers from the city morgue, choosing the bodies of freshly killed which were not diseased or senile. We lived on this cannibal diet for two months, and everyone's health improved.

During the time of our experiment, I discovered that I liked the legs and breasts of women, for as in other animals, these parts are delicacies. I also savored young women's breaded ribs. Best of all, however, I relished women's brains in vinaigrette.

I have never returned to the eating of human flesh, not out of squeamishness, but because of the hostility with which society looks upon the practice. Yet is this hostility entirely rational? We know it is not. Cannibalism does not necessarily involve murder. And human flesh is probably the most assimilable food available to man. Psychologically its consumption might do much to liberate him from deep-rooted complexes—complexes which can explode with the first accidental spark.

I believe that when man evolves a civilization higher than the mechanized but still primitive one he has now, the eating of human flesh will be sanctioned. For then man will have thrown off all of his superstitions and irrational taboos.

—Diego Rivera,
My Life, My Art