
Armenia

LaRouche: No nation can solve any problems within IMF conditionalities

The following exchange took place at the International Caucus of Labor Committees-Schiller Institute conference in Eltville, Germany on Dec. 10-11, between Hrant Kachatrian and Lyndon LaRouche. Mr. Kachatrian, a member of Armenia's parliament, is the chairman of the Union of Constitutional Law.

Q: During the last four years, we have become convinced that the Schiller Institute genuinely supports the aspirations of the Armenian people to restore the separated part of our homeland, and to restore its independent statehood. So far, however, the consolidation of humanist forces is going rather slowly, and during this time, Armenia is being turned into a testing ground for destructive International Monetary Fund policy. The ideological background for this is created by the broad propaganda of cosmopolitanism and the distorted concept of the allegedly common values of humanity, and phony liberalism. Therefore, what we are confronted with, is not temporary economic difficulties, but the genocide of an entire people. What we are confronted with, is not so much solving questions of development, but rather how, in a short time, to ensure that we even survive.

Posing the task in this way is dictated by the tactics of our struggle, in the process of which we have been forced to use a kind of romantic nationalism. In addition, some political parties have attempted to solve these national problems through geopolitical games involving the great powers, including Russia. We understand very well how outside forces can manipulate the national liberation struggle of our people for their own purposes. Therefore we are doing everything in our power to establish peace in our region on the basis of the independence of Nagorno Karabakh from Azerbaijan.

I have the following question for Mr. LaRouche: Do you see possibilities for better coordination of tactics among peoples sharing a common strategy?

LaRouche: I think we have been trying to do that this past weekend. It's obvious that the zeal for confining attention to practical solutions does not work, and could not work. We are dealing with nations which, individually, have no solution to their problems. There are abstractly possible solutions, but no practical solutions that could be affected by one nation alone. So, while on the one hand we insist on national

sovereignty, because spiritually, as well as in fact, it is good to have—it is good to have it spiritually if you cannot have it otherwise, because that enables you to think and function as a person who represents a sovereign nation—but there are no practical solutions available, even if you could design some, because the circumstances don't exist.

The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which are simply agencies of the British monarchy, have no good intention towards any nation. Their intention is a malicious one. The IMF and World Bank will never give any advice or accept any proposals which will do you any good. If you solicit or accept their advice, you are cutting your own nation's throat. Therefore as long as these institutions are supported, or the new GATT institutions, or others you are up against, the only practical question is: Do you have the military means to shoot these guys down, or are you going to be forced to submit? There is no way any nation can solve any problem within IMF conditionalities. You cannot continue to live without betraying your nation if you follow IMF conditionalities, even if you do it at the point of a gun. Under these conditions, there are *no* practical solutions.

Under the present international markets, dominated by London, there are no practical solutions. Do you have the power to bomb London? If you do not, you do not have a practical solution. Do we have the power to destroy London? Yes, we do. How? "Lemon" County gives an example. Let me explain how London exists.

When I was a younger man, it was conventional to speak of gangsters as people who lived on invisible earnings, who lived very well with no visible means of legal support. London under Mrs. Thatcher was turned from a bankrupt enterprise into a rubbish pile. She was a magician, a witch, and she has the broom slivers to prove it. . . . A very stupid woman, and very bad.

How do the British survive? Without industry, without agriculture, with people in the cities who are living more or less like rats, and have the cultural level and linguistic abilities of rats. They are so oppressed, so demoralized. There are parts of urban England in which the moral and intellectual condition of the people is poorer than in some of the most notorious black and Hispanic ghettos of the American cities.

How does a nation so worn out by Thatcherism have any control over the world economy today? The proud Londoner



Lyndon LaRouche and his wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at the December 1994 conference in Eltville, Germany. "Any nation that lines up with London against Clinton, is betraying itself. Not because Clinton is a great hero, but because this is the historically determined opportunity to get free of that which has been destroying us for a century."

will explain to you that London has its *invisible earnings*, which means it is one of the more conspicuous gangsters of the world. But the fact is, it is an empire, after all; it has a base in Singapore from which it's trying to conquer China with corruption. This is the agency that controls the United Nations—the one that owns George Bush and controls everything that's evil in the United States. This is the agency behind the reform policy in Russia, behind the one in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and so forth. It commits genocide in Africa, chaos and disruption in Central and South America, it is planning a civil war in China, and so forth. It's very much an empire of invisible earnings, centered not around the British people—they aren't getting the money—but rather the British monarchy and the institution called the Club of the Isles.

Ship of fools

They control the world not just with money but with folly. Russians believe in a certain historical truth which is nonexistent. Germans believe in historical truths which are nonexistent. The French believe that "Mitternich" expresses the national interest, although he has been a British agent most of his adult life. How can he express a French interest?

It's a miracle he can even speak French; he certainly can't think in it. In the United States, we have idiocy. The generation which followed mine was the product of the folly of my generation in producing their children. They are now running the United States. The President of the United States is a member of that generation. Same thing in Europe. The generation after them is practically illiterate: They can still read and write, but they don't know what the words mean. The generation after that is becoming more and more illiterate. We are being destroyed morally; in the words of Cotton Mather, we are *shrunk*.

They control us by controlling our folly. They have written the textbooks, the science books, entertainment. Why do you have rock music today? In the 1970s, what did you hear on the German radio? What did you hear in the 1980s? In the 1990s? When you passed a book shop, what kind of books did you see? In school, what texts did you study in the '60s, the '70s, the '80s? What was the quality of the teaching you had in the '60s? What are the ideas accepted and reflected in the newspapers or on television? In advertising? In the 1960s, if a Greenie had come out, what would you have done? You would have called for a psychiatrist; you would not have elected him to the Parliament. He would have been aberrant.