

LaRouches express solidarity with NATO ally Turkey

by Thierry Lalevée

A 72-hour visit to Ankara, Turkey, which began on July 28, by U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, chairwoman of the Schiller Institute, opened the way for better relations between the United States and Turkey, the most important country of NATO's Southern Flank. "Turkey has been a heroic nation since the times of Kemal Atatürk; it is an important state," said LaRouche in an interview with a Turkish paper. "I thought it important for some people of influence from the United States to come here and express solidarity with Turkey," he told another interviewer. "The strength of Turkey's economy, the stability of Turkey's culture, the influence of Turkish-Islamic culture throughout the entire region as a moderating force . . . are in the interest of the United States to protect."

During their stay, the LaRouches held a series of private discussions with Prime Minister Turgut Özal, Minister of Foreign Affairs Vahit Halefoğlu, Defense Minister Zaki Yavuztürk, and other officials. They also gave several interviews to Turkish publications, and visited the mausoleum dedicated to the founder of the modern Turkish state, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.

The visit concluded on July 30 with one of the best-attended press conferences ever in Ankara's Grand Hotel. More than 30 journalists, representing all of the Turkish media and numerous international agencies, gathered to hear LaRouche sum up his trip.

The visit occurred only a few hours after the departure from Ankara, for Athens, of U.S. Undersecretary of State Michael Armacost and State Department Cyprus specialist James Wilkinson. The timing of the LaRouche visit served to underline the message that Turkish officials wanted to send loud and clear to Washington. Armacost refused to make any commitments on any of the fundamental issues affecting the two countries, and especially on the economic and military assistance which had been cut by Congress.

As one journalist told LaRouche, as soon as his visit became known, by July 29, phones started to ring nonstop between the State Department and the U.S. embassy in Ankara, headed up by Ambassador Robert Strausz-Hupé, all express-



Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Özal (second from right) receives Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Ankara. LaRouche commented after the meeting: *Even if we had said nothing to one another, it would still have created an uproar in capitals around the world.*

ing shock and amazement at the visit. Networks and contacts were mobilized to find out what LaRouche was up to. Hours prior to the LaRouche press conference, his visit received front-page coverage in the Turkish press. On July 30, the daily *Hurriyet* announced, "LaRouche Meets with Özal, Hal-efoğlu", while the daily *Milliyet* announced that LaRouche had come to Turkey on "a fact-finding mission on American-Turkish relations and the situation of the Southern Flank of NATO."

LaRouche's press conference

We publish here the text of LaRouche's opening remarks at the July 30 press conference, followed by excerpts from the question and answer period. In our initial coverage of the visit last week, we selected highlights from LaRouche's interchange with the press concerning Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and the "Greek Lobby" in the United States. Now, we take up some of the other issues raised in the question period as well.

I cannot discuss what I said to Prime Minister Özal, the foreign minister or the defense minister, or in some private meetings. It would not be proper for me to discuss the contents of them. But the circumstances under which I am here, I can discuss and shall discuss.

But I would like to say first of all one thing, which, I think, many of you will understand, and I shall speak with as much delicacy . . . on the internal affairs of this country, for I do not want to meddle in the relations of this country's government to my State Department. However, as a pres-

idential candidate, I am free to say some things and I should say them. You understand me.

On the subject of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou: I have a dossier, which includes material on Andreas Papandreou, which covers a period of about 50 years. The name of this dossier is the name of one Michel Raptis, R-A-P-T-I-S, also known as Michel Pablo. Michel Pablo was for some time and still is supposed to be a leader of an international Trotskyist organization. He met Trotsky on the boat, coming out of Russia from exile in 1930. He has been the controller of Andreas Papandreou since the 1930s. Both of them come from Alexandria, Egypt, where George Papandreou was a British agent; Andreas is of a different nature.

In 1967, as you recall, as it always happens in postwar history of Greece, there was a Cyprus crisis. The way you change the government of Greece, is to have a Cyprus crisis. This led to the junta. Andreas Papandreou was left in Canada, sucking on whiskey bottles, which were temporarily full, at the time when he began sucking on them. The whiskey bottles were provided by Mr. Raptis and his organization. Mr. Raptis's organization was then known as the Greek Communist Party of the exterior, the KKE. This included people like George Votsis, the Arsenis brothers, Theodorakis, the actress Melina Mercouri, and others, who are now featured in the government of Mr. Papandreou. I knew at the time, that this organization, Mr. Papandreou's organization, was controlled by the Soviet KGB. Thus we know, that the government of Mr. Papandreou in Greece is controlled by the Soviet KGB, by a certain section. I don't

want to go into technical details.

We know, that we are now in the process of another round of attempted destabilization of the entire eastern Mediterranean, which includes the prospects of certain powers' attempts to create incidents, which would destabilize Cyprus as a part of a chain reaction in the Middle East. We also know, the same powers are involved in efforts to escalate a destabilization of Yugoslavia to create a new Balkan crisis. At this time, therefore, with a crisis in the Persian Gulf, Turkey is in the middle of a very dangerous situation in the Middle East. I thought it very important, particularly because of the confusion which temporarily exists in my own government, that presidential candidates of the United States, who put great value on the continued cooperation between Turkey and the United States, should if possible be present in Turkey to demonstrate, that there are some people who may be shaping the future foreign policy of the United States, who are committed to a close relationship to Turkey. That's the reason I'm here.

I wish other presidential candidates, who also believe in that policy, would also be here, to demonstrate the friendship of the future government of the United States to Turkey.

Ankara News Agency: Regarding your allegations against Mr. Papandreou, and knowing from what I have read in the United States, that you are very anti-Soviet, do you plan, in the future, to be a sort of spokesman for Turkish interests in the United States?

LaRouche: No, not particularly. Not as a lobbyist for Turkey. I would represent, to the degree I'm able to, as a U.S. political figure, I would represent what I understand to be Turkey's interests, in a sense that the United States must understand Turkish interests, as it must understand also those of every other nation in the world. And the United States must recognize certain things which are in Turkey's interest, *because* they are in Turkey's interest, are in the interest of the United States. For example, let me get very concrete in this respect.

Everybody knows about the military question. So I don't have to concentrate on that. People are talking about military questions too much these days. In war and conflict, 80% or 90% of even a full-scale war, of the effort, is not lethal force; 80% or 90% of the effort in war or guerrilla war is devoted to cultural efforts, political efforts, economic efforts. . . . But the problem is, that even where people in the United States understand Turkey's military needs, we do not understand adequately, that Turkey has cultural needs in the region, has political interests in the region, has economic interests in the region. The strength of Turkey's economy, the stability of Turkey's culture, the influence of Turkish-Islamic culture throughout the entire region as a moderating force—throughout a region that is being destabilized by what is called Islamic fundamentalism—is in the interest of the United States to protect. . . .

Yes, everybody is talking about the fact that we don't ship weapons, or we don't supply this kind or that of military aid. I agree that we are derelict in that. But where we are really derelict, is in this 80-90% culture, politics, economics. And our government has recently not understood the importance of culture, politics, and economics in the strategic equation.

Toronto Star: What is your position on the Queen and drugs, and the IMF [International Monetary Fund] and AIDS?

LaRouche: You throw out a lot of questions all at once. They're not a package, they're all quite different. . . .

The only question on AIDS, is that it is being misrepresented as a sexual disease. It is not a sexual disease. It is a blood disease, transmitted by one of several varieties of human-specific retroviruses. The thing is rapidly evolving, so we don't know how many more we're going to be getting. The disease spreads, as any other highly deadly communicable disease spreads. If you add up all the vectors involved in spreading AIDS, you come down to the fact that poor nutrition and poor sanitation and poor conditions of public health in general are the factor in spreading AIDS.

So it comes down to the same old thing as with diphtheria, or any other highly communicable deadly disease. The dirtier the area, the more poorly fed the people, the poorer the medical services, the greater the spread of the disease. And in a tropical disease belt, where the factors are bad, then you have a lightning spread of the disease. If you live in a modern industrialized country or, like here, in the upland, with decent sanitation, and you are well fed, you are less likely to catch the disease.

The policies of conditionalities of the IMF, which have gone beyond the normal rights of lenders and have gone into areas which were taken up in Shakespeare's "Merchant of Venice," of looking for the pound of flesh and blood together, of nations, by dictating their policies to them, have imposed upon developing-sector nations, in particular black African nations, conditions which have fostered the spread of all kinds of epidemics, as well as famine conditions.

A state of affairs now exists in black Africa, that probably within the first generation of the next century, the black African population could very well be extinct from a combination of about three varieties of AIDS, or three species of AIDS infection, and various other kinds of diseases. Among the urban educated strata of a number of black African countries, we have 30% infected! This is among professionals, military professionals, and so forth. Thirty percent infected! This means that these countries are doomed, biologically doomed, and while AIDS is not caused by the IMF, IMF conditionalities and similar conditions have brought about conditions of famine and epidemics, which have fostered the spread of AIDS. People are dying of AIDS who would not have died of AIDS, but for these kinds of conditions.

It's an old principle—some Calvinists don't agree with me, particularly radical Calvinists, and of course those who don't agree with me believe in Adam Smith, who of course, was one of the first drug lobbyists. But I believe that we are, each of us, accountable to God for the condition of mankind. And we are specifically accountable to God for those actions or omissions which are within our power, such that if I adopt or support a policy which leads to increasing the death rate in a certain country, I am as guilty of murder as Adolf Hitler, because I should have known better.

And when the IMF demands conditionalities policies, which impose upon countries increased death rates, through poverty and lack of sanitation, then I say the IMF, and the IMF officials involved, are going to have to face the standard of Nuremberg. They are officials. They should have known and could have known that the policies they promote create increased death rates in developing countries. And therefore, as we say in the United States, they are as guilty as hell, in that sense.

I find nothing ridiculous in that. As a matter of fact, I would find it criminal and immoral for anyone to deny that the IMF is fostering the spread of AIDS. Because we have the history of public health, in European history, which shows us that whoever supports policies like the IMF conditionalities policies is a mass-murderer in that specific sense, as Adolf Hitler. . . .

Washington Post: Are you planning to visit other countries? Are you on a swing through the area?

LaRouche: I do not play this kind of game, like the other candidates. You know, when they call the other Democratic Party candidates the Seven Dwarfs, I think it's an insult to dwarfs! I do not believe in these kinds of relations, I'm a serious statesman. I came here, because I thought there are certain countries that I have to visit, but it is on very specific business. I am in no sense on a general swing, and I do not believe in those kind of publicity stunts. Besides, it is much more fun for me to do things quietly, and let people find out that I have done it afterward, as in this case, than to run these publicity stunts.

Don't you realize, what fun it is? The prime minister and I meet, we are sitting in a room and we realize that if we had said nothing, we would cause a turmoil in capitals; the Soviet government would be asking questions; other people, news people, would be asking questions; we could have sat there and said nothing to each other, and we could have the greatest fun imaginable. And I do think that way, as you may have divined in following earlier aspects of my travel.

No, there is no general plan. I have a number of specific countries that I should visit during the course of the summer, but it is on very specific, concrete pieces of business. This thing came up because, as I indicated in my opening statement, there is a very special situation here, and I thought

somebody ought to stand up on their hind legs and say, "Well, there are some people in the United States who believe in the Turkish relationship."

Anatolian News Agency: You have called for an increase in American presence in Turkey. Would you also like to see American radio stations operating in this country?

LaRouche: No, radio stations and TV stations, no. I think our radio and TV are terrible! I think it would do damage to the cultural. . . .

Anatolian News Agency: No, I mean operating in this country, but broadcasting for the Soviet Union. . . .

LaRouche: Don't let me mislead you with my answer. You see, I don't think that the United States ought to have an empire. I don't believe in empires. Anybody who wants to start an empire, is going to have a lot of trouble with me. I don't like empires. I believe in a system of sovereign nation-states. As far as I am concerned, I don't want the United States dictating to the government of any other country what its policies should be—except to enemy countries. If an enemy country wants to attack the United States, then I'll dictate, like we do to Mr. Khomeini, that there are certain things that we won't put up with.

But a legitimate country, it should do everything for itself. I don't want more U.S. military forces here, unless Turkey wishes them to assist them. I don't want more U.S. presence here, in terms of corporate or government presence, unless the Turkish government requires that, as a friend requiring of a friend, some kind of cooperation.

I'm concerned with Turkey, in particular, to strengthen Turkey's ability to take care of all of its own problems. But we, as the United States, have the right and obligation to offer Turkey technology transfers, for example, capital equipment, access to modern technologies, the favorable conditions of borrowing for projects which are necessary for Turkey's future, things of that sort, and to assist Turkey in various ways. I think we should have an increased U.S. presence, but not an increased imperial presence, but an increased U.S. cooperative presence in the region.

Turkish journalist: Where will you be traveling from here?

LaRouche: Oh, I'll go back to Europe, back to Germany, perhaps—never know where I'll turn up, from week to week over the course of the summer. I've got a full intensive schedule of campaigning in the United States, beginning after Labor Day of this year—the first Monday in September—so I'll be in the United States, and I'll be campaigning—my style—not like the other fellows, who are mostly running as stand-ins for Ted Kennedy. Gephardt is running for Kennedy, Dukakis is running for Kennedy, Gore is running for Armand Hammer!

But anyway, I'll be out there, talking to American citizens, as a presidential candidate is supposed to.