

[NYHEDSORIENTERING APRIL-MAJ 2020:](#) [Menneskehedens eksistens afhænger af](#) [et nyt paradigme nu!](#)

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

[Schiller-Konference – En ny måde at](#) [tænke på bringer verden sammen for et](#) [Nyt Paradigme](#)

Den 27. april (EIRNS) – Efter det vestlige finanssystems sammenbrud i 2008, præsenterede Lyndon LaRouche de nødforanstaltninger, påkrævede for at gøre en ende på den britisk imperiale finanspolitik, som skabte boblen til at begynde med, men advarede om at kun en kombination af verdens fire største nationer – Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA – i et fælles samarbejde kunne skabe den nye finansielle arkitektur, der kunne erstatte det bankerotte, monetære system, centreret i City of London og Wall Street. Disse forslag blev afvist til fordel for massive redningsaktioner af "too big to fail"-bankerne, som forårsagede skabelsen af en boble dobbelt så stor i dag – omtrent 2 billiarder \$, for det meste af værdiløs derivat-spillegæld. Denne idioti blev forenet med indførelsen af ondskabsfulde nedskæringer i de transatlantiske nationer samt i udviklingssektoren i Afrika og Sydamerika.

I denne sidste weekend afholdt Schiller Instituttet en todages konference med titlen "[Menneskehedens Eksistens afhænger nu af Skabelsen af et Nyt Paradigme!](#)" Over 2500 personer skønnes at have deltaget i konferencen over internettet gennem de to dage, fra over 55 lande fra Europa, Asien, Afrika, og Amerika. Mandag eftermiddag var det samlede antal seere af det første panel på YouTube allerede oppe på 5300. Blandt de mere end 40 talere, blev hovedtalerne givet af grundlæggeren af Schiller Instituttet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den første permanente stedfortrædende repræsentant for den Russiske Føderation til FN og af Folkerepublikken Kinas generalkonsul i New York. Kombinationen af disse taler demonstrerede både muligheden, og den presserende nødvendighed, for at "Østen" og "Vesten" kan arbejde sammen for at gøre en ende på den imperiale opdeling af

verden i stridende blokke, og for at takle de eksistentielle trusler som nu konfronterer menneskeheden, både i form af coronaviruset og i form af finanskatastrofen udløst af pandemien.

Over 200 spørgsmål blev indsendt i løbet af konferencen, fra flere afrikanske og sydamerikanske ambassadører, fra landmænd, fra politikere, og fra patrioter og borgere rundt om i verden. Talerne blev oversat til adskillige sprog.

Det fungerede, fordi konferencen demonstrerede en anderledes måde at tænke på, i modsætning til den geopolitiske nul-sums-tæknings atomiserede, usammenhængende strukturer, påduttet af imperiets medier og korrupte uddannelsesinstitutioner. I stedet blev de fire paneler – om strategi, videnskab, klassisk kultur og fysisk økonomi – præsenteret som en "Enhed", på den måde som var tilsigtet af de tænkere, hvis idéer skabte historiens største nationer – Platon, Konfutse, Nicolaus Cusanus og Gottfried Leibniz, som alle indså at "Enheden" er større end summen af de enkelte dele.

Verden vil aldrig blive den samme efter COVID-19-pandemien. "Årsagen" til pandemien kan ikke skjules bag "Kina-Kina-Kina"-hysteriet (en genafspilning af den forfejlede "Rusland-Rusland-Rusland"-kampagne, som forsøgte at fjerne Donald Trump fra embedet, og sabotere hans forsøg på at etablere venskabelige relationer med Rusland og Kina). Årsagen var ikke et land eller en person, men ødelæggelsen af det Amerikanske System efter mordet på John Kennedy, og de 50 års nedskæringer, som ødelagde både Vestens og udviklingssektorens infrastruktur og industrier – og specielt nedlæggelsen af de offentlige sundhedsvæsen, for at maksimere profitten for de Wall Street-firmaer, der kontrollerede de private sygehusselskaber.

Men verden blev også forandret for altid af denne historiske Schiller Institut-konference. En "bestemt tone" har lydt, i dette Beethoven-år, og den tone genlyder internationalt, resonerer med den Nye Silkevej og med den nødvendige fremkomst af en Ny Bretton Woods-konference, ledt af Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, Narendra Modi og Donald Trump, og andre velmenende ledere, for at erstatte imperiets og de geopolitiske kriges afdankede idéer én gang for alle, og etablere et nyt retfærdigt kreditsystem, dedikeret til at give hvert barn på denne Jord en mulighed for at udvikle hendes eller hans iboende kreative potentiale til fulde.

Vi opfordrer alle, som læser denne rapport, til at blive medlemmer af [Schiller Instituttet](#), og til at købe det første bind (af dusinvis, hvis ikke hundredvis, af kommende bind) af *Lyndon LaRouches Samlede Værker*, udgivet denne uge af [Stiftelsen for LaRouches Eftermæle](#).

Panel 2: “For en bedre forståelse af hvordan vores univers fungerer”

Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference den 25. april 2020

Talere på panel 2: Jason Ross, ordstyrer, LaRouches videnskabelige Team; Megan Beets, LaRouches videnskabelige Team; Ben Denniston, LaRouches videnskabelige Team; Jean-Pierre Luminet, ph.d., astrofysiker, forsker emeritus ved National Center for Scientific Research; Michel Tognini, astronaut, Association of Space Explorers, stiftende medlem; Walt Cunningham, Apollo Astronaut; Marie Korsaga, ph.d., astrofysiker, Burkina Faso; senator Joe Pennacchio, New Jersey State, sponsor af Fusion Energy Resolutionen; Will Happer, ph.d., professor emeritus i fysik, Princeton University; Guangxi Li, M.D., ph.d., Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing

Videoarkiv af Panel 2, se <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x0LZ-2CcXiY>.

Panel 2 i Schiller Instituttets historiske konferencer bar titlen: “For en bedre forståelse af hvordan vores univers fungerer”. Det var en vidtrækkende international drøftelse om anvendelse af menneskelig kreativitet, videnskab og teknologi til forbedring af menneskehedens vilkår gennem samarbejde mellem nationer. Ordstyrer Jason Ross åbnede med at sige, at spørgsmålet om at skabe et globalt sundhedssystem, som grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har opfordret til, burde overvejes mere bredt som en del af et strategisk forsvar for menneskeslægten. Ross optrådte sammen med sine kolleger fra LaRouche PAC’s Videnskabelige Team, Megan Beets og Benjamin Deniston, der uddybede Lyndon LaRouches perspektiv for, hvordan man udfører denne målsætning.

Deniston henviste til det russiske forslag fra 2011 om et ‘strategisk forsvar af jorden’ (SDJ), hvilket var en åbenlys reference til det forslag, som præsident Ronald Reagan fremsatte i 1983, kaldet Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Lyndon LaRouche er kendt for at være ophavsmanden til denne Reagan-politik og

for at have foretaget 'bagdørsforhandlinger' med Sovjetunionen for at opnå en aftale. Men andre mennesker kæmpede også for deres egen version af SDI – ofte for at undergrave LaRouches forslag. Deniston definerede LaRouches SDI som et videnskabs-drivende program, ligesom John F. Kennedys Apollo-projekt, der skulle hjælpe med at udvikle begge nationers svigtende økonomier, og, i processen med samarbejdet at afslutte den geopolitiske kløft, der blev påtvunget af den britiske 'del og hersk'-operation. Denne reference til betydningen af internationalt samarbejde og at skubbe grænserne for menneskelig viden blev et kritisk tema for panelet. Et videoklip præsenterede Lyndon LaRouches egen beskrivelse af konceptet.

Megan Beets udviklede, hvordan SDI-konceptet ville involvere aspekter af rummets indflydelse på vejret og klima samt et forsvar imod store soludbrud og solpletter. Beets og Deniston tog også andre spørgsmål vedrørende asteroide- og kometforsvar op, langvarige cyklusser i solsystemet og galakserne og hvordan disse spiller ind på arters uddøen, samt hvordan det kan spille ind på livscyklussen af vira. Ross påpegede endvidere, at dette at tolerere at blive holdt som gidsel af et virus eller af en fejlslagen økonomisk politik virkelig er et spørgsmål om tragedie – at undlade at befri os for fejlslagne aksiomer.

Jean-Pierre Luminet, Ph.d., astrofysiker og forsker emeritus ved Frankrigs Nationale Center for Videnskabelig Forskning, tog spørgsmålet om videnskabelig tænkning op i sin præsentation: "Frie Opfindelsers Rolle i kreativ Opdagelse." Luminet leverede sit syn på videnskabens udvikling fra oldtiden til Kepler, Einstein og moderne teorier, men understregede, at gennembrud mere var beslægtet med kunstneriske udtryk.

Luminet blev efterfulgt af to tidligere astronauter, Michel Tognini og Walt Cunningham. Tognini er brigadegeneral i det franske luftvåben, og tidligere astronaut hos både CNES og ESA, og kan tælle tilsammen 19 dage i rummet på den internationale rumstation, ombord på både Columbia og Soyuz. Tognini er et stiftende medlem af Association of Space Explorers (Selskabet af Rumforskere, *red.*), der har medlemmer fra 38 lande, og han redegjorde for nogle af sine oplevelser i sin præsentation: "Venskab mellem astronauter: en eksemplarisk præcedens for internationalt samarbejde." Tognini blev fulgt af den tidligere NASA-astronaut Walt Cunningham, der fløj på Apollo 7-missionen. Cunningham beskrev, hvordan han på radioen lyttede til opsendelsen af Alan Shepard, og efter at have kørt ind til siden for at høre nedtællingen, udbrød "Lucky S.O.B.!" ('lucky son of a bitch', eller 'heldige kartoffel', *red.*) 18 måneder senere delte han kontor med Shepard.

Astrofysiker Dr. Marie Korsaga fra Burkina Faso behandlede spørgsmålet om

"Nødvendigheden af videnskabsuddannelse for afrikansk ungdom". Hun beskrev det faktum, at 40 % af Afrikas befolkning er under 15 år, hvilket vil være eksplosivt i de kommende år – godt eller dårligt, afhængigt af om denne 'skat' opdyrkes med uddannelse og økonomisk udvikling. Hun delte også sine refleksioner vedrørende kvinder inden for videnskab i Afrika, hvor hun desværre er en af få.

Senator fra New Jersey (2008 – nu), Joe Pennacchio, gentog Korsagas appel om en fremtid for ungdommen i sin præsentation: "Making Nuclear Fusion a Reality" (Gør fusionsenergi til virkelighed). Pennacchio er ophavsmand til et lovforslag i New Jersey, der kræver udvikling af fusionskraft. Han sagde, at han kæmper for fusionskraft for de kommende generationer.

Will Happer, professor emeritus i fysik ved Princeton University, som også har tjent i præsident Trumps nationale sikkerhedsråd, gav sine indsigter vedrørende kampen om klimaforandringer, og beskrev den som en "kultrigion", eftersom dens tilhængere endog nægter at debattere det. Happer beskrev, hvordan mange videnskabelige opdagelser er sket gennem "uheld", idet forskere har fundet, at deres eksperimenter ikke gav de forventede resultater, hvilket tvang dem til at komme med et højere ordens begreb om universets love for at forklare det uventede resultat. Dette fremprovokerede en hel del diskussion under den livlige spørgerunde.

Dr. Kildare Clarke, en læge fra New York, delte sin indsigt i implikationerne af afviklingen af det offentlige sundhedssystem i USA gennem privatisering. Dr. Clarke har i årtier arbejdet med LaRouche-bevægelsen om dette spørgsmål, der går tilbage til den af LaRouche ledede kamp for at redde D.C. General Hospital fra lukning i 1990'erne.

Clarke blev efterfulgt af Guangxi Li, M.D., ph.d. fra det kinesiske akademi for medicinske videnskaber i Beijing og ved Mayo-Klinikken. Li præsenterede sin succes med at bruge traditionel kinesisk urtemedicin i behandlingen af COVID-19 i tidlige stadier, som han beskrev som anderledes end andre virale lungebetændelser.

Det historiske panel afsluttedes med en spørgerunde, der berørte spørgsmål om vigtigheden af, at internationalt samarbejde skaber muligheder for unge til at deltage i videnskabelige gennembrud og gøre en ende på de mislykkede aksiomer, der har bragt os til kanten af denne faktiske mørke tidsalder.

Panel 2: For a Better Understanding of How Our Universe Functions Saturday,

April 25, 2002 With Jason Ross, Megan Beets, and Ben Deniston

[incomplete transcript] JASON ROSS: Hello! Welcome back to this Schiller Institute International Conference. This is Panel 2 in the afternoon on Saturday. If you're watching this on YouTube, you can find a link to the conference webpage in the video description. My name is Jason Ross, and I am a many-year collaborator with Lyndon LaRouche and the lead co-author on the Schiller Institute's recent draft program on addressing the COVID-19 pandemic entitled, "LaRouche's Apollo Mission to Defeat the Global Pandemic; Build a World Health System Now!" This panel will be a real treat. We are going to bringing together astronauts, astrophysicists, and other top scientists, as well as a physician, to gain a deeper insight into the role of science in the advancement of the human species and a deeper idea about the essence of what science itself actually is. After the presentations, and perhaps during them, there will be time for discussion. You can participate in that discussion. You can do so by sending your questions or brief thoughts to us at questions@schillerinstitute.org. We will definitely not be able to address every question that comes our way. We have received 50 or so, so far this morning. Apologies is we are not able to get to your question. We will be forwarding them to speakers afterwards so that they can respond if they'd like to. If your question is directed towards a particular one of the panelists, please indicate that in your question. We will begin with a discussion of the global health system that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had brought up in her keynote, considered from the broadest possible perspective – the strategic defense of the human species. The speakers for this first presentation will be Ben Deniston, Megan Beets, and myself. We're also seeing Michele Tognini, who will be speaking after that. Ben, Megan, and I titled our talk "In Defense of the Human Species". At present, the planet is being plagued by a tiny piece of RNA – just 30,000 base pairs long – that's causing pandemonium, keeping us hostage in our homes. Just this tiny bit of RNA in a drop of oil with some protein sticking out. With all of the uncertainty that there has been around this disease – about how to treat it, how to prevent it, what measures are appropriate, what measures aren't, controversy about masks. There's a lot of ideas going around that aren't correct, and we'll discover that in due time. But, let's talk about not just the missed opportunities to prevent this disease in particular, but what about the missed opportunities not to more quickly start producing masks, but what have we done over the past decades that has left us susceptible to a world in which we are held hostage by a virus? Over 50 years ago, human beings left the Earth and set foot on the Moon; forever expanding the horizon of the possible. Seventy-five years ago, the atom yielded to scientific thought, offering a bounty of energy many orders of magnitude greater than what could be provided by molecular or chemical means, such as coal, oil, gas. And definitely beyond what can be

provided by physical means such as windmills or waterwheels. Over 100 years ago, human minds became aware of the existence of a new astonishing world of quantum phenomena, and began to forge ideas to comprehend and make use of this domain, as well as the realization that what we thought were space and time, energy and matter, were not distinct categories, but had a connection between them that was previously unknown. Over 400 years ago, Johannes Kepler created modern physical science through his faith in the power of human ideas to comprehend the causes of nature. Stepping beyond appearances, he hypothesized for the first time what made the planets move. So, how could such a species be held hostage by a virus? For that, we have to examine not the great successes of science, including those just mentioned, but the failures of science and of culture more generally that have allowed us to be prey to false and ugly axioms of thought that have plagued us for millennia. The most crucial concepts we have as human beings are those respecting our humanity; what we are as a human species. What we are capable of, and what our relationship to nature is. Consider two contrasting outlooks of the human species. On the one side, there is the view that the human mind is made in the image of God, and therefore coheres with creation in such a way that our ideas have the power of physical forces to unlock ever-improving knowledge of the world around us. Or, the idea that the human mind does not really exist. Free will is a delusion, as our brains – being biochemical in nature – are governed by the laws of physics; which we will one day be able to explain, at least in potential. We'll be able to explain our thoughts and decisions. Human thought can be replicated by a mechanical system; true artificial intelligence is possible. One view says that human beings are a remarkable species. Unlike any other form of life, we can improve our living from generation to generation; increasing in number and in quality. We can improve nature beyond the state that it happens to have at the present. On the other view, some people say that humanity is a horrible species. That what sets us apart from all other life is that we destroy ecosystems, drive species to extinction, and destroy the planet with our excessive numbers. We must end growth and return to nature, according to these people. One view holds that we create resources by the power of our minds. Whereby uranium, which was just a rock, becomes a useful fuel by the fact that we have learned how to unlock its atomic, nuclear potential. On the other side is the view that we are consumers of resources. That we gorge ourselves in a relentless pursuit of material comfort. One view is that humanity is the most beautiful species. That the world needs more people. The other view is that humanity is the worst species, and that the world should have fewer people. Most of us have varieties of both types of these thoughts echoing in our minds to some degree. Lyndon LaRouche and the Schiller Institute maintain the first outlook of growing creativity and beauty, of growing humanity. That this is true in science, in culture, and in art. Recognizing the conflict between these two paradigms, Lyndon LaRouche saw the coronavirus coming. Not in its particulars,

but as a potential. And he said what to do about it. The Schiller Institute saw this coming in potential, and we said what to do about it. Today, we have the coronavirus on our minds, but we are susceptible every day to a variety of horrors against which we and the Earth have no current defense. Other viruses, the dangerous drawdown of ground water, a comet striking our planet, the Sun throwing off a coronal mass ejection and destroying half of our planet's power grid. Or even the seemingly simple task in some of the developed countries of having clean water and proper sanitation for the over 2 billion of our fellow human beings who lack reliable access to improved water and sanitation. Or insects; consider the plague of locusts currently spreading. In the immediate sense, we need a global health system; a response to the COVID-19 pandemic. But we need much more. We must go beyond a group of medical experts with a few technicians that can be sent around the world. We need the resources, the commitment, and the intention to ensure that around the world, we have the global economic infrastructure required for a robust health infrastructure. Talking about handwashing where there is no running water is a cruel joke. Telling people to stay at home when they rely on their daily work to pay for their daily bread; this simply doesn't function. How do we address the fact that the world is in this condition? We have put forward a preliminary proposal on how to do this. It is posted on the Schiller Institute site, and you can find it by searching for its title – LaRouche's Apollo Mission to Defeat the Global Pandemic: Build a World Health System Now! But, let's now seem to leave behind our worldly cares. Let's reflect on our fundamental beliefs about the human species, and let's do it from the standpoint of the heavens; full both of promise and of peril. Let's look down on ourselves from that standpoint to get the broadest sense of what would be a strategic defense of the Earth, a strategic defense of the human species.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. The term "Strategic Defense of Earth" specifically was first floated in the Russian press in 2011, for people who are not familiar with it. It was absolutely a direct reference to the Strategic Defense Initiative, the SDI, which was the Reagan-era proposal for a joint missile defense system between the US and the USSR to end the threat of Mutually Assured Destruction [MAD]. For many people around the world, Lyndon LaRouche is perhaps most famously known for his leading role in promoting his notion of the SDI. Also, his key position as a back channel between the US and Soviet governments at the time. However, while that is somewhat known, and Mr. LaRouche is somewhat famous for that, not everyone shared the same idea for how the SDI was supposed to be implemented. It is critical for us to emphasize Mr. LaRouche's unique conception for his SDI program, and illustrate how this core principle is as valid today with the Strategic Defense of Earth, as it was in the 1980s. This policy is derived from a scientific principle, a scientific assessment

expressing the current stage of the long-term development of the human species. Mr. LaRouche's SDI program was not merely about defensive systems to prevent thermonuclear war. It was also about establishing the necessary political and economic policies to ensure lasting stable peace; to ensure durable survival generations into the future. There's probably nothing better than to let Mr. LaRouche state this in his own words. We have a brief clip from an address Mr. LaRouche in September 2000 – 20 years ago now – to a Schiller Institute conference.

LYNDON LAROUCHE:

This is the policy which became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. Now, the important thing is to understand what the original SDI was. Contrary to the idiocy which you hear in the press today about missile defense—what you hear in the press is idiocy, by people who are worse than idiots; they don't know anything about missile defense... I said, what we have to do is something completely different. We do have the ability to devise systems, new kinds of physical systems, which could deal effectively with thermonuclear missiles – that is, render them effectively, technologically obsolete, down the line. But that was not the extent of my proposal. The proposal was that, instead of having the Soviet Union and the United States engage in this crazy chicken game, called SALT I and ABM, why don't we find a way out of the conflict itself? How? Because the Soviet economy, like the U.S. economy, is collapsing. The present policies of the U.S. economy, the present policies of the Soviet economy, ensure a {collapse} of those economies, physical collapse. So, why don't we change the policy? Why don't we go back to the space program of Kennedy, and let's do what we proved with Kennedy? Remember, according to the estimates that were made in the middle of the 1970s, the United States got more than a dime of additional GNP out of every penny the United States invested in the space program, the Kennedy space program. The point is, that since increases in productivity come directly, only, from improvements in technology derived from fundamental scientific discoveries, the higher the rate you convert fundamental physical discoveries into practice, the greater the rate of increase of productivity per capita of population, and per square kilometer of area. The problem of both the Soviet system and our own, although in different degrees, I said at the time, was that the United States was not generating a rate of net growth in physical productivity, sufficient to maintain the economy. Therefore, we needed a program for forced draft, science-driven technological progress, with some mission, like the Moon mission, but as a byproduct of that mission, such as the Moon mission, we would generate spillovers in terms of technological progress, by such a crash, to put the United States economy back on the plus side, in terms of net

growth. The Soviet economy does not work for similar reasons, different, but similar reasons. Therefore, if the Soviet Union, with its vast military-scientific technological capability, were to put that capability, in cooperation with us, in global technological progress, and if we focussed upon developing countries – South America, Africa, Asia – to do what Roosevelt proposed be done for these countries, had he not died, then the benefit of such a program would put – two things: would put the two economies back on the plus side, together with Europe; and it would also be a way of creating a global agenda which would solve the conflict problem. Now, that was the SDI, in original form...[end video]

DENISTON: So, obviously today we no longer have a conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States, but as we've been discussing in this conference, other geopolitical tensions have clearly emerged. LaRouche's core policy, {his SDI policy} is just as valid and necessary today. As Jason discussed in his opening, mankind has seen tremendous growth over the past few hundred years, and that is a relatively miniscule amount of time compared the history of our planet, our Solar System, the biosphere, our galaxy, and so on; a very short period of time. And only in the past 100 years has mankind entered into a new historical phase, in which the same technological capabilities and scientific discoveries which have brought tremendous growth and tremendous progress, have also created a new historical situation, in which mankind now technologically has the capability to annihilate itself through war and conflict. Mankind can no longer allow, not just full-scale military conflicts among nations as we've seen before, but we can no longer tolerate the political and economic preconditions which lead to those conflicts, as Mr. LaRouche outlined. So, an historical change is needed, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche has led the discussion in raising the need for a shift to a New Paradigm, as she has defined it. But, this relatively new historical period mankind finds himself in, defined by this new capability, comes with another more profound aspect. What do we really know about life on this planet, in our galaxy, and in this universe? We can know one thing for certain, the vast majority of all species of animal life that have existed on this planet, are no longer here. Estimates are that over 99% of all species of animal life that have emerged on this planet in our evolutionary record, have gone extinct – over 5 billion species, gone. Interestingly, we have evidence that this extinction process, this evolutionary process is not simply a planetary process, or even Solar System process, but somehow involves our Galaxy as well. 500 million years of records of species origination and extinction exhibit a cyclical pattern that matches our periodic changing relation to our Galaxy. There are very interesting studies pointing at this, indicating that the evolution of life on Earth is somehow also expressing some galactic influence, or is expressing some form of galactic process. This extinction principle is an undeniable fact of the evolutionary development of the biosphere. Under that

principle alone, with no other intervening factors, you can guarantee that all existing species of animal life on the planet today are also going to go extinct at some point in the future, as the evolutionary process continues. There's only one scientific exception that we know of, one distinction, one form of life that expresses anything distinct from and transcending this principle of the biosphere. That is the existence of mankind, uniquely expressing a distinct power of creativity, as Lyndon LaRouche has uniquely defined a scientific understanding of human creativity. This is not seen in any form of animal life. The same science and technologies which give us the ability to destroy ourselves in conflict – the potential to wipe out our entire species on this planet – also provides the ability for mankind to be the only species on this planet which transcends and moves beyond the limits of the biosphere; which defeats the extinction principle. As Mr. LaRouche used to often say, mankind is the only potentially immortal species, if he chooses to fulfill that destiny. So, in the spirit of LaRouche's SDI, years later, decades later, we are discussing the evolution of that same core policy, now in the form of the Strategic Defensive Earth. A policy to erode the economic and political causes underlying conflict through joint science-driver and technology sharing programs focussed on addressing the common threats facing all mankind. So, just as the SDI was designed to unite the leading powers of the planet against the common threats of thermonuclear missiles, the Strategic Defense of the Earth is intended to unite mankind against the common threats which all inhabitants of this planet inherently face: from space weather, to asteroid strikes; from cosmic climate change, to comet impacts; from pandemics, to catastrophic earthquakes and volcanism, mankind is unavoidably united in dealing with the dangers inherent to living on this small planet, subject to the influences of our Solar System, and Galaxy beyond.

MEGAN BEETS: I'd like to pick up from here, and I'd like to begin by talking for a little bit about the weather. We tend to think of the weather – including dangerous extreme weather events – as a local phenomenon. If we're a bit more astute, we realize it is actually a planetary phenomenon, with weather events on one part of the globe affecting those on another. In reality, there is nothing local or even merely planetary about the weather. Our Earth and the other planets in the solar system swim in an environment created by the Sun. One feature of that environment is the solar wind, which is a constant flux of charged particles streaming out from the Sun, which creates the interplanetary magnetic field, and modulates Earth's magnetic field. Why is this important? Because the Sun is a dynamic body; it is changing! And we are mere babies in our understanding of it. For example: Approximately every eleven years, the Sun goes through a cycle of increasing and decreasing activity, during which time the polarity of the Sun's magnetic field completely flips. We track the solar cycle

by the number and polarity of sunspots, which if we pull up the first slide [Fig. 1], you can see as the dark areas on the Sun's surface, which are sites of intense magnetic activity. Here [Fig. 2], you see a chart of the number of sunspots over time going back to the early 1600s when they were first observed, showing a clear 11-year cycle of maximum and minimum. However, not every solar cycle is the same, and there are longer-period cycles of very low lows, called Grand Minima, in which almost no sunspots appear for a prolonged period, and very high highs, periods of Grand Maxima. What I want to talk about here for a moment is, I want to talk about the periods of solar maximum, when the Sun is its most active. Two space weather phenomena that occur as part of this intense activity of the Sun are solar flares and coronal mass ejections. If we go to the next slide [Fig. 3], we see on the left here, an image of a solar flare from NASA's SDO satellite; and on the right, you see a coronal mass ejection. Solar flares are intense flashes of energy occurring on the Sun's surface which release bursts of electromagnetic radiation. Coronal mass ejections, or CMEs, are often associated with solar flares, and as opposed to the flares, they fling large clouds of plasma, charged particles, out into space; some of which are directed at the Earth. While the energy from flares can disrupt radio communications on and near the Earth, CMEs are something much more dangerous. When a CME strikes Earth, it can induce an oscillation in the Earth's magnetic field, causing a geomagnetic storm. These storms can be mild, and they create the auroras, which are lovely. But, they can also be severe. And if they're severe, they have the potential to induce currents in electrical infrastructure. They can blow out transformers, causing black-outs in the electrical grid of an entire hemisphere of the Earth which receives the CME strike. With our current capabilities, we would not have the ability to repair that for several months, or possibly {years}. In 1859, a large CME struck the Earth, called the Carrington Event, with there were reports of auroras visible near the equator. There were reports of telegraph systems catching on fire, blowing out, glowing with induced current even though they weren't hooked up. If a CME of that magnitude struck the Earth today, we could expect sweeping and long-lasting black-outs for which we are not prepared. Another effect of CMEs is a phenomenon called Forbush decreases. This is when intense magnetic activity from the Sun temporarily blocks the normal influx of cosmic rays from the galaxy. If we look at the slide [Fig. 4] here, we see two sudden drops in cosmic ray flux, labelled there as the Forbush decreases, as the result of two geomagnetic storms which you see in the red there on the top. These occurred in March 2011. Initial studies that were done, indicate that the resulting change in ionization of the atmosphere and the change in associated latent heat release can, in turn, increase the temperature differential with the ground. This can affect convection currents and potentially increase and intensify cyclones. This is believed to have happened in the case with Hurricane Katrina in 2005. The

phenomenon of the atmospheric ionization caused by increased galactic cosmic ray flux has been studied and demonstrated to create an increase in cloud cover on the Earth. The galaxy increasing and modulating cloud cover on the Earth. This is a major factor in cycles of global temperature. In fact, there is a very interesting correlation between the 140 million-year cycle of our solar system's transit in and out of the spiral arms of the Milky Way galaxy, which are regions of relatively high cosmic ray flux. There is a correlation between that cycle and the long-term cycles of warming and cooling of the planet, which you see in the slide [Fig. 5] here indicated as the icehouse Earth periods. Not only is the Sun acting to control our planet's weather, but now we have to ask the question, what is, in turn, modulating the activity of our Sun? What is occurring in the galactic environment in which our Sun swims?

DENISTON: So, following on that thread of these unique threats that all inhabitants of this planet face, another existential threat, for which we currently have no protection, is the inevitability of future asteroid and comet impacts with the Earth. Much of the world was given a rather rude and surprising awakening to this reality in 2013. I think many of you have probably seen this footage and remember it, with the surprise explosion of a very small asteroid in the atmosphere above Chelyabinsk, Russia. No one knew this small asteroid was on a collision course with the Earth prior to its impact, because we've only been able to locate and track a relatively small percentage of the asteroids in the inner Solar System environment. Significant efforts have been made to track most of the larger asteroids, but there are literally hundreds of thousands of unidentified, untracked, medium- and smaller-sized asteroids that are out there by all current estimates. These are asteroids larger than the one that exploded over Russia which we just saw, which could devastate an area on the smaller end of the size of a city, or in the more medium range, up to the size of a nation or a continent. Furthermore, even if we found an asteroid which was on an impact trajectory with the Earth; say it was going to impact a few years from now, and we knew it was coming. We have no defense systems, we have no demonstrated capability to divert such a threatening object and ensure the defense of the Earth from that collision. A related threat also comes from long-period comets, which are distinct from asteroids because they spend the vast majority of their time not in the inner Solar System, but in the farthest outreaches of the outer Solar System, far beyond our detection capabilities. Although long-period comets are significantly less frequent, they're generally much larger and far more difficult to detect, and extremely challenging to divert. We'll just play an animation briefly of one example of this. This is data from an actual event that occurred in 1996. This comet was discovered less than two years before making a close pass by the Earth. If that had been on an impact trajectory, there is nothing we could have done. That could have been an extinction event right

there. Just an example of how difficult these challenges can be from comets. While most of the potential threats posed from near-Earth asteroids are thought to be limited to local to continental scale effects, an impact with a long-period comet would likely be a global extinction event; threatening the entire existence of humanity on this planet. In line with this Strategic Defense Initiative perspective, efforts can be taken to build up mankind's defensive capabilities against these threats, taking us directly back to LaRouche's SDI principle. The same joint science-driver programs to expand mankind's capabilities in space generally, for the defense of the Earth, are the same programs that can generate the economic and political growth on this planet needed to erode and address the underlying causes of conflict and warfare, as Mr. LaRouche discussed. As Mr. LaRouche stated in his 1984 LaRouche doctrine, which Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche had quoted from earlier in her keynote address today, the most important program, LaRouche says in that document, is a multi-generational Moon and Mars colonization project, driven by fusion technologies. While at the same time expanding technology sharing and capital goods export policies throughout the less developed regions of the planet. Again, ensuring the preconditions for durable peace and durable survival are met, and the causes underlying future conflicts are removed before those conflicts can arise. Again, this Strategic Defense of Earth perspective forces us to see our common place in our Solar System, within our Galaxy, and locate our actions on this relatively small planet from that perspective.

BEETS: To continue that line of thought, I'd like to read a quote from Vladimir Vernadsky, who was a Russian bio-geo-chemist. In the opening section of his 1927 writing, {The Biosphere}, he says, "The history of the biosphere is ... sharply distinguished from that of the rest of the planet, and the role it plays in the planetary mechanism is quite exceptional. It is as much, or even more, the creation of the Sun as it is a manifestation of terrestrial processes." One area of study I'd like to raise that could give us unique insight into the role of extraterrestrial factors in shaping the biosphere and the evolution of life on Earth is viruses. Viruses are a relatively new object of study for humanity, not discovered until the end of the 19th Century, and not imaged until the 1930s with the invention of the electron microscope. However, since that time, what has become undeniable is that viruses are inseparable from life. They are pervasive throughout the biosphere and are known to infect every type of organism. To give a quick sense of the ubiquity of viruses on the planet: there are millions of virus particles in a single teaspoon of seawater. Billions of viruses float in the air currents high above your head in the atmosphere. Even inside the human body, just as we have a microbiome of trillions of bacteria living inside us, we and other living things also have a virome with likely trillions of little viruses living inside us as a regular part of our organism;

some of which are an essential part of our immune system. Viruses also play an important role in a phenomenon called horizontal gene transfer. We normally think of gene transfer as happening from parent to offspring. Horizontal gene transfer transfers genetic material from one organism to another unrelated organism, and it's incorporated into the genome of that next organism. This has been known for some time to occur regularly in single-celled organisms – bacteria and so forth. But studies in the past decades have shown this to have occurred between many types of much more complicated organisms, including fungi, plants, and animals. While specific figures on this are still being debated, some suggest that upwards of 100 genes in the human genome were transferred there at some point long ago by viruses. Some of these genes are very important ones dealing with metabolism, reproduction, and immune system response. This idea completely disrupts the typical textbook view of the “tree of life” with its separate, parallel branches. And posits a notion of evolution which is much more interconnected and complex. So, now I'd like to take up that idea and look at it in the context of the solar system and the galaxy. First is some very interesting research that was begun and presented in the 1980s by Dr. Robert Hope-Simpson among others, on the seasonal pandemics of influenza A, which, like many other seasonal phenomena that we're all familiar with, which are connected with Solar radiation, breaks out somewhat simultaneously in the winter in the Northern Hemisphere, migrates across the tropics to the Southern Hemisphere for their winter, and then returns the following winter to the Northern Hemisphere. One element that interested researchers was the rhythm of outbreak of new strains of influenza, which, if we look back over the 20th Century, shows an interesting, even if not perfect, correlation with the eleven-year Solar cycle, as we see on the slide here [Fig. 6]. Here you see pandemics from the 1940s to the 1970s, mapped on top of the cycles of solar activity. If we look back over a longer period of time, 300 years, we see the possible fingerprint of a larger process [Fig. 7], perhaps a galactic driver. Not only do pandemics tend to occur more frequently during periods of solar maximum, but as you see here, indicated by the peaks of the blue curve, they tend to cluster around periods when solar maxima are more intense. We also have the anomalous years of pandemic during solar minimum. Studies were done which showed a very interesting fact, which is that these years were also years during which the Earth received a higher influx of cosmic radiation from galactic sources, due to – among other causes – bright supernovae. But a question mark left by these researchers was, what is the mechanism? This is unanswered. It is known that viruses can be activated and deactivated by certain frequencies of light. It's also been observed in many astronauts on the International Space Station, that virus infections that were latent would suddenly become active again. While all of this research is still quite preliminary, and requires further investigation, it is undeniable that the anomalies that I've hinted at here point to a higher causality. A modulator of

the development of life on Earth which is beyond earthbound chemical reactions. I think that it's safe to say, having spent only 20 of the past couple millions of years that human beings have been on the planet, just 20 of those years being able to study life outside of the Earth environment, as we have on the ISS, we are mere infants in our understanding of the science of life. In the 1980s, Lyndon LaRouche called for massive investment into research in the field of optical biophysics: electromagnetic radiation as part of the physics of living processes – moving beyond a mere chemical approach to life. This is not an option. As we move civilization more and more off of the planet, off into the Solar System, we are going to be forced to deal with life in the cosmic environment, interacting with galactic processes in a relatively unmediated way. This demands a new and collaborative approach to the science of life.

ROSS: So, to bring a conclusion to these thoughts that we've been elaborating, we're going to return our thinking to the immediate situation, and reflect on just how much work is needed to bring our institutions and our ideas and outlooks into coherence with the perspective that we just heard. For example, how effective is the current idea of the Department of Defense? Can current missiles defend us against asteroids? No. Can bombs save the life of your mother, if she is unable to receive adequate treatment and is dying of COVID-19-induced hypoxia? No. We will develop one or more vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 virus, but what will be the form of a vaccine against asteroids? How can we inoculate ourselves against anti-human, ugly patterns of thought that are both widespread and tragic? How can tragedy be overcome in a durable and ongoing way? Well, Lyndon LaRouche insisted, and Helga very strongly stated in the first panel, that an essential step towards creating a healthy culture on this planet is to achieve of the leaders of the United States, China, Russia, and India, to shape a truly new paradigm of international relations. We do have to work out a global approach to COVID-19, and we have to work out an international system that will go beyond just making sure we have enough ventilators and PPE. But to achieve the economic and cultural development required to completely eliminate poverty – 100% worldwide – and provide for the hygiene, the sanitation, the health and the optimism, and the science of the next chapter of the human experience, the world urgently needs a new paradigm for international collaboration on science, defined by the defense and growth of society, and without the poison of ugly and old ideas. Life sciences research cannot rely on the largesse of a few billionaires who happen to enjoy investing money in it. Consider the billions made off of the misery inflicted by opioids, and the relative paucity of money invested into studying diseases of plants and animals, many of which could potentially start threatening us next week. We could have another outbreak. Government funding has to be dramatically increased, so that the benefits can be public. Basic research is needed. Our progress in learning

more about and improving our mastery over the universe; that is the truest sense of defense in the broadest scale. We must ensure that, as we move ahead, this is a shared mission of mankind. The three of us will be available during the Q&A period, if you have questions about any of the content we just discussed. And we're going to move on now, to our next speaker, after, again, just briefly mentioning, the first volume of the {Lyndon LaRouche Collected Works}, which is available at the LaRouche Legacy Foundation website, <https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org/> Megan Beets is one of the co-directors of the LaRouche Legacy Foundation and helped make this possible. Our next speaker is Dr. Jean-Pierre Luminet. He is a French astrophysicist, writer and poet. He's well-known internationally as a specialist on black holes and cosmology, in particular. He worked as Research Director, and is now an Emeritus Researcher, at the prestigious CNRS in France, the National Center for Scientific Research. Dr. Luminet will be addressing some of the questions raised in this last presentation about errors in science in scientific method itself. The title of Dr. Luminet's talk is "The Role of 'Free Invention' in Creative Discovery." Here's Dr. Jean-Pierre Luminet.

JEAN-PIERRE LUMINET: Hello. At the beginning of the 20th century, the poet and philosopher Paul Valéry wrote in his Notebooks, "Events are the foam of things, but it's the sea that interests me." The aphorism is dizzying. He says everything about what the physicist is looking for, underlying the dry body of equations. The poet seeks likewise under the velvet cloak of his words. Symbolizing depth, the sea enfolds what is essential. But what are the essentials? For the ordinary scientist, this is the "reality" of the world – if the expression makes sense. But for the theoretical physicist, as for the artist and the creator in general, is not the true reality of the world the life of the spirit, which maintains its distance from the fleeting effects of external events? In Valéry's mind, the depth of the sea's vitality is rich enough to accommodate the most tenuous and ephemeral manifestations of the experience. "A little foam, a candid event upon the dark of the sea," he still notes. The contrast between the sea and the foam expresses the striking discrepancy between the unity associated with the permanence and the happenstance associated with evanescence. In other contexts, such as the one I'm currently working on – namely, modern theoretical physics, which seeks to unify the laws of gravitation and quantum mechanics – it rather reflects a complementarity by which the constituent parts are no longer off-kilter, but coherent. I take as an example a brilliant hypothesis put forward by the great physicist John Wheeler in the 1950s. The most creative minds often function by analogy. Wheeler imagines that at the microscopic level, the very geometry of space-time is not fixed but in perpetual change, agitated by the fluctuations of quantum origin. It can be compared to the surface of a rough sea. Viewed from far above, the sea looks

smooth. From a closer distance, we begin to perceive motions agitating the surface, which still remains continuous. But, closely examined, the sea is tumultuous, fragmented, discontinuous. Waves rise and break, throwing off drops of water that then fall. Following this analogy, space-time would appear smooth on our scale, but when scrutinized at an ultra-microscopic level, its "foam" would become perceptible in the form of ephemeral and transient events: elementary particles, micro-worm holes, even entire universes. Just as hydrodynamic turbulence creates bubbles by cavitation, space-time turbulence could constantly bring forth, from the quantum vacuum, what we consider to be the reality of the world. All of this is superbly poetic; however, this does not imply that it's physically correct. Fifty years after its formulation, Wheeler's concept of the "quantum foam" is still debated; other approaches to "quantum gravity" have been developed, offering different visions of space-time at its deepest level – the sea – and of its manifestations at all scales of size and energy – the foam. Although none of these approaches, like the string theory, loop quantum gravity or non-commutative geometry, have yet come up with a coherent description, these various theories have at least the merit of showing how the scientific investigation of nature is a tremendous adventure of the mind. Deciphering the fragments of reality under the foam of the stars is to detach oneself from the limits of the visible, to free ourselves from customary deceptive representations, without ever forgetting that the fertility of the scientific approach is watered from underground by other disciplines of the human spirit such as art, poetry, music, and philosophy. This brings us back to Paul Valéry. The prescience of his words does not surprise us when we acquaint ourselves with his background. Curious about everything, Valéry was particularly interested in how great scientists worked mentally. He himself was full of ideas, and in order not to let any of them escape, he was always filling the pages of his notebooks. Several times during the 1920s, he met Albert Einstein, whom he admired, and who admired him. The mischievous father of the theory of relativity later recalled public debate at the Collège de France in Paris in the presence of Paul Valéry and the philosopher Henri Bergson: "During the discussion," he recounts, "[Valéry] asked me if I got up at night to write down an idea. I replied, 'But as far as ideas go, you only have one or two in your life.'" When it was Einstein's turn to question another poet, Saint-John Perse, about how he worked, the explanation he received did not fail to satisfy him: "But it is the same as for the scholar. The mechanism of discovery is neither logical nor intellectual... It begins with a leap of the imagination." In his acceptance speech for the 1960 Nobel Prize in Literature, Saint-John Perse called it the "common mystery." Einstein later spoke out about the essential role of imagination in scientific creativity. At this stage, it is fascinating to consider the bet made on the free invention of fundamental concepts to interpret the world. Einstein already believed that the principles of a global

theory could not be adduced from experience alone or from the scientific method alone, in the strict sense of the term. Einstein said: "We now know that science cannot arise from the immediate experience alone and that it is impossible for us to build the edifice of science without availing ourselves of free invention, whose usefulness we can only verify in hindsight, in light of our own experience. My conviction is that we are able, through a purely mathematical construction, to find concepts, as well as laws that connect them, capable of unlocking the doors to the understanding of natural phenomena." To take on the question of Valéry's poetic statement, in its potential, but also within its limits, in the face of the field of equations that escape our common language – this must be the aim of a true scientific culture, which is in total opposition to the fashion of the day, consisting rather in accumulating tables of figures, formulas, code, protocols, and misleading statistics, and cramming them into skulls of young people eager to learn and to understand. A true scientific culture must boldly choose not to shrink from acknowledging the dizzying mystery of the world that surrounds and forms us. By accepting its strangeness, the public – especially the young – will benefit by gathering up some form rocks, at least for the time of a movement of the universe. As the great Johannes Kepler wrote to a fellow astronomer in 1605, "This is how we progress, by feeling our way, in a dream, much as wise but immature children." Along with some other great innovators in the history of science and ideas, Kepler, too, offers an instructive model on how to conceive of the world in a way that opposed received opinion. In 1975, the philosopher Paul Feyerabend published {Against Method}, a book whose central thesis, supported by many historical examples, is that not only is the classical scientific method not the only valid way to acquire knowledge, but that applying it too strictly blocks creativity and innovation. Science is essentially an anarchist undertaking, in the sense that the origin of our scientific ideas can come from everywhere: from art, literature, poetry, philosophy, and even from myth. Anarchism, in theory, would thus be more humanist and more likely to encourage progress than doctrines based on law and order. I will not, however, go so far as to approve of the extreme attitude of Feyerabend's disciples, who say that "everything is good," "everything is equally valid"; which leads to absolute cultural relativism, which would, for example, put on the same level of value a Schubert melody and a Madonna song. As in all things, wisdom is about taking the right path between the two. But among the proponents of the strict scientific method, to the exclusion of any other form of thought, why ignore or pretend to ignore that the creative imagination of scientists undeniably appeals to mythical images? For example, the generating principles present in all cultures – Desire, the Tree, the Egg, Water, the Void, Chaos – clearly appear as archetypes of cosmogonic thought; namely, primitive and universal symbols belonging to the collective unconscious, to use [Carl] Jung's terminology. The term "archetype" was first used by Kepler himself: "The

traces of geometry are printed in the world, as if geometry were a kind of archetype of the world," he wrote in 1606 in his treatise "On the New Star" – {De Stella Nova}. Certainly, the work of the great creators in the field of fundamental physics rarely reveals the philosophical background that underlies it. At first reading, we are often tempted to see extreme rationalism and a fundamentally skeptical position. In fact, behind the critical mind of the inventive physicist often hides a deep interest in everything related to the obscure regions of reality, and those of the human imagination, which are apparently opposed to the concept of reason. The work of epistemological reflection of Wolfgang Pauli, who is also one of the fathers of quantum mechanics, exerts skepticism towards skepticism itself, in order to track down the way knowledge is constructed, before we come to a rational understanding of things. The influence of archetypal representations on the formation of scientific theories is undeniable. As seen with Albert Einstein's statement, the theoretical physicist cannot be satisfied with a purely empirical view according to which natural laws could only be established on the basis of experimental material, subject to a strict protocol. Rather, one has to consider the role played by the decisions we make during the process of observation and the role of intuition. The bridge that connects the initially disordered experimental material is located in original images that pre-exist in the collective unconscious. These archetypes are not linked to rationally formulated ideas. Rather, they are forms or images with strong emotional content, which are not captured immediately by thought. The "Kepler case," to which Pauli devoted a book, is exemplary in this respect. Pauli takes the example of Kepler's adoption of the Copernican system. According to him, the persuasive power of the Copernican system holds sway above all for Kepler because of the correspondence he finds there with the Trinitarian symbol, the archetype of Christian thought. This conception of knowledge of nature, according to which the unitary order of the cosmos is not initially formulable rationally, refers us, in its essentials, to Plato and to the neo-Platonism of Plotinus and Proclus, but with an essential difference. In Plato, the original images are immutable and exist independently of human consciousness (Plato uses the term "soul"). Immanuel Kant's use of the concept of the {a priori} form of sensibility, applied to the geometric framework, is equally objectionable. It led him to argue that Euclid's postulates were inherent in human thought. However, the archetypes of psychology are not fixed; they can evolve in relation to a given situation of knowledge. The cosmologist seeks to describe this indefinite expanse of space using a geometric model. Several models are possible; the description obtained depends in particular on the degree of sharpness with which physical space is analyzed. In fact, for a long time, Euclidean space was the only space known to mathematicians. (It was still the case at the time of Kant, before we discovered the non-Euclidean geometries.) In addition, human beings have an instinctive

tendency to interpret their sensory perceptions by means of Euclidean geometry. It has been shown that the semi-circular channels of our inner ear, which detect acceleration of the head in three perpendicular planes, construct a mental space whose local structure is Euclidean. So, it took a singular intellectual work to understand that Euclid's postulates were not the only possible ones. To say whether space has three or eleven dimensions, whether it is finite or infinite, flat or curved, simply connected or multiply connected, etc., is far from obvious. Indeed, it's usually counter-intuitive! In this case, the idea must necessarily pre-exist the sensory experience. Therefore, we must indeed place what Einstein called the free invention of theories at the heart of the process of discovery. After all, as the poet Novalis wrote: "Theories are like fishing; it is only by casting into unknown waters that you may catch something." For several decades, the Schiller Institute has adopted, among other goals, the mission of promoting this fruitful way of thinking about the world, and I am glad to have been able to share it with you. Thank you very much for your attention.

ROSS: For our next speaker, we're going to be hearing from a French astronaut, and given the time in France, we're very glad he's able to be on with us this late. And I'd also like to make sure that everybody knows that if you have a question for our next speaker, please email it in right away, so we'll be able to have a short dialogue with him before it gets too late. Michel Tognini is a French test pilot, engineer, and former astronaut at the Centre National d'Études Spatiales (CNES) the French Space Agency. He's also the former head of the European Astronaut Center of the European Space Agency, and one of the founding members of the Association of Space Explorers. He has logged a total of 19 days in space aboard the Soyuz, the MIR station, the Space Shuttle Columbia and the International Space Station. What an impressive international space presence! His presentation is entitled, "Friendship Between Astronauts: An Exemplary Precedent for International Cooperation."

MICHEL TOGNINI: Hello everybody and thank you for inviting me to speak about cooperation between astronauts and cosmonauts. I will ask you to give the next slide, please. We are going to talk about a brief history of space, and the cooperation between us and what we did in space. So, next slide; and next as well. So, if we look at what we did in the beginning, we had the first flight of Sputnik, in 1957. It was a big surprise all over the world, because the nobody was expecting this Sputnik to flight in space, except the Soviets at the time. And as you see very well, the Sputnik as it is designed, it is metallic and it was making a big because it was a tool to be seen and to be heard all over the world, which was propaganda tool in space. Next, in 1961 was the first human flight of Yuri Gagarin. It was the first time that a human left the Earth to go

to space. He made one orbit around the Earth, which only is one hour and 40 minutes. And he landed safely. That was the beginning of human space exploration. Then, humans have been to space regularly, have been to the Moon, and they go to the International Space Station. If we consider all the flights made from Gagarin up to today, we have spent roughly 150 years in space. Next slide: Other important dates as well are: 1962: John Glenn, the first American went to space. As you can see, in the beginning was Russian, and then American. 1963: The first female in space was Valentina Tereshkova. She was Russian. 1965: The first space walk, Alexei Leonov went up in a spacecraft, in space, and then he went outside of the spacecraft with a spacesuit, to spend a little bit, like 15 minutes, in a space walk. 1969: You all know, the first humans on the Moon, with Armstrong and Aldrin. 1981: The first Space Shuttle flight. The Space Shuttle flew roughly 30 years. 2001: The first tourist in space, Denis Tito, who was American. His dream was to fly in space, and he had to pay for his mission. So that was a way to demonstrate that the human space missions are safe enough to be flown by tourists. 2003: Yang Liwei, the first Chinese in space. We call them taikonauts. 2012: The first SpaceX mission, that was the mission made by Elon Musk, a private company going into space with a dream and with a goal to send humans to space. And I can tell you, 2012, when he started, nobody believed he that he would send a human into space, but this year, in May 2020, he will send the first human mission to the Space Station. 2017: China announces its planes to return to the Moon, to exploit the soil of the Moon. Next slide: You can see on this slide, the fact that Russians and Americans are the different paths for space flight. The Russians had the classical rocket, called Soyuz and the classical capsule. They made the progressive evolution of the rocket and capsule, in order to fly, almost the same rocket and the same capsule, but much more modern, and they had seven space stations called Salyut, from 1 to 7; they had the Mir space station that was used also to do the first flight between the Space Shuttle and the first docking of the Space Shuttle to a space station. And they tried to land a human on the Moon, but they could not have a [inaudible 1:12.34]. On the other side, the Americans had the Mercury for 1 person, Gemini for 2 persons, Apollo for 3 persons to go to the Moon, and to go to the space station called Skylab. They went to the Moon six times safely, and successfully. They had the Space Shuttle. So, it was more, for the Americans a zig-zag path. And we can say that at the time, when you see the two red and white columns, it was a kind of a confrontation between American and Russian. But, there was a flight called ASTP, Apollo-Soyuz Space Mission in 1975, where Soyuz went to space; an Apollo spacecraft went to space. They docked in space. When they docked, they opened the door, they shook hands, they gave each other gifts, and they started a very strong friendship. Next Slide: This shows you the crew of this Apollo-Soyuz mission in 1975. In green you have the Russian, in light brown you have the Americans. And in this five [inaudible 1:13.51], two persons, one

American, one Russian became very good friends. This first mission was made because of the good friendship between two persons. And usually when I make a speeches, I ask people in the room to tell me who the two persons. I will tell you today, because you cannot speak to me: The two persons are Tom Stafford, an American fighter pilot, test pilot and astronaut; and on the right side is Alexei Leonov, who was also the first man who made a space walk. He was also a very courageous space, fighter pilot. And these two persons became friends, on this mission, before the mission, when they met in 1972, during the mission that was very successful, and also after the mission. And the pictures right after show you the two men, as they could be today. Next slide: You can see, on the left, Tom Stafford; on the right, Alexei Leonov, after 45 years of true friendship. I can tell you that every year, Tom Stafford went to visit Alexei Leonov in Russia to spend a few days with him on vacation. And every year, Alexei Leonov went to America to spend a few days with his friend Tom Stafford. And even sometimes, when the relationship between the two countries were slightly heavy, the two governments asked them to try to solve the problem. Unfortunately Alexei Leonov passed away a few months ago, so this friendship is no more. But the next slide will show you that we continue this friendship, as you can see, in space. We have today the space station, and these are young people on the space station: on the left side, you have the Russian cosmonaut, on the right side is an American astronaut. They fly in space: They have been flying long duration flights in space for 20 years now, and they have a very strong relationship and they have a good trust, because they can each cut the other's hair, and this has led to what we called the ASE, which "Association of Space Explorers," which was created 35 years ago. This Association of Space Explorers includes {38} different countries and this was created in 1985 in France. Since then we meet every year in a different country in the world. Next slide: To show you that we went from confrontation to cooperation, slightly. The confrontation gave very good speed to the space program. You remember when John Kennedy asked the country to go to the Moon. NASA went to the Moon in eight years, which is very, very fast. But, there was less emphasis on scientific content. Today we cooperation, which is slower evolution, but more focused on science, and we do have cooperation, among five partners, which are NASA, the Russian, European, Japan, and Canada. And also, we try slowly to have China and India with us, to have seven partners in space. Next slide: In this case, you could have a pattern to fly in space with seven different space agencies, and the seven space agencies would have seven tasks, to go to the Moon or go to Mars. On this slide, you could see that one space agency could be in charge of the launch site, the second space agency could be responsible for the access to low-Earth orbit, what we call LEO; the third space agency would be in charge of MTFE, which is a low-Earth orbit small space station; the fourth space agency would be in charge of the transfer, with a tug, from low-Earth orbit to the Moon

orbit; number five would be the MTF on the Moon; number six would be the descent to the Moon; and number seven would be in charge of the lunar base. You can see on this diagram that we can share all the activities between the whole world to have a common goal of going into space together. Next slide: I show what we did achieve with the space station. The first mission was in 1988. What we did in this mission is a real Apollo-Soyuz mission, with a left module which you called LTB, launch from Baikonur, on a Proto rocket. The right module was node number 1, launched on the space shuttle from Kennedy Space Center, and the two were docked together with the robotic arm from Canada. That was the beginning of the building of the space station. Next slide: This shows that we put a third module called Salis [ph] module. Inside you have oxygen, you have life, therefore there was Soyuz on the back, in order to bring people into space. That was the beginning of the Space Station, with three persons on board. And the next slide shows you the complete Space Station with the Space Shuttle on the top, the U.S. part on the top part of the picture; the tray with the solar panel on the side; and on the backside you have the Russian side and you have the European ETV that was able to fly five times in space, in order to be paid for the launch of Columbus, that you can see on the left front side of the station. The next slide shows you one of the current positions of the space station. You can see that you have two Soyuz's, two Progress's and we can congratulate the Russians, as today they launched a Progress which is like Soyuz but automatic; and they had the re-cut of the docking time, because they were going from the ground to the space station in less than 3.5 hours. So that's the shortest time to go to space. And you can see on the left side the Dragon insignis; these are made by private companies. And the Beam is an inflatable structure, in order to have less weight and less volume from Earth to space. Next slide: So the first mission was 1 hour and 40 minutes, which was the one with Gagarin. We slowly made an evolution on the direction of the space flights, to go for 1 hour, to 1 day, 1 week, 2 weeks, and then 6 months. All the flights today are six month duration. Some flights have been 1 year. The record was 14 months with Valery Polyakov. So we knew that we could cope with the fight that we lost muscles, we lost [inaudible 1:21.07] in space. We can do exercise every day, two hours of exercise to compensate for this loss. In parallel, we understood that the difficulty was the psychological behavior, so we did some studies on the ground with Mars 500, 18 months on the ground with 6 international people, in order to simulate a flight to Mars, and also a flight on Hawaii with one French person, one year on that mission completed. It was also to test the psychological behavior in this long period of confinement. And the good is to have the best knowledge of human behavior in space, in order to make a trip the Moon, to Mars, or to an asteroid. Next slide: The goal is to make a long duration flight and to stay in space longer and longer, and also to be able to make operations in space, like repairing a satellite, or doing a

space walk, or building some structure, like we did with the space station. But, because we're in space, we use the fact that we're in zero G to do science, like the control of muscles during long flight, or study on the risk of kidney stones during long flight. Next slide: And this also is an application of what we could do in space, we're starting to do it, in the growth of protein crystals. You see on the top left picture, what is protein crystal growth on Earth, and the one on the right side is the one in space. Because you are in zero G, the spatial protein is bigger so you can have better presentation of the disease, and you can make some special medicines, much more precisely because of that. Next slide: shows you also the impact of space missions, which is education. When Kennedy initiated the Apollo program, we had the top record of students going for PhDs, physical science, and engineering diplomas. We had the same in France. When we have the French astronauts playing in space, still don't want to study more science to better understand what's going on in space, and better understand what space science. And the space station we have today, which is a real success, we can say that all the building of the space station was successful, all the flights were successful; there is permanently on the space station at least one American and one Russian and they do work very well together. This cooperation program is between Russia, United States, European Canada and Japan. In Europe, 10 countries participate in this program, so altogether, 15 countries work together. It was a program made for joint science together with the participation of Russia in a great way. And the next slide, will be my last: which is slogan of Konstantin Tsiolkovsky "Earth is the cradle of humanity, but mankind cannot stay in the cradle forever." This is why we go to space, and this is also why we want to increase our knowledge there, today. Thank you very much.

ROSS: Thank you very much, Michel Tognini. If you have time, there are a few questions that came in for you. I can combine it into one question so you answer them together. One of the questions was, someone was saying that it seems like you had a very unique background, for being involved in the U.S. and the Russian space agencies. They wonder what the biggest lesson you learned for advising the future would be, based on that. Another question asks about how countries should work together to do the Moon-Mars program – this is an American and she says: This seems like it's too big for America to do alone! Should we work with other countries? And a Serbian, a member of the executive board for the Serbian Office for Space Sciences asks about international cooperation for space. This person writes: "I am a strong advocate that outer space should be considered as a common heritage of mankind, as the UN conferences also say. In this light, and being a space developing country, we are facing problems as well as many other countries to join the Space Club. I would like to hear your opinion on how we can rethink the global approach to outer space activities, policies and

research.”

TOGNINI: I will try to reply to the question, what did I learn from this cooperation with Russia and with NASA? I learned humility. And I think humility is really important for an astronaut, from people on Earth, and also for the consideration that life is very fragile. As someone said before, we could be hit by a comet or an asteroid any time, and we need to have a plan to fight against an asteroid or a comet. And the only way to fight this danger is to work together. In the Association of Space Explorers, where we have several different countries joined together and different astronauts from these countries, we have a plan to study every year, the way to deflect an asteroid from Earth. Today, it's an automatic program, but in the future, we will try to make it maybe a human program. And the second question is how to go to the Moon and Mars. I strongly believe that slowly, we need to cooperate together, even with China and India, because they have very good potential for a program in space. And the example of the International Space Station is an example that could be applied to the whole world. If we could succeed in the International Space Station, we are obliged to succeed if we include China and India together. So I believe in it. And, for the case of Serbia, you know Serbia could participate in a space program, whether it is with Russia or it with ESA, the European Space Agency. It's a pretty good organization, it's a pretty good will. But if a country wants to participate in space, at {any} level, even at 1% of the budget, it's possible to do it.

ROSS: OK. Thank you very much, thank you for joining us. We know it's late there, and we're very happy to have had your participation. Thank you, Michel Tognini.

TOGNINI: Thank you very much, and good evening to all of you.

ROSS: We had sent in, not as a question, but actually as an interesting comment, a statement that was made today by Presidents Trump of the United States and President Putin of the Russian Federation, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the Meeting on the Elbe, which Dennis mentioned in his introduction to this conference. I'd like to read their joint statement:

“Joint Statement by President Donald J. Trump and President Vladimir Putin of Russia Commemorating the 75th Anniversary of the Meeting on the Elbe “April 25, 2020, marks the 75th Anniversary of the historic meeting between American and Soviet troops, who shook hands on the damaged bridge over the Elbe River. This event heralded the decisive defeat of the Nazi regime. “The meeting on the Elbe represented a culmination of tremendous efforts by the many countries and

peoples that joined forces under the framework of the United Nations Declaration of 1942. This common struggle required enormous sacrifice by millions of soldiers, sailors, and citizens in multiple theaters of war. "We also recognize the contributions from millions of men and women on the home front, who forged vast quantities of war materials for use around the world. Workers and manufacturers played a crucial role in supplying the Allied forces with the tools necessary for victory. "The 'Spirit of the Elbe' is an example of how our countries can put aside differences, build trust, and cooperate in pursuit of a greater cause. As we work today to confront the most important challenges of the 21st century, we pay tribute to the valor and courage of all those who fought together to defeat fascism. Their heroic feat will never be forgotten."

ROSS: That is the joint statement by Presidents Putin and Trump. For our next speaker we're going to be hearing from an American astronaut: Walt Cunningham is a retired American astronaut, who served as Lunar Module Pilot on the 11-day Apollo 7 mission, the first Apollo that brought human beings into space. During the flight, the three-member crew did exercises in docking and lunar orbit rendezvous, completed eight successful tests and maneuvering ignitions of the service module propulsion engine, measured the accuracy of performance of all spacecraft systems, and provided the first effective television transmission of onboard crew activities. Among his many decorations and honors, Walt Cunningham is a recipient of the NASA Distinguished Service Medal; an associate fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; and a fellow of the American Astronautical Society. In preparation for this conference today, we asked him about his historic flight and the contributions that flight made to fulfilling the vision laid out by President Kennedy, and to making the Apollo Moon landing missions that came after a success. Let's hear Walt Cunningham's presentation: "Apollo 7: An Astronaut's Reflections."

Q: What did you have to do to qualify to become an astronaut?

CUNNINGHAM: My personal assessment is, you really shouldn't be there unless you're willing to stick your necks out a little. It took me years after that to fully put into the right perspective on this with fighter pilots. I have to tell you, in my book I have a section in there on the day that I decided I was going to apply to be an astronaut. That morning, actually I was getting my college degree in my mid-20s. I had not been to college. I joined the Navy out of high school, managed to pass the two-year test, became a fighter pilot. Smart enough to go in the Marine Corps instead of the Navy, which I never regret. [laughs] But I was going to college trying to get a degree that year, and I was driving in the morning, because I was working at the RAND Corporation, and I was driving

that morning, and they were going through the countdown for Alan Shepard. It was 1961. And he was on the East Coast, and I'm driving along in my car, and we didn't have all those freeways out in L.A. at that time, I was going to UCLA. It got down to the last four or five minutes, and I had to pull over to the side of the road and park, so I could hear what was going on. I couldn't even keep driving. It got down, I remember the count – 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, lift-off – and I caught myself screaming out, “You lucky SOB!” [laughter] And that was the time – I felt like I was alone; I looked around to make sure, there was no one parking that was looking at me—and that was when I decided that that was what I was going to do, I had good background for it. And 18 months later, I was sharing an office with Alan. It was like joining a very unusual, unique kind of life at the time. That's evolved the way a lot of these kinds of things do. When we first had human beings sail around the world, that's the difference from how they evolved into consistent kinds of systems out there in the oceans.

Q: What did you think about President Kennedy's challenge to land on the Moon? What went through your mind?

CUNNINGHAM: It's interesting now as time goes on. I can only speak for myself, but I'm sure a lot of the other people feel the same way, too. As you get older and you get more mature, you can put in perspective some of these things that at the time you never even thought about; you just took it for granted. When he was making his speech, I remember that was before I had been selected by NASA. I got selected the first time I applied. But I can remember when he was saying that, I just thought, “it was a good speech.” Now, it's something that goes down in history, and I think it's because at the time, our minds were not working quite the same way. You've got to let your mind mature in order to get the perspective on what's going on historically. It was a unique period in our history, for the people here with that kind of an activity to move to. If you go back 500 years, and you look at the first time they set out to sail around the world? I have to tell you, I think they started off with about 240 people, and there were 4 ships. When they finally made it, a year and a half or two years later, there were 18 of those original people still alive. And they had made it around the world. They were willing to pay the price. They moved our society forward. We felt a lot of pluses going out in society after that. That was 500 years ago. The society in the world benefits from being willing to stick your neck out, but not doing it wildly. You've got to be committed to what you're trying to accomplish. I'm sure I feel I can speak a lot more about that now than I ever did at the time, because you've got to get wise.

Q: What was it like to be one of the first in space?

CUNNINGHAM: I think that they've said that 25% or 35% of people had a reaction to zero Gs, throwing up the first day and stuff like that. But they were all committed; they would all go on, anyway. The amount of weight that was lost by those folks – ours was the longest Apollo mission I think; there might have been one more mission slightly longer. I think the most anybody lost weight on our mission was 10 pounds, something like that. The attitude of the people in those days was different than the attitudes today because we were all military fighter pilots. Whether the world likes it or not, it takes a certain attitude on that to justify having those kinds of activities from one country to another. But I have to tell you this: One of the reasons that our mission was such a success – first off, it's gotten a lot of criticism because Wally Schirra at the time had a cold. But I have to tell you this, everything that Wally needed to do operationally, he did it anyway. It was a problem with the verbiage back and forth, because he was recovering from a cold. As a matter of fact, he let the ground think that we all had a cold. We didn't have colds. I didn't cough once. Donn Eisele I think once or twice may have coughed, but we were juniors; he was a very serious guy. And whether we like it now at this stage, I think he did a very good job. He was a {good pilot} in my opinion. At the time, that flight, I think it surprised him, because it was an 11-day mission, and they added four different objectives to that mission. The ground, I'm sure, had lots and lots of reservations as to whether we would make 11 days; they did it. I can remember the last couple of days, we had some time on our hands, because we didn't have a lot of film left. Now they take pictures all over the place. Our total film for the whole 11 days for 3 of us using the camera, was 500 pictures! Now, they might do that with one pass around the Earth. The world doesn't realize that 53% of the Earth's surface is covered by clouds. Whether we like it or not, most of the Earth is ocean, out there. Back in those days – and even today – they're almost totally dependent on air-to-ground communication. Now they've got essentially pretty much 100% air-to-ground communication. But what we had for air-to-ground communication was 4% of our time. And you had to be directly able to contact it. They say, "Oh, gee, that was horrible!" No, we thought that was good, because we had so many things to do, that we felt it was good when we weren't getting pushed to do other things. But we did need a certain amount of information. It was 4% or 4.5% of the time we had communication. You're looking and talking to me at my age – I'm 88 years old. I'll tell you this, I thought we had a great mission, I really do.

Q: What advice would you give to young people today who want to go into space?

CUNNINGHAM: I would not consider myself of giving the real overall best answer. I'm still stuck in that world of how important it is to be the world's greatest fighter pilot – mentally, at least. But the other things, it's a different way

of living, and the public today has been educated now for 50 years, most of them. Well, I can't even say most of them, but many of them want that opportunity to do that. Of course, now they're selling tickets to people to ride a spacecraft up there. And I'm sorry, I can't look positively at all that stuff. I know it's got its positive side, but I live in a different world. And I think that they're fortunate, if they become one of today's astronauts. But to do that, you better perfect yourself in the skills it takes. There's a lot of different skills that it takes today. There's a pretty good number of doctors, for example, who have been up there. That's good. They've had a number of ladies – there have been a couple of lady pilots, incidentally, that I thought were pretty doggone outstanding. They did a real good job.

Q: How do you think about taking risks and doing what sometimes seems almost impossible?

CUNNINGHAM: You have to have the attitude that comes automatically if you're a major league fighter pilot. One of the best fighter pilots, or at least, and I'm specific about this, at least believing you are. The best kind of attitude when you go in to attack somebody else, rightly or wrongly, you have to have the kind of confidence that says you're going to come out ahead, and you're willing to pay whatever price it takes {to get that done.}

ROSS: That was Walt Cunningham, an astronaut on Apollo 7, the first Apollo to take human beings into space. Let me give you a sense of who's coming up: I'll introduce our next speaker in a moment. Follow our next speaker will be a State Senator who is a big supporter of nuclear fusion; a physics professor who has received two Presidential appointments to national scientific positions; a Chinese physician, speaking about their experience with COVID-19; and a New York City physician, who's going to speak about what it's like in the current hotspot here. Our next speaker, Dr. Marie Korsaga is from Burkina Faso and she holds a doctorate in astrophysics and specializes in the study of dark matter. She is West Africa's first female astrophysicist and seeks to share her love of science, and its importance, more broadly, through expanding science education in Africa. Dr. Korsaga has entitled her presentation, "The Necessity of Science Education for African Youth." Please go ahead, it's fine: We're having some audio difficulty, so I'm going to dub your video into English myself, rather than the interpreter. Please, Dr. Korsaga, go ahead.

Dr. MARIE KORSAGA: [as translated] My name is Marie Korsaga, I am an astrophysicist and originally from Burkina Faso. My research focuses on the distribution of dark matter, and visible matter in galaxies. In simple terms, it

must be said that visible matter, that is to say, ordinary matter made up of protons, neutrons, electrons, everything that is observable with our devices, represents only about 5% of the universe – the rest is invisible matter, distribute as follows: 26% dark matter and 68% dark energy. Dark matter, with its gravitational force is used to explain the fact that galaxies remain close to each other, while dark energy causes the universe to expand faster over time. So we cannot speak of understanding the universe if we only know about 5% of its constituents. So, to understand our universe, that is to say, to be able to account for its formation and evolution, it is essential to understand what dark matter and dark energy are. Dark matter, as its name suggests, is something that you cannot see with even the most sophisticated telescopes. So far, no dark matter particles have ever been detected, nevertheless, we feel its presence thanks to its impact on gravity. The purpose of my research is to study how dark matter is distributed inside galaxies in order to better understand the formation and evolution of our universe, and therefore, the origin of life on Earth. Beyond my research, I am interested in the development side of astronomy in Africa. For this, I work at the Office of Astronomy for Development on a project which consists in using astronomy as a factor of development almost everywhere in the world, but especially in the developing countries, by supporting projects related to education, educational tourism and so on. Speaking of education, it is important to remember that according to the African Union, Africa has the youngest population in the world, with more than 40% of its young people under the age of 15, which will produce a demographic explosion in the next 10 years. This population growth has disadvantages, but also advantages. The downside is that if measures are not taken, such as access to quality education for boys and girls, especially in science, these young people, instead of becoming a source of development for the continent, risk, rather to be a source of socio-economic political instability and conflict, which will further plunge the continent into misery. However, the advantage of this population growth is that through a well-developed education system, this demographic growth, if accompanied by strong measures both on the side of public policies and the private sector, will be a great source of sustainable development, at the economic and political level of the continent. For this, it is very important to make significant investments in the field of education, with a focus on innovation, science and technology. It should be noted that today, African graduates mainly graduate from the literary and human sciences fields. STEM students – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – represent only 25% of the workforce on average, according to the World Bank. In addition, women are underrepresented in these areas. Take my case: I am the first woman to obtain a doctorate in astrophysics in Burkina, and even in West Africa. It may sound flattering, but it reveals a rather disturbing diagnosis, despite being a light of hope. Indeed, even if the region has a dozen doctorates

in the field, there are almost no women among them. Unfortunately, this shows that we are still a long way from achieving gender parity in science, and there is still much to do. This requires a change in mentalities and the accessibility of science to women, especially among the underprivileged. It is not unknown that a career in astrophysics requires a course in physics, which is not obvious for women in our societies where the majority of people think that the scientific fields are dedicated to men, and that women must go to the literary streams. This has the effect of discouraging women from opting for long studies, especially in the scientific fields, and even if they opt for them, they tend to give up at the first obstacles, due to the lack of encouragement. Today, I can say that I have broken this barrier, at my level, and I would like to take advantage of the privilege to inspire and encourage as many young girls as I can, to opt for it. It is true that today there are efforts being made by several governments to break these stereotypes with, for example, the NEF, the Next Einstein Forum in Rwanda, which is a platform for popularizing science, and which offers opportunities for students through scholarships of the network of women in science, called OWSD, the Organization for Women in Science for the Developing World, which gives opportunities to girls and women in STEM fields. However, there is still a lot to do, because the representation of women in science is far from being reached. Beyond research, I intend to contribute to the training of young people in science in Burkina Faso, and in Africa in general, by giving courses at universities, and also supervising masters and PhD students. I also plan to take action to popularize science education in general, and astrophysics in particular in countries where access to science is limited. This will serve to motivate young girls and boys, especially young girls, to take up scientific studies. There are also other future actions that I plan to undertake, in collaboration with other researchers, namely the establishment of scientific schools in Africa, particularly dedicated to women; the organization of workshops to enable female scientists to speak about their inspiring work, and cultivate self-confidence. The creation of an astronomy club for children, etc. In addition to being fascinating as a science, astronomy can also be used as a development tool through, for example, education and tourism. The International Astronomical Union understands this and is making a lot of effort to address this development component in developing countries, and working to achieve a Sustainable Development Goals set by the United Nations. The typical example, in Sub-Saharan Africa is the case of South Africa, where the installation of telescopes in localities has not only facilitated the popularization of science and the creation of jobs for young people, but also has boosted the economy, and the development of infrastructure in these localities. The current context in which we, notably the COVID-19 pandemic, reminds us of how important science must occupy our lives and our education system. This importance must convince the African authorities that it is more

than necessary to devote a large part of national budgets to the support and the promotion of studies and of scientific research, because investment in human capital remains a secure means for the growth of a country. Above all, we must understand that to get our continent out of underdevelopment, we will have to review our way of executing these programs, focusing on education, training in science, technology, and innovation, especially space science, could not only increase our human potential, which is a source of sustainable development, but also enable the management of our natural resources and thus impact the economy in the continent. Africa has an immense amount of natural resources, essential to the development of industry. It is necessary to arrive at a point where these resources are exploited, first for its development, by women and men trained on the continent and with compatible techniques. Thank you for offering me the opportunity to share my thoughts on the necessity of education in science in Africa. Thank you.

ROSS: Thank you, Dr. Korsaga. Sorry we had a little bit of trouble. We will be taking questions for Dr. Korsaga – send your questions in now. We will be taking them in a short moment. Our next speaker is Sen. Joe Pennachio. He has served in the New Jersey State Senate since 2008, and previously served in the state's General Assembly from 2001-2008. Senator Pennachio has a far-reaching vision and has been an outspoken advocate for the development of nuclear fusion energy. Senator Pennacchio sponsored a hearing in the New Jersey State Legislature last May entitled: "What Are the Prospects and Requirements for the Early Development of Fusion Energy, and What Are the Implications for the U.S., New Jersey, and the World?" This hearing pulled together leading scientists – from the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab, as well as from several New Jersey technical corporations that are working on fusion, including in collaboration with ITER [International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor] project in France. A link to the video of that hearing that Senator Pennachio held will be included on the conference webpage. Following the hearing, Senator Pennacchio introduced an important group of six interrelated bills to support and attract businesses on fusion, to call on the federal government to offer greater support for this necessary new technology, and one, which passed the Senate this February, finances research positions for fusion energy and plasma physics, as part of this effort. In his introduction to his hearing he said that even with the estimate that we could have a sustainable fusion reaction by 2025 and commercial applications by 2050, he said "in my humble opinion, that is not soon enough." He then concluded: "The problems that we have ... for instance, in space travel—we have to get a new propulsion system that can overcome those challenges—one of the ways to allow intergalactic and interplanetary travel in the future. Imagine the benefits that men and women can reap from its development... Myself, and the other legislators in this building—we need to know how we can help that; how can we nurture and

help this game changer come into being.” Let’s now hear from New Jersey State Sen. Joe Pennacchio, serving New Jersey’s 26th District.

SEN. JOSEPH PENACCHIO: I’m New Jersey State Senator Joseph Penacchio.

Q: At the close of your hearing, there was a group of high school students there who had attended, as well as people from universities, and you said that the development of fusion – you said that the hearing was for them as much as for anybody, and that the development of fusion would fundamentally change their lives. What is your vision for the next 50 years for those young people, the next two generations, if we achieve fusion? If we get a commitment to actually achieve fusion today?

SENATOR PENACCHIO: Well, I don’t know if the word is “if.” From what I’ve been reading it’s not “if” but “when.” They’ve actually set up parameters and dates within the five years, 2025, they will actually have a sustainable fusion reaction, and then 25 years after that they think they can have the first commercial application of fusion. I think that more or less parallels what happened with nuclear fission, and the application and development of that. I would hope that, if you put a concerted effort into it, if we share our knowledge with knowledge that’s going on around the world, especially with the tokamak reactor and all the countries that have signed onto that [ITER] consortium, I would hope that it would be sooner than that. And it’s as much for their future as it is for mine. I’m 65 years old: My future is not measured in too many decades, if God is willing. But their future is measured in an awful lot more decades than I am. So again, imagine a clean, safe, renewable energy source, where we don’t have to go to war with each other to get it, and we don’t have to worry about breathing in some of the gases which may be harmful in the production of those energies.

Q: The idea that you have put forward, also, that you said in the hearing that politicians always think they’re responsible for the good things, but your position is that actually, it’s scientists who have changed history. I’d like to ask you to talk about that; and also, the influence of the ideas of the American Revolution which was very committed to science, from Ben Franklin on, – Ben Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and then, of course, someone whose picture is all over your office, Abraham Lincoln. So, I’d like you to comment on that, on the question of the American System, the commitment to science and the relationship between political leadership and scientific advance: What is the responsibility of politicians to advance that, and what is the role of the citizens to make sure that that is done?

SENATOR PENACCHIO: Well, the evolution of our lives, the fact that they've gotten better has been through science. It wasn't politicians that got rid of cholera and typhoid and smallpox and polio: It was science. It wasn't politicians that got us to the Moon, it was science. But it was politicians that challenged us, and that redirected some of those resources that way, we {can} go to the Moon, we {can} fight off these infectious diseases. We can improve and lift the spirits of {all} Americans and all humankind! So my job as a politician is to form public policy and to act as catalyst for some of those good things that science can do. And part of that process is economic, of course, and we think that by generating that enthusiasm for fusion, we could also cultivate a resource in the state that we haven't seen, since Princeton first got themselves involved with fusion. So, it's a win-win-win for all those around us. For some reason we abrogated that responsibility to Paris and their tokamak reactor. And being the selfish New Jersey politician that I am, I'd like to see us get it back. The good news is that, as with the tokamak reactor and the ITER, International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor, that a consortium put together, I would hope all of this material, all this science is shared, in real time: That way we can push this forward and make it a reality for those children that were attending that meeting that day, Susan. [end video]

ROSS: Wonderful. Thank you, to Senator Pennachio. Now, what I'd like to do, is pose to Marie Korsaga, two questions that are related to your presentation. The first comes from Ahmed Moustafa, who is the director of the Asia Center for Studies and Translation in Dakar, Senegal. He asks: "How should we reconsider the current educational pedagogic systems worldwide, according to this pandemic? What lessons must be realized?" One other question comes from Benoit Douteau [ph] from France, who asks: "How can we in Africa use the coronavirus pandemic to develop nuclear energy, infrastructure and industry in the next decade?" So the questions are about changes in the educational system, in pedagogical technique, as well as how to use the current problem as an opportunity to create growth in Africa. And I'd like to ask Dr. Korsaga, because we might be having some troubles with our translation facilities, if she could respond slowly to the question.

KORSAGA: [translated] To respond to the first question, I would say that to improve the quality of education, we must improve the Africa laboratories, scientific laboratories. Theoretical studies are more common due to a lack of material supplies and this must be rectified. We must also encourage students and provide them opportunities to be able to really extend their education and fulfill it to a higher level. We must also include facilities and tools to help women pursue their studies and feel more comfortable in the educational environment. On the second question, about the coronavirus pandemic, we don't

yet have full scientific abilities to deal with the coronavirus, and in their absence, we're relying on governmental techniques, such as staying at home, washing your hands, or disinfecting them. Scientists are performing studies, they're simulating the reaction of the virus with different drugs they're considering, they're studying the propagation of the virus with methods of modeling.

ROSS: OK, and then she'll be available for more questions later. Thank you, Dr. Korsaga. Our next speaker is Prof. Will Happer: He has a long and distinguished scientific career. He is a Princeton University Professor of Physics Emeritus. Will Happer received his physics PhD at Princeton and began his career at Columbia University (where he became the director of the Columbia Radiation Laboratory), before joining the physics faculty at Princeton in 1980. In 1991 he was appointed by the President to serve as Director of Energy Research in the Department of Energy, where he oversaw a research budget of some \$3 billion annually, which included much of the federal funding for high energy and nuclear physics, materials science, magnetic confinement fusion, environmental and climate science, the human genome project, and other areas. He then returned to Princeton as a physics professor until his retirement in 2014. From September 2018 to September 2019, Dr. Happer again served in an appointment by the President. He was the Deputy Assistant to the President and Senior Director of Emerging Technologies on the National Security Council. He has published over 200 peer-reviewed scientific papers. And he is happy to speak with us next.

WILL HAPPER: I'm Will Happer, and I'm a retired professor of physics at Princeton University, where I worked for many years. I still have an office there, thanks to the trustees of Princeton University. Before that, I spent many years New York City at Columbia University in my youth, and my children were born there. I'm trained in nuclear physics and atomic physics. I've done a lot of work on laser physics. I'm probably best known for inventing the sodium guidestar, which most modern telescopes use to compensate for atmospheric turbulence so you can get better resolution of galaxies and other astronomic objects. My career has been a mixture of theory and experiment. I've done a lot of experiments. I've spent a good fraction of my time in working on spin-polarized gases, spin-polarized nuclei, and one result of that was that we learned to polarize helium-3 and xenon-129 in such large quantities that there was enough that you could breed them, and then you could look at people's lungs with magnetic resonance imaging machines, that was impossible before. And so that's developed into an interesting diagnostic technique in medicine, still going on today. We actually did a little start-up company based on that, which was successful, and helped to launch the careers of some of our former students

and post-docs. So, I guess, I would say, I'm a classical physics nerd: I like physics, I like quantitative things, I like things that you can model. I want them to be models that can be believed!

Q: You were requested by the Trump Administration to organize a panel to evaluate the claims of climate change, but that committee never functioned. What happened?

HAPPER: Well, it's not a very complicated idea. Almost any other important science or technology, or effort of our country has been carefully reviewed. Especially in defense, for example, before we buy something, we have what's called a "Red team review," where people intentionally try to poke holes in say, this weapons system, or this theory, or that. And then the proponents have to defend it. And you know, often they get through with A-plus certification. I defended what I'm trying to do, you got these people at their best, they couldn't poke any holes in it, so I'm stronger than when I started. And so, if climate is really so good, why are they afraid to stand up and defend what they're doing, to be questioned, answer questions – everyone else has to do that, why are they different? So, they were absolutely outraged to think that anyone would like to audit what they were doing. Everybody else gets audited, but they're free from audits. And so, it was a political issue. They called in all of their friends in the Senate, you know, and all across America – "how dare this evil Trump Administration us. We're the greatest scientists who ever lived on the planet, and we're saving the planet. And here are these guys are trying to ask us about how we calibrate this thermometer, you know? How dare they do that!" That was the situation. And then I think the President understood, but there were many, many other issues at the time, and it just didn't seem like this was the right one to pick up. He was probably right.

Q: [2:16:24 no text]

HAPPER: What it tells you is that scientists always have to be very self-critical, you should always be questioning yourself, you should be questioning your colleagues. Have you thought about this? Could it have been caused by this, rather than what you claim it's caused by? And that's what does not happen in climate. Climate is completely impervious to criticism. You cannot criticize it. It's like denying some religious belief. In fact, it's interesting: The language that they use is all religious. "You're {denying} climate..". Well, what does "denying" mean? Why are you using that word in connection with a scientific field? So, it has all the trappings of a religious cult, and that's what it has become for many people. There are exceptions; there are honest climate scientists, but they're deluded by many cultists.

Q: What is your view of the nature of scientific research? How do you think fundamental discoveries in science are made?

HAPPER: A lot of people don't realize how important accidents have been in the development of technology and science. You know, politicians think that we will set up a big program, we'll spend a lot of money and we'll have a war on cancer, and we'll cure cancer. I remember when that happened – that was back in the '70s, and we spent a lot of money and cancer's still here! We've made a little progress, thank goodness. But that's not the way that you solve a really hard problem. It's usually solved because of some accidental discovery: Take nuclear energy, for example, fission energy. It was obvious there was a lot of energy involved in nuclear transformations, from the first discovery of the nucleus by Ernest Rutherford. And when Rutherford was asked, "Are you ever going to get power?" He says, "Anyone who says they're going to get a power out of nuclear physics, they're talking moonshine." I think that was the word he used, "moonshine." And he was right, because, at the time, no one knew there was there was such a thing as a neutron. But, a few years after he had made this statement, the neutron was discovered – accidentally – they thought, at first, it was some odd gamma-ray, penetrating gamma-ray, so it took a long time to realize that this was a new elementary particle that was not charged, and so, could easily interact with nuclei – there's no Coulomb force to keep it out. So that was the first accident. And then Enrico Fermi was very quick to use the neutron for studies of nuclear physics, and he and his team in Rome did lots of exciting work in those first few years. He got the Nobel Prize for making what he thought were transuranic elements. He deserved the Nobel Prize, he was such a good guy, but it was a mistake! You know, what he was really doing was causing fission of uranium, and it wasn't until Lise Meitner and her team in Berlin started doing chemistry on this irradiated nuclear uranium, they realized it's not transuranics at all. It's barium, and intermediate weight nuclei, that have been formed when the uranium nucleus splits. Again, an accident. And so, those two accidents, the accidental discovery of the neutron and the accidental discovery of fission made nuclear power possible, not only weapons, but civilian power, too. That has not happened for fusion. I think it may happen: Somebody will make an accidental discovery, which will make what seems like a very, very difficult engineering problem right now, suddenly feasible. And so, I'm all for supporting work on fusion. But you have to be realistic that it won't help to increase the budget by a factor of ten, if you don't have a good, new idea!

Q: What areas of scientific research most excite you today?

HAPPER: Well, of course, satellites have been very important for climate science, because we have the best data available now, from satellite

measurements of atmospheric temperatures, satellite measurements of cloudiness, satellite measurements of the radiation budget of the Earth; all of that's good stuff, and I'm 100% for that. That's a part of climate science that we can be proud of, and I think it doesn't get enough support. Of course, that's focused on the Earth, not on other planets, but, the way other planets' climate systems work is interesting, too. You know, Venus is quite different from Earth, most of that is because it's quite a bit closer to the Sun, so it gets twice as much insolation as Earth does. But there are interesting systems on the other planets: Jupiter has an amazing climate system, you know, clouds, the great red spot. So, there are a very rich set of targets out there for bright young people to work on, for NASA's exploration satellites to help with. So, all of that's very good stuff. I think if you ask, what is the fundamental question out there, it's really dark matter. You know, there's this huge part of the matter in the universe that nobody knows what it is. And it's obviously there, from not very subtle experimental observations: You know, how fast galaxies rotate about their center – they rotate much too fast, because of some of this missing mass, the dark matter. And then there's the dark energy. So, I think those are the fundamental frontiers. And there, too, I think this is probably a puzzle that will be solved by a lucky accident. You know, we should do our best to design experiments, but keep our eyes open for accidents. I think that's how it will be cracked. If you don't talk about space, I think the other huge area, if I were a young person, I would look very carefully at, biology, biophysics, biochemistry. We see, just in the case of COVID, if we were nimble, we could have had a vaccine or an antidote. And I would guess the time will come when we will be able to respond to new viruses very, very quickly, and nip them in the bud. We can't do that today, but that's certainly something that I believe could be done in the future. But it won't happen automatically: People need to work on it, there have to be accidents happening. There, too, there have been accidents. I think many of your listeners may know about the CRISPR revolution, that was, again, an accident in biology that discovered this CRISPR mechanism for gene editing. But it was because some smart people looked at data and realized, there's something funny about this, it doesn't fit the usual paradigm, and they worked it out. So, I think there's plenty of room for smart young people who are willing to work hard, to make a big difference to the human condition – and to have a good time doing it, you know, solving problems. [end video]

ROSS: That was Prof. Will Happer, Professor of Physics Emeritus from Princeton University. If, like me, you found several of the things he said surprising, or you'd like to ask him about them, please send in your questions, to questions@schillerinstitute.org. Professor Happer will be available for the Q&A shortly, as are Ben Deniston, Megan Beets, and Marie Korsaga. Our next presentations, before we get into that Q&A are about the treatments of COVID-19,

and we're going to be hearing from two physicians who are involved in this. First we'll hear from Dr. Kildare Clarke who is a physician practicing in New York City, about what the situation is like at what is currently Ground Zero for the coronavirus.

DR. KILDARE CLARKE: I'm Kildare Clarke. I've been a doctor for many, many years, too many to even remember! However, I got very involved with the Lyndon LaRouche movement, which was a very important thing for me to do that point in time, due the fact that they were looking at the injustice which goes on in healthcare delivery, on the closing of various hospitals, turning over those spaces to private entities at the expense of the patients which we were taking care of. We warned them, back then! and with many protests, many demonstrations, even down to the Washington, D.C. General Hospital, where Dennis [Speed], myself, Lyndon LaRouche, and many of others went to protest the closing of that hospital. Despite our loss – because they did close the hospital – we have never given up that mission. Because healthcare is the {number one national product} of the world. Just to give you an example: If every person in this world is sick, nothing moves! So therefore, our national product is the healthcare of everyone, and that's where our focus must always go first, because we can think about politics. Anyhow, the powers to be think it is best for them to look at healthcare as a numbers game, like widget, which you play on Wall Street. But people's lives are not widgets; they're human beings. Without them, there is no world. And it is incumbent upon us, as healthcare providers to make that message go through loud and clear! We might have to give up a lot! We might be fired from our jobs, we might be thrown in prison! But it's a cause which is so indelible in my mind, that we must do it, and do it for the good of society. It's not a personal thing, it's for the good of society. [end video]

ROSS: I think Dr. Clarke put the moral terms of the necessity for a world health system very clearly in what he just said. Our next and final speaker for this panel is Dr. Guangxi Li. And the Schiller Institute would like to thank the CGTN Think Tank in helping to make Dr. Li available. Dr. Li is an MD-PhD at the China Academy of Medical Sciences in Beijing and he is with the Department of Cardiovascular Medicine at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. His most recent paper, published on April 11 in the Mayo Clinic Proceedings, is "Association between Hypoxemia and Mortality in Patients with COVID-19." He will speak with us today about an aspect of the Chinese response to COVID-19. His title is "Preventing Acute Lung Injury – Essentials of COVID-19 Treatment." Following Dr. Li's remarks, we will be able to have more Q&A with all of the panelists I mentioned before.

DR. GUANGXI LI: Hello everyone. I'm Guangxi Li. I'm from the Academy of Chinese Medical Science. Today, my topic will focus on the Chinese medicine treatment of COVID-19. So, we all know the COVID-19 outbreak since January of this year has now spread all over the world, and it's certainly a pandemic for humanity. We are fighting COVID-19 with different approaches. But in China we do have traditional Chinese medicine theory and a history of Chinese medicine, we are fighting different kinds of viruses and pandemic using only herbs. It's really, really effective, and we have quite a lot of experience with that. So today, I would like to share some of our successful cases. We also have some data, and we are going to publish these data soon. Let me share this [slide show] screen first: ["Preventing Acute Lung Injury – Essentials of COVID-19 Treatment" Guangxi Li MD] My topic today is "Preventing Acute Lung Injury – Essentials of COVID-19 Treatment." [Slide: "Clinical Presentation"] As we all know most patients who suffer from COVID-19 will have very mild symptoms, or even they may not have any symptoms. They are asymptomatic patients. In terms of our experience there are several stages: The first stage is the incubation period, that's about 1-14 days. The second week of the disease is the most important window for us to prevent acute lung injury. That's the fever period. That's Day 1 to Day 7. Basically the first week of the disease onset. The patient will usually have mild fever to severe fever, so 37.5°Celsius to over 39.1°C. So, one patient may only have a very mild fever, then they stop at that line, and then other patients may develop a quite severe fever. The third stage is acute lung injury period. So if we cannot treat a fever, when the patients may develop acute injury, even in [alveoli? 3:10]. Now we need some kind of [inaudible 3:18] approach, especially when we need to intubate patients. And later on, if the patient can overcome this difficult stage and they will come to the current period, so that's after two weeks. [Slide: "Whole Map of Treatment"] Basically, this is a whole map of the treatment using Chinese methods. What we need to do, is we need to start treatment early. There are several indications for the severe cases. Here, the high temperature increase, and dry cough increase, and the patient develops dyspnea, and that means the patient may go down the road of acute lung injury. So that's a very dangerous indicator. So that's what we need to do. We need to treat the patient early, it's not too late. Once we start when a patient has already developed acute lung injury, then we treat them for what's really a very long treatment period, and the mortality is high. So the best, if we want to get some good outcome, we need to intervene at the early stage. [Slide: "Very Early Stage: Control Transmission"] So, the very early stage is what we need to do. Also we need to control transmission. So, test, test, test. Then we can find out who has the virus, and then we isolate the patients. That's what we have done. [Slide: "Fever Window"] So, the fever window is very, very important, as I said before. Right now, we don't have any confirmed antiviral drug that really works on these patients. So, if they have persistent fever, the

patients may develop very severe, and they're falling off the cliff. So, the best way, what we've seen is the Chinese medicine. [Slide: "ALI Prevention"] Regarding Chinese medicine, we actually don't want to kill the virus, from the Chinese philosophy. We want to regulate our immune response to the virus, to attack the virus. Basically the virus actually can be killed by ourselves. The major reason why the patients die, because the virus causes very strong cytokine storm. And then the cytokine storm will kill us. So this is what we use. Here is a formula what we use for our patients [on slide]. Basically, the first important medication is the ginseng. Using the current Western medicine we tested, isn't really helpful to decrease cytokine storm, by regulating ourselves to attack the new virus. [Slide: "ALI Prevention"] And then we monitor patients' fever progression. We monitor their oxygen saturation. We monitor their cough and shortness of breath. So, we can prevent the acute lung injury. [Slide: "Rescue Therapy"] So, if we could not cure the patient at an early stage, and the patient may develop ARDS, then we use some kind of ventilator, even ECMO [extracorporeal membrane oxygenation]. [Slide: "Early Stage (Day 1-7) Fever Reduce"] [Slide: "Early Stage Case – Fever & Fatigue"] There are some kind of cases I would like to discuss. Here is a patient, 76 years old, he had a fever for 2 days, and you can see [CT video], here is the CT scan, and you can see the moderate bilateral lung infiltrate. We used medicine to treat him. And then you see four 4 days later, we had another CT scan and the patient with not much better symptoms. Here is another CT scan for him. We noticed that this disease is quite different from other pneumonias. The infiltrate could disappear in a very short period of time, if we treat patients in time. So the patient, even though he had quite a lot of co-morbidities, and other complications, but he still recovered in about 1 week. He did not get any Western medicine treatment, no antiviral drug, no antibiotics. There are some other cases, but I will not discuss too much. [Slide: "Fever Persistent (after 3-7 days) Early ALI"] [Slide: "Persistent Fever – Early ALI"] And here, the patients if the fever is persistent, maybe after a week, the patient could start to develop acute lung injury. Here is another case, I would like to discuss. The patient who is marathon runner, and after he got acute lung injury and you can see the bilateral infiltrate. And when we used the Chinese medicine, it stopped the fever, the patient could recover after the Chinese medicine; but it doesn't work with the Western medicine. [Slide: "Coughing & Dyspnea (Second Week) Early ARDS"] [Slide: "Early ARDS – Coughing & Dyspnea"] In this case, the patient really had acute lung injury, even he had already developed lung injury, how it [s/l shake up 9:27]. This is another case. Once the patient had the acute lung injury, his O₂ was about 65 and his saturation only 81. Obviously, it's very severe acute lung injury. And what we did is, we used Chinese medicine, and nothing else, some kind of trapping and fashion, all this stuff to stop the coughing. And the patient recovered after 1 week of Chinese medicine treatment.

And you can see the CT scan is very severe: Almost 90% of his lung was infiltrated, it was damaged. [Slide: "Treatment Summary"] So, the basic stuff I want to summarize, the mechanism of this COVID-19 is the development of acute lung injury. If the patient doesn't acute lung injury, that's [inaudible 10:26]. The only patients we need to treat are those who develop acute lung injury. You can see this last figure from the {New England Journal of Medicine}, talking about the acute lung injury. The right side is abnormal alveolus after an attack of COVID-19. Recently, you could see those patients, where the alveoli were broken, and we have quite a lot of infusions, and there was [s/l flattening?], it's worse here. So then we need to treat patients at the early stage, so that's why we use the Chinese medicine to stop the fever and stop the inflammation, and stop the cough. After that, with some patients maybe, we still need oxygen support on a respirator support. We should not use any antiviral drugs or antibiotics. [Slide: "Questions & Discussion"] So that's what my talk is. Thank you. I would like to take any questions. [end video]

Panel 2 CONCLUSION: For a Better Understanding of How Our Universe Functions

Saturday, April 25, 2002 With Jason Ross, Megan Beets, and Ben Deniston

Question & Answer Session

ROSS: Thank you Dr. Li. We're now at our discussion period and we've got a fair amount of time available – I don't know if that's true for all speakers, but currently available for questions are myself, Ben Deniston, Megan Beets, Marie Korsaga, and Professor Happer is being connected, as well.

While he's being connected, I'll just make an announcement that *Lyndon LaRouche Collected Works, Vol. 1* is available at larouchelegacyfoundation.org

I see Professor Happer is now with us, thank you so much for joining us. Several questions came in for you based on the speech you gave, and so I'd like to combine a couple of them, and maybe just chat for a minute.

One of the things that you brought up in your talk was about the role of accidents in making discoveries, even if you weren't really intending to – that they sort of come up. You had said at the end of your talk that it might be possible one day, to be able to rapidly react to a virus that arises, be able to create antibodies or antidotes quickly; but that making that breakthrough might

require a fortunate accident.

I was wondering if you could say more about the role of accidents in scientific discovery. And also the apparent contrast between the ability to have a science-driver program, like when Kennedy said "We going to the Moon," – how do you see the relationship between having a crash program to really try and make a scientific discovery, versus the serendipitous nature that some of them take?

HAPPER: Well, frankly, you can have focused research programs and they can do some good. But the really big breakthroughs historically have usually been some accident or another. For example, the discovery of X-rays was a complete accident: Roentgen was perceptive enough to recognize something strange was happening in his laboratory, and he worked hard and he turned it into modern X-ray technology. It was an accident that fission was discovered. Nobody predicted fission: It was thanks to Lise Meitner and Otto Hahn that when they tried to repeat Enrico Fermi's experiments, transuranics, and did some chemistry on it, they did not find what they thought should be there. They thought there should be neptunium and plutonium transuranics; that's what Fermi got the Nobel Prize for. But in fact, that wasn't what he was doing. He was splitting the nucleus, and Meitner and Hahn were smart enough to demonstrate that. The radioactivity really associated with barium not with plutonium.

So there are many cases like that, where the initial breakthrough is just completely unexpected. The other extreme of that is you take something like the semiconductor industry, you know, Moore's Law, that has been systematic investment in better and better equipment, higher resolution, photolithography, better photoresists, better control of the equipment – that also works. But it's a different type of scientific progress than the type that I think will be necessary for example to solve the controlled fusion problem: I think that will be solved by an accident.

Another example of that is not practical, but I think you know that the low-hanging fruit in physics and cosmology today is what is the nature of dark matter? What is it that makes galaxies rotate a lot faster than they really should be rotating? And people are desperately trying to figure out what it could be, trying to build detectors that would detect weakly interacting particles, hereto-unimagined – this, again, I think will be a problem that will be solved by a lucky accident and some perceptive person who can tell the difference between an important accident and just the usual mistakes that are made in experiments. I hope that's enough.

ROSS: Another one of the panelists from this discussion would also like to ask a

question. Ben, are you there? Ben Deniston, go ahead.

DENISTON: Glad to be here with all the guests we've had, and glad to speak to you Mr. Happer: One thing I wanted to ask, you've discussed and other people have discussed the benefits of higher levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere, and I've found that to be some fascinating areas of science to look at, just how our biosphere responds to some of these things. And when I've discussed that with other people, what I find is that there seems to be more of a gut reaction, even from scientists, about that that doesn't seem to fit a certain narrative; and oftentimes, in the most fundamental sense there tends to be a narrative that human activity is inherently problematic for the planet and human activity inherently causes problems and catastrophes and any idea that it could be good just doesn't fit this perspective. And people tend to think about science as "objective," "fact based," kind of like a cold just-follow-the-facts process, when in reality it seems like we have these narratives and dogmas that do play a substantial role in affecting where science goes and doesn't go, and what areas of science which could be incredibly beneficial and interesting, including various factors of natural causes of climate change are actually affected by this. So, I'd definitely appreciate any thoughts you have on that reality of this social aspect and these narratives in science, and the affect that has; and where we can go to get past some of that.

HAPPER: I think science has always been much more subjective than scientists would like you think, and people have been disputing science since Galileo and long before, over the nature of this aspect of science or that. And the idea that scientists are somehow different from other human beings who have prejudices and who have infatuations or are mistaken frequently, that's just not true. Scientists have all those faults, and it's been demonstrated generation after generation. An example is continent drift: You remember that this was originally proposed by a very good, very bright German, but he was not trained in geology, so his ideas – it was Alfred Wegener – he was an excellent scientist and he was just dismissed out of hand, especially by American geologists. And I remember, even when I was a graduate student in the early '60s, he was still being dismissed. But he was completely right. And now, nobody would even think to question continental drift, it's a real fact. But it wasn't easy for the first proposers and first disciples who made headway: You didn't get tenure, for example, if you believed in continental drift in the 1950s.

Coming back to your question, people don't like to admit that CO₂ is a benefit to the world. It actually clearly is: The geological history is completely clear, and I think the most compelling thing is that if you go to greenhouse operators, they routinely double, triple, quadruple the amount of CO₂ in their

greenhouses, and not because they're involved in the debate over climate, but because they want to make money! And if you grow cucumbers or if you grow decorative flowers in a greenhouse with more CO₂, you get a better product, and you get a better price. You have to pay for the CO₂ – it's not cheap – but it's a good investment.

And so, here we're getting this free CO₂ that's enriching the entire planet, and we should be very grateful for that. But of course, it doesn't fit the narrative, and what can I say? It's the human condition.

ROSS: Dr. Happer, in your short talk here, you mentioned dark matter. Another speaker we have on the panel who's not appearing on the screen right now, but we have with us, Marie Korsaga: She recently received her doctorate in astrophysics looking at dark matter. And I'd like to pose a question to her, and then return to ask you a question, Professor Happer.

Dr. Korsaga will answer this one in English, I believe. The question is from [inaudible 2:53:16] who asks that since gender divisions in enrollments are more pronounced in STEM than they are in other areas of education, what can be done by Africa states to encourage girls to study space sciences. And congratulations for setting the ground for future girls to study astrophysics.

That's a question for Marie Korsaga, and then we have another question for you, Will Happer.

KORSAGA: To answer this question, I'm really not an expert to the method, but my opinion is that girls need to be inspired from a young age, and for that they need role models. That's why it's important to encourage girls and women to pursue scientific studies, by allowing them to have more access to science, for example, during meetings in organizations, or meetings and workshops.

And also what I would like to say, we need more scientific schools for girls, to have access, and give them opportunities like scholarships to pursue in STEM studies. And what I would also like to say, is may be if the government would give more opportunities, and to give more opportunities for girls in science, like having interactions between girls and women who already have science backgrounds, so they can see them as role models, and then they will be inspired to continue and pursue scientific studies.

ROSS: Thank you Dr. Korsaga. I'd like to pose a question to Will Happer now. Professor Happer, one of the earlier speakers on this panel who is not able to join us for the Q&A – he's in France – Dr. Jean-Pierre Luminet, who's an

astrophysicist, he in his presentation had contrasted the necessity for free invention, and he used quotations from Einstein about this; he spoke about the method of Johannes Kepler; and he contrasted the role of free invention in being able to actually create concepts to improve our understanding of physics – he contrasted that with the too-strict implementation of what’s called the “scientific method,” which he believes is too formal, really, to bear the greatest kinds of fruit.

Do you have a response to this distinction that Jean-Pierre Luminet had laid out in his talk?

HAPPER: OK, well, unfortunately, I didn’t hear the talk because I had some trouble signing in. But I agree with what you describe, that the scientific method is often a straitjacket that hinders progress. It certainly hinders these accidental discoveries if you take it too literally. It is important eventually to make sure this brilliant idea you think you’ve had, it really is a brilliant idea, and most people I know have lots of brilliant ideas of which maybe one in ten really is brilliant, you know. And so it takes a little while to sort out which ones really are important. But they don’t come from following some textbook. They come from God knows where, but they come to prepared minds, to people who are prepared to recognize some important new idea.

ROSS: Good, thank you. I’d like to ask one more to Dr. Korsaga. Here is the question that came in from someone in New York. He says, “The great historian and physicist, Cheikh Anta Diop, wrote in his 1978 short book on Africa that advanced technologies such as thermonuclear fusion must be pursued in African nations and astronomical observatories and elements of space exploration are needed to be put online as rapidly as possible, to allow African states to enter the 21st century on the same footing as other parts of the world.

This did not occur. In what way do you think we must act to encourage, in particular young people, the people that Professor Happer and others expect to make the new breakthroughs, how do we encourage them despite the many hardships that may exist?

KORSAGA: Thank you for this question. It’s an interesting one. What I can say is, to encourage them is before we need to create more opportunities, and also we need to let them know the importance of these sciences, these scientific programs for Africa, for the development of Africa, and the impact of these in Africa.

And what I also want to add, is when you take space science, astronomy and

others, even if it's not the other impact related to different kinds of studies like taking, for example, a program for astronomy, you need to develop competence in engineering, mathematics and physics, and all those skills are useful for the development for the country in many sectors. So I think we need to give all this information to young people in Africa, to let them know the importance and the positive impact of these scientific studies.

ROSS: Thank you Dr. Korsaga.

The next question goes to Will Happer, and this is a question that another one of our panelists wanted to ask you. Megan Beets, go ahead.

BEETS: Hi Dr. Happer. Earlier in the presentation that Jason, Ben and I gave, we discussed some of the common threats to the planet including space weather events like CMEs, asteroid strikes and so forth, and something that I raised as part of my presentation was the fact that our planet is in a galactic system. And what I specifically wanted to ask you about is the weather system. You've had people like Nir Shaviv, Henrik Svensmark, and others demonstrate that cycles of our Solar System's motion through the galaxy and the influence of galactic cosmic rays in the atmosphere play a big role in modulating weather on Earth. So I was wondering if you could say a little bit more about that, and also if you have any thoughts on why that outlook is so rejected and resisted today?

HAPPER: I'm a big admirer of Henrik Svensmark and Nir Shaviv. They've done absolutely very beautiful work, very interesting work. They're still working hard on actual experiments to see how cloud nuclei form in the atmosphere in response to cosmic rays, so they don't just make theories, they actually do measurements. As they pointed out, the Earth and the Solar System drift in and out of the spiral arms of our galaxy and so this modulates cosmic ray backgrounds on a long-term basis over maybe tens of millions of years. And there's some evidence that that has played a role in the climate of the Earth, if you take these very long periods into account.

So, if you don't know about their work, I do recommend it to you. Nir Shaviv in particular has written some very accessible summaries of the ideas. It's good physics, good astronomy – and, they may be right! I don't know whether they're right or not, but it looks better than many of the establishment theories of what is controlling climate which are clearly – those theories are clearly not working very well.

ROSS: Dr. Happer, we've got some more questions that have come in for you – well, we have many questions on many topics: There are about 20 questions about

COVID, ranging from implanting microchips when you get a vaccine, to digital identity cards, to vitamin C, to masks being bad for you. We're going to leave those aside for now, and stick with some of the topics of the speaks that we have actually available for the Q&A. We will forward those to two physicians that we heard from earlier to see if they have any responses.

The next question that came for you is sort of a combined topic about national science objectives: This is sort of three questions put together. One is that Trump has called for international collaboration in space exploration as the U.S. plans to return to the Moon by 2024. U.S.-Soviet cooperation in space science has had a long and productive history. Recently, Putin has outlined a bold plan for multi-nation work to finally realize thermonuclear fusion as an inexhaustible energy source, says the questioner, and they'd like to know what the pathway is to realize those potentials?

I'd like to combine that with another question that came in, about the social role of science and of scientists.

Another question was about Trump's approach towards science and how it may be related to the work of, I believe his great-uncle, who is Prof. John Trump, who I believe was at MIT doing work during World War II. If you have any thoughts – those are sort of two different questions there – but about the cultural aspect of a commitment to science and how we could learn from working with others internationally?

HAPPER: I think international collaboration, to the extent that it provides career paths for young people is very good. For example, the Russians did us a big favor by launching Sputnik, in the United States, because science was languishing until that point, and it woke many people in the U.S. up to realize that there are a lot of smart people all over the world, not just in the United States, not just in Europe. There were smart people in Russia and China, even Africa. So, it was time for us to pull up our bootstraps and start moving again.

I think programs like this that inspire young people are important, programs that give them a career path forward, something they can do that gives them some self-respect. And I'm convinced that we will solve a number of problems because of the young people of the future having smart ideas, good ideas, and these accidents that I mentioned before, they don't have to come to young people, but they often do. So having some kind of a goal, even if you don't reach the goal often it doesn't matter, because you've discovered something else that you didn't expect to discover. And perhaps the type of joint efforts on controlled fusion or on space exploration with other countries will help us to do that. I'm

all in favor of that.

ROSS: I'd like to switch to one more question to Dr. Korsaga. We'd like to ask you to give some of your thoughts about how you believe the question of dark matter may be resolved? I know this was the topic of your PhD dissertation: Where do you think the future will lead us in exploring this phenomenon?

KORSAGA: My thought is first to state that dark matter for the moment it's a hypothetical matter. We cannot observe this matter. But we can feel it through gravity. So, knowing more about this matter will help us to understand form and evolve with time. But if you take a galaxy, you can notice that the rotation that the velocity as a function of the radius, the way it rotates, it's faster compared to the visible matter inside. When I'm talking about visible matter, I'm talking about the stellar components inside the galaxy, and also the gas components.

So, if we take these components, we can notice that the rotation, the way the galaxy is rotated is faster, compared to the rotation that we can only get when using the visible matter inside. So to understand how the galaxies rotate, we need to include the dark matter inside, to describe the rotational core of the galaxies.

So knowing this dark matter will help us to understand both the distribution and how the quantity of dark matter inside galaxies, and then to understand how the galaxy rotates, ends to better inform the formation in evolution and to better understand the universe.

One interesting thing to also notice, is that when we observe a galaxy at a certain distance, which are galaxies far from us, the luminosity that we collate is disturbed by the dark matter. And so, we call this the gravitational lens, and this gravitational lens can help us have a knowledge on how the dark matter is distributed, and the real quantity of the dark matter inside the universe. So knowing our universe, it's very, very important to understand the behavior of dark matter.

And when I'm talking about visible matter inside the universe, it only represents 5%, and the dark matter is five times the abundance of the visible matter. So we cannot say that we can understand how our universe is forming in time and evolving, if we only know 5% of the constituent. So knowing the dark matter will be an opportunity for us to understand the formation and evolution the galaxies and also the universe, and then, to go back, to understand the formation our planets and the appearance of life on Earth.

ROSS: Hmm! Thank you.

There are several more questions that came in, one in particular to Professor Happer about his work on developing the guidestar approach for adaptive optics. I first wanted to ask Professor Happer if you would like to add anything on the topic that Dr. Korsaga just addressed, of dark matter, before we move on?

HAPPER: I think she did a very nice job explaining that. It's obvious there's dark matter there, because galaxies are rotating too fast, if you don't assume dark matter. So it's clearly there, but the question is, what is it? Is it little particles; at one time people thought maybe it was dwarf stars that were too small to be seen. There is not much support for that any more. But it's a wonderful mystery, and it's a big effect. I would love to be the one to discover it – I don't expect to be, but I encourage young people to take that as one of their goals.

And I do agree with Dr. Korsaga about the importance of role models for young women. It's very hard for women in physics and astronomy to get started, at least in the United States, you don't get much support from your peers. If you're a young woman in middle school or high school and you show an interest in math or science, people make fun of you. And unless you have tremendous strength of character and you have family support, you often just give up before you've even had a chance to try something. One of my good friends was Sally Ride, the first female astronaut in the United States – I'm sorry Sally died far too young – but she was a tremendous inspiration to many young women, and I hope that she still is. And I hope that Dr. Korsaga will be an inspiration one of these days to a new generation of young women: So, good luck to you!

KORSAGA: Thank you very much!

ROSS: And I want to thank Dr. Korsaga: She's joining us from Burkina Faso and it's getting a little late there.

KORSAGA: I'm studying in South Africa.

ROSS: Oh, you're in South Africa, OK! Well, it's still pretty late, though. Well, I want to thank you for joining us. And if you can stay on, that's great, and if not, we wish you a good night, and thank you being with us.

Dr. Happer, Ben had a question for you about your development of the guidestar approach.

DENISTON: I definitely appreciate your taking the time: I was just curious if you had any favorite discoveries or areas of investigation that had been dependent on and built upon this ability to see through the atmosphere more clearly for astronomy, which your guidestar system contributed to.

HAPPER: Yeah. Well, it certainly played a major role in defining the properties of the black hole in the center of our galaxy, because it allowed people like Claire Max and Professor Malkin [ph] at UCSC to measure stars that are very, very close to the galactic center with infrared telescopes, and the additional resolution you could get from the USIP GuideStar was a key part of this, so I'm pleased that it had that application.

Of course, it has applications also in laser propagation. If you try to project a lot of laser power through the atmosphere, if you don't correct for the atmospheric turbulence, you just can't get much power onto target. And there it's routinely used also.

So there have been uses. It was heavily classified for 10 years, so we couldn't talk about it, but again, thanks to Claire Max it has been declassified since the early '90s, and has proved its worth in astronomy.

ROSS: I'd like to ask one final question, and Professor Happer if you want to stay on for it – I'll pose the question and let you decide. I'd like to ask all of our panelists to respond to it. This came in: "What do you believe is the one axiom that is most holding back scientific progress? What do you think is the most pernicious false belief that's holding us back in our creativity?"

HAPPER: I wasn't aware that we were being held back, actually. It seems to me we've made good progress! [laughter]

ROSS: Wow! OK. Well, thank you very much then. If you have anything that you'd like to say in summary, Professor Happer, and then, our other panelists and we'll wrap up the panel. Is there anything else you'd like to say to our viewing audience?

HAPPER: I think the main thing I want to say, is that especially young people should keep their courage up. People often give up too soon, and so if you're a young scientist, or you want to be a scientist, don't be easily discouraged if people say you can't do it, you usually are being misled. You can do it, if you keep trying. There's this great quote from *Faust* [quotes in German] "Whoever keeps trying, we can save." That's good advice: It was good advice then, it's still good advice today.

ROSS: Thank you very much, and thank you for joining us on this panel, Dr. Happer.

There are still dozens and dozens of questions that came in, and if you asked a question and we haven't answered it, there are literally dozens that we didn't get to that were sent in just for this panel.

So, Megan or Ben would either of you like to share any concluding thoughts with our audience today?

BEETS: Yes, I can say a few things: first, on your question about the axioms holding back science, there are probably many things to name. One thing I think is extremely important, and which was addressed in part by Dr. Luminet earlier, is the false belief that what we know about the universe from our own creative mental processes, cannot be applied when we look at the physical world outside of our skins. And I think this is an idea which really came to prominence in the 20th century, and I think that it should be eliminated: Because things we learn, for example, from our experience in Classical musical composition, especially the compositions of Beethoven, these can help us investigate the paradoxes having to do with time, that absolutely apply to our investigation of the physical universe. So that's one thing I would put out, is something which is extremely important, and I'll reference people to the work of Johannes Kepler as somebody who is exemplary as *not* having this problem, and his discoveries certainly speak for themselves.

But, just in a final summary word, in terms of what we presented today, I think the main message I'd like people to take is that coming out of this crisis we must have a new paradigm, not only in economic policy and many other things we spoke of this morning, and will continue to speak of; but scientific collaboration must be defined by this optimistic outlook for cooperation around these common aims: Humanity must be allowed to pull together and apply the best talents from among us from all over the world, to solve these real threats to human civilization. The only solution to these problems is progress: Scientific leaps forward, and that intention really does have to guide our scientific collaboration coming out of this period of crisis.

ROSS: Ben, do you have anything you'd like to say in conclusion.

DENISTON: I endorse everything Megan said. [laughter] She sums it up very well. When we were discussing with Helga Zepp-LaRouche about the formation of this panel and some of the content, she made the point that we want to be very clear that we're having this COVID pandemic; if it wasn't COVID, it could have been a

surprise asteroid, surprise comet, this is just – in a certain sense the best thing that can come out of this crisis is taking that as a warning to get this shift we're talking about, to get nations united against these common, larger threats, and not go through just the tragic fate of failing to get beyond this geopolitical perspective and end up going extinct, like many other, as we discussed, over 5 billion other species have gone before. It's on us to decide not to go.

So the best thing that can come out of this crisis is using this as a motivation to ensure that we do make the changes needed and go with LaRouche's program, as we've discussed, addressing not just the technical ways to avoid war, but addressing the underlying causes that lead to conflict, and finding the solutions in mutual, shared progress, that is uniquely human. Without that, as Mr. LaRouche spent his life defining, there's no durable survival. So shared progress is the guarantee of durable survival.

ROSS: I'll say something in conclusion and then we'll have some closing announcements.

As Ben just said, building on Megan, this conference takes place at a time where we have this COVID pandemic taking place, and it could have been any number of other disasters to which we're susceptible. That susceptibility is what we must take on.

And I'd just like to say one thing about the search for enemies, that unfortunately people are being pushed into right now: People are being told that China has lied about the coronavirus, that China created the coronavirus, etc., these kinds of things. There is no evidence that any virologist takes seriously that this was a manmade virus, that it was deliberately created in China, etc. There are also people who find fault with the performance of various governments. Michele Geraci had mentioned how Italy could have learned more from China's experience in dealing with the coronavirus. I believe that's clearly the case in the United States.

When people make the mistake, however, of looking for somebody to blame, they ignore the overall environment in which these decisions get made, and I'd like to read a quote from LaRouche to end things off here. It's from a paper that he wrote, so I can't play a video, but it's about his view of what is the real essence of tragedy. Take, for example, a Shakespearean tragedy such as *Hamlet*: Many people learn from their literature teachers that the tragedy is in Hamlet himself, that he failed to do what he should have done.

LaRouche takes a different view about where the tragedy is located. So, I'll read this paragraph from his 2000 essay, entitled, "Politics as Art." https://larouchepub.com/lar/2000/2745_politics_as_art.html

In it, Lyndon LaRouche wrote: "The principle underlying all competent composition and performance of what is known as Classical tragedy, is based upon the historical evidence it reflects. That principle is, that, in real life off stage, entire cultures, excepting those destroyed by natural causes beyond man's present ability to control, have been usually destroyed by the fatal defects inhering within that prevailing popular culture itself, as the U.S., as a nation, is being destroyed, like the ancient pagan Rome of the popular arena games, by no single factor as weighty as the effect of what is called 'popular entertainment' today."

So he says that most cultures have been destroyed by the "fatal defects inhering within that ... popular culture." What we need to do, and which this entire conference has been addressing on the highest level, is, what is a new paradigm? What is a new cultural outlook that we can adopt internationally, in discussion with each other, to replace the tragic one, in which we are susceptible to what we are currently experiencing, and overcoming that, with a real victorious, and enduringly growing future?

I'd like now to wrap things up. I'd like to thank our speakers today: Dr. Jean-Pierre Luminet, Michel Tognini, Walt Cunningham, Dr. Marie Korsaga, Sen. Joe Pennachio, Prof. Will Happer, Dr. Guangxi Li, Dr. Kildare Clarke.

Before the panel that begins tomorrow morning at 11 a.m., which is going to be a panel on culture, we do have a playlist of some cultural experiences for you, to enjoy and learn from before that panel begins.

[https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLoHwt4KyUk5Blyjo-lyI1akY_m95R12QD]

You'll find that on the conference website.

I'll just make one final reminder about the *Collected Works* of Lyndon LaRouche which are available and you can purchase online at <https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org>

Panel 1: “Det presserende behov for at erstatte geopolitikken med et nyt paradigme i internationale relationer”.

Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference den 25. april 2020

Talere på panel 1: Dennis Speed, ordstyrer, Schiller Instituttet; Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (videoklip); Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og præsident for Schiller Institute; Dmitry Polyanskij, 1. vice-permanent repræsentant, Den Russiske Føderations faste mission ved FN; Hans excellence Ambassadør Huang Ping, generalkonsul for Folkerepublikken Kina i New York; Jacques Cheminade, formand, Solidarité et Progrès, tidligere fransk præsidentkandidat; Michele Geraci, økonom fra Italien, tidligere sekretær for udviklingsministeriet i Rom; Bassam el-Hachem, professor i sociologi, det libanesiske universitet i Beirut, Libanon; Antonio Butch Valdes, grundlægger af det filippinske LaRouche Society, Filippinernes demokratiske parti.

Videoarkiv af panel 1: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_OCAxLIpAMY

Ordstyrer denne morgen, Dennis Speed, åbnede med to videoklip fra Lyndon LaRouche, et fra 1997 og et fra 2007, som præsenterede det fremsyn, der definerede LaRouches karriere. Kombination af disse videoklip understregede betydningen af samarbejdet mellem USA og Kina i forbindelse med større infrastruktur-platforme, samt den kritiske strategiske rolle, som nationerne USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien spiller i forbindelse med at gøre en ende på det britiske imperium, også kendt som det britiske Commonwealth.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche introducerede publikum til den bredere historiske baggrund og præsenterede det fremvoksende sammenfald af multiple kriser, dvs. pandemien, græshoppeplagen fra Afrika til Indien, den truende globale fødevarerkrise, stigende arbejdsløshed osv., som uforlignelig med selv den mørke tidsalder i det

14. århundrede. Hun opfordrede verden til at opdage nye principper og identificere de langsigtede årsager til den aktuelle krise, eliminere dem, og åbne et nyt kapitel i universalhistorien, så vi kan afslutte geopolitikens æra og etablere et nyt system baseret på menneskehedens identitet som en kreativ art.

Hun behandlede den igangværende optrapning i retning af atomkrig, som ses af den voksende propaganda, der drives af de samme elementer, som står bag kuppet mod præsident Trump, MI6 og Henry Jackson-Selskabet, men denne gang rettet imod Kina. Og dog udstiller denne operation også vores fjende, det britiske imperium, som et døende imperium fuldstændig afkoblet fra virkeligheden. Og hvis nogen skulle "betale" – som briterne nu insisterer på, at Kina skal betale for de økonomiske omkostninger ved virusset – skal briterne betale for deres forbrydelser mod menneskeheden og unødvendige tab af liv i de sidste to århundreder.

Fru LaRouche præsenterede et bredt intellektuelt overblik over den afstumpede liberale/nyliberale verdensorden, fra pastor Malthus 'folkemordsøkonomi, der var baseret på den italienske Giammaria Ortes syn på befolkningskontrol, til den venetianske agent Paolo Sarpi og hans besætning af karakterer såsom Galileo, Newton eller Adam Smiths filosofi og de moderne udtryk i form af spilteori og computerstyret økonomisk spekulation baseret på korruption af videnskab af Bertrand Russell. Russells opfordring til lejlighedsvis at have en 'sort død' til at feje hen over verden for at "løse" overbefolkningsproblemet blev omtalt som karakteristisk for imperiets ondskab. Hun insisterede på, at løsningen er et helt nyt verdenssyn, der bygger på den videnskabelige udvikling af menneskeheden, såsom rumforskning, fusionsenergi og udvikling af det menneskelige geni.

Den næste taler var første vicerepræsentant i FN fra Rusland, H.E. Dmitry Polyanskij, som behandlede den igangværende COVID-19-pandemi, de bredere sociale virkninger og nødvendigheden af øget globalt samarbejde, især at undgå at beskyldte hinanden eller bruge krisen til at øge konkurrencen. Han understregede også G20's rolle i at tackle problemerne, især for udviklingslandenes vedkommende.

Han blev efterfulgt af Generalkonsul for Folkerepublikken Kina i New York, Huang Ping. Ambassadør Huang, der foretog sin præsentation via videooptagelse, idet han var forpligtet til at hjælpe med levering af nødvendige medicinske forsyninger, der ankom fra Kina til Boston samme eftermiddag, gav et overblik

over den kinesiske tilgang og filosofi i forhold til den aktuelle pandemi og opfordrede til en udvidelse af samarbejdet mellem USA og Kina.

Der fulgte en kort række spørgsmål, hvor den videnskabelige rådgiver ved det kinesiske generalkonsulat i New York, Zhou Guolin, tog imod spørgsmål på vegne af ambassadør Huang. Det første spørgsmål omhandlede vigtigheden af et visionært topmøde mellem de 5 permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd, hvilket Rusland for nylig har foreslået. Et yderligere spørgsmål kom fra vicerepræsentant for Sydafrika i FN om atomkraftens rolle i udviklingen af Afrika. Også Hr. Polyanskij havde tid til at svare på spørgsmål, inden han måtte forlade konferencen for et andet virtuelt møde.

Jacques Cheminade, to gange præsidentkandidat for Frankrig, startede anden del af det første panel, med et oplæg, der implicit havde titlen: "Et Europa man ikke behøver at skamme sig over." Hr. Cheminade præsenterede sit syn på den tabte sag i Europa under det nuværende system for kultur og politik, eller som han sagde, "Hvor løggen er blevet en pervers kunst," og behandlede derefter den form for ændringer der kræves for at genoplive de ægte suveræne nationer i Europa med henblik på at deltage i et nyt udviklingsparadigme. Han omtalte den 30-årige periode under den europæiske genopbygning efter 2. verdenskrig som et eksempel på det sande Europa.

Efter Mr. Cheminade fulgte Mr. Michele Geraci, økonom og tidligere undersekretær for Italiens ministerium for økonomisk udvikling. Hr. Geraci har omfattende erfaring i Kina som økonom. og spillede en central rolle i at introducere Kinas globale udviklingsprogram for Bæltet & Vejen for det italienske folk under hans periode i regeringen. Han behandlede sine erfaringer fra både Kina over en tiårsperiode såvel som sin erfaring i den italienske regering i de seneste år, med fokus på behovet for større ekspertise, kompetence og repræsentation af det italienske folk.

Udtalelser blev også fremsat af Bassam Al-Hachem fra Universitetet i Libanon om krisen i hans land; den delvise erklæring fra Butch Valdes – lederen af LaRouche-bevægelsen i Filippinerne, der talte om præsident Dutertes fremkomst og hans afvisning af den neokonservative/neoliberale dagsorden, som begyndte med hans åbenlyse afvisning af præsident Obamas neokolonialistiske politik (hans fulde erklæring forventes at komme søndag); og Daniel Burke, uafhængig kandidat til det amerikanske senat i New Jersey, opfordrede ungdommen over hele verden til at tage del i den globale udvikling gennem Lyndon LaRouches ideer. Der kom spørgsmål fra blandt andet ambassadøren for Costa Rica i Canada, Mali-ambassadøren i Canada og Nigerias ambassadør i Canada.

Der blev præsenteret en video med fru Zepp-LaRouche om den dybe betydning af hendes mands ideer og vores indsats for at fremstille hans "samlede værker" i mange bind, hvoraf det første bind nu produceres og kan købes på [https:// larouchelegacyfoundation.org](https://larouchelegacyfoundation.org). Hun sagde, at hans ideer er "lige så vigtige i dag som Platons var mht. at igangsætte den italienske renæssance," og hun afsluttede det første panel med en opfordring til 'at være kampberedte', eller bedre endnu, "fyre op under sæderne" for at få folk til at rykke!

Transcript:

Panel 1: The Urgent Need To Replace Geopolitics with a New Paradigm in International Relations

DENNIS SPEED: Hello! My name is Dennis Speed, and on behalf of the Schiller Institute, I want to welcome everyone today to today's conference. It is being broadcast all over the world; the conference is being translated into many languages – Spanish, Chinese, German, French, Italian. We welcome our international audience and thank the translators very much. Today's conference is called "Mankind's Existence Now Depends Upon the Establishment of a New Paradigm." I'd like to welcome and announce our speakers for this morning's panel, which is called "The Urgent Need to Replace Geopolitics with a New Paradigm in International Relations." Our first and keynote speaker will be Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and chairman of the Schiller Institute. His Excellency Mr. Dmitry Polyanskiy, First Deputy Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations; Ambassador Huang Ping, Consul General of the People's Republic of China in New York; as well, Counsellor Zhou Guolin, head of the Science and Technology section of the Consulate General of the People's Republic of China in New York; Jacques Cheminade, chairman of Solidarité et Progrès, and former French Presidential candidate; and Professor Michele Geraci, an economist from Italy.

Seventy-five years ago today, April 25, 1945, Russian and American troops met at the Elbe River in Germany. This signalled the end of the Second World War in Europe. The postwar world, as envisioned by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a world that would be free of British and other colonial rule; but that was not to be. Roosevelt's death on April 12, 1945, allowed the British and other political powers to downshift history. From 1945, Lyndon LaRouche, a veteran of the Second World War, vowed that – in the words of the poet Friedrich Schiller – "a purpose which higher reason hath conceived, which men's afflictions urge, ten thousand

times defeated may never be abandoned." Lyndon LaRouche's postwar experience in witnessing the Indian independence movement gripped him. He decided to commit his life to achieving that FDR dream of a world free of colonialism.

But Lyndon LaRouche also realized that to end imperial rule, what Winston Churchill had once called "the empire of the mind" must be defeated. LaRouche regarded Lord Bertrand Russell's idea of scientific method to be as evil as were his ideas about society and humanity. Russell espoused ideas like this: "If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full." LaRouche, opposing such a Malthusian view, wrote hundreds of documents over five decades that proved that there were no limits to growth. Limits were only in the human mind. Alexander Hamilton's design of the United States Treasury's power to issue public credit for investment in the nation's physical improvement expressed the same outlook. In 1985, Lyndon LaRouche produced a report entitled "Economic Breakdown and the Threat of Global Pandemics." This forecast that the Malthusian financial policies of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund would lower the resistance of populations worldwide, leading to pandemics and the deaths of millions.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, a LaRouche dialogue with many nations to avoid and avert that disaster, and most notably China, resulted in the issuance of this report, "The Eurasian Land-Bridge; The New Silk Road." Helga Zepp-LaRouche visited several nations on behalf of this proposal, and it was a diplomacy of development, not geopolitics. In a public talk in 1997, LaRouche made these remarks regarding why China and the United States are natural allies in the pursuit of world economic development.

LYNDON LAROUCHE (video)

The Congress does not represent the United States; they're not quite sure who they *do* represent, these days, since they haven't visited their voters recently. The President is, institutionally, the embodiment of the United States, in international relations. The State Department can't do that, the Justice Department can't do it, no other department can do it: only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can represent the United States as an entity. Its entire personality. Its true interest. Its whole people.

Now, there's only one other power on this planet, which can be so insolent as that, toward other powers, and that's the [People's] Republic of China. China is engaged, presently, in a great infrastructure-building project, in which my wife and others have had an ongoing engagement over some years. There's a great

reform in China, which is a troubled reform. They're trying to solve a problem; that doesn't mean there is no problem. But they're trying to solve it.

Therefore, if the United States, or the President of the United States, and China, participate in fostering that project – sometimes called the “Silk-Road” Project, sometimes the “Land-Bridge” Project – if that project of developing development corridors, across Eurasia, into Africa, into North America, is extended, that project is enough work, to put this whole planet, into an economic revival...

So that, what we have here, is a set of projects, which are not just transportation projects, like the transcontinental railroads in the United States, which was the precedent for this idea, back in the late 1860s and 1870s. But you have development corridors, where you develop an area, of 50 to 70 kilometers, on either side of your rail link, your pipeline, so forth – you develop this area with industry, with mining, with all these kinds of things, which is the way you pay for a transportation link. Because of all the rich economic activity: every few kilometers of distance along this link, there's something going on, some economic activity. People working; people building things; people doing things, to transform this planet, in great projects of infrastructure-building, which will give you the great industries, the new industries, the new agriculture, and other things we desperately need.

There is no need for anybody on this planet, who is able to work, to be out of work! It's that simple. And that project is the means.

If the nations, which agree with China—which now include Russia, Iran, India, other nations—if they engage in a commitment to that project, which they're building every day; if the United States, that is, the President of the United States, Clinton, continues to support that effort, as he's been doing, at least politically, then what do you have? You have the United States and China, and a bunch of other countries, ganged up together, against the greatest power on the planet, which is the British Empire, called the British Commonwealth. That's the enemy.

And if, on one bright day, say, a Sunday morning, after a weekend meeting, the President of the United States, the President of China, and a few other people, say, “We have determined this weekend, based on our advisers and the facts, that the international financial and monetary system is hopelessly bankrupt. And we, in our responsibility as heads of state, must put these bankrupt institutions into bankruptcy reorganization, in the public interest. And it is in our interest, to cooperate as nations in doing this, to avoid creating chaos on this

planet.”

The result then, is that such an announcement, on a bright Sunday morning, will certainly spin the talking heads on Washington TV.

SPEED: LaRouche’s view of China from 23 years ago has much to teach us today. Here is another excerpt from a speech ten years after what you’ve just seen, which was done in 2007, describing the LaRouche proposal for a new international monetary system.

LAROUCHE: We have to create a new monetary system. And what I’ve proposed is this: If the United States, and this is not impossible, if the United States should extend à proposal to Russia, to China, and to India to co-sponsor the formation of a new international monetary financial order, that could be done. The problem is that most nations, such as those of Western and Central Europe and other parts of the world, are not able to independently act in this way to initiate. However, if you get the United States and Russia, which are two of the largest nations of the developed world, formerly developed world, and you combine that with China and India, which are the two Asian nations which represent the largest ration of population of the world’s population. Then you have a combination which can provide a protective cover for joint action together with the nations of South America, for example, and Europe and elsewhere.

We have now an incalculable crisis worldwide in progress. This is not a financial crisis; this is not a financial scandal as such. This is not a scandal in any ordinary sense. This is a crisis to see who is going to run the world. Is it going to be a group of nations, or is it going to be the emerging new British Empire – or the re-emergent British Empire, which never really went away – which takes over from the United States, and establishes its world rule through globalization?

Therefore, what we have to do is this: The present world international monetary financial system is bankrupt. There is now way in which it can be reformed on its own terms and survive. Any attempt to maintain this system would mean a complete disintegration into a New Dark Age comparable to what Europe experienced during the 14th century, with the collapse of some of the Lombard banks in Italy at that time. That would happen. Therefore, the solution is to establish a new international monetary financial system. That could be done on the basis of the U.S. Constitution’s special provisions. Remember, the U.S. system is not a monetarist system. The U.S. system constitutionally is based on a credit system based on the Constitutional authority of the United States

government over the utterance and control of its own money. In other parts of the world, countries' financial systems have been controlled largely under the Anglo-Dutch liberal system in which this system, through its network of private banks – so-called central banks – actually dictates and controls governments. So, we've had an imperial world monetary financial system which has been traditionally centered on the British Empire essentially ever since February 1763. Against that, the only system which is surviving of any great significance today, is the alternative; the Constitutional provisions of the U.S. Constitution, which establish the U.S. dollar as a credit mechanism of the U.S. government. That is, under our system, when it's operating – and it has not always operated that way obviously – under our system, we generate credit through a vote in the Congress; essentially House of Representatives. The President of the United States then acts upon that authority of this Federal law, to utter currency as credit against the United States itself.

Now the chief function of this credit is not just to print money. The function of this credit is to supply capital funds for long-term capital investments; especially in the public sector, but spilling over into the private sector. In the public sector, largely large-scale infrastructure projects for the states as well as the Federal government. This credit generally extends for a life period of 25-50 years in terms of modern economy. Therefore, we have a present world monetary financial system which does not function. However, if the United States affirms its Constitution, and enters into agreement with three other sponsoring countries, and other countries, then we can create a new international monetary financial system immediately; putting the entire existing system into bankruptcy reorganization to maintain the continuity of essential functions, and to start a program of actual net economic growth and development.

The hardcore of this over the long term would be long-term investment in basic economic infrastructure and development of the economies of various parts of the world. A cooperative set of treaty agreements of 25-50 years' duration to create capital formation to bring the world up in the way that Roosevelt had intended, had he lived at the end of the war. Therefore, the United States must be reformed in the way consistent with its own Constitution, by offering cooperation with other countries – especially leading countries – to establish a new world system; a new version of the old Bretton Woods system which would provide for recovery programs of over 25-50 years of long-term investment throughout the world as a whole.

SPEED: Now, 13 years later, Lyndon LaRouche's vision for the United States and the world must become a reality. We all over the world stand simultaneously on the precipice both of disaster and of the greatest potential in human history.

We're one human race, tied together in this whether we like it or not. Now more than ever, Lyndon LaRouche's wise words and his passion for solving great problems is needed. There is an idea, a principle in drama, which Friedrich Schiller used called the *punctum saliens*. It is an idea which the keynote speaker for today's panel is very familiar. The whole of civilization is now at a crossroads, and only from the higher realm of art, which is the same region from which statecraft comes, can the promise of a durable future proceed. That has been the life's pre-occupation of our keynote speaker, and it's always an honor for me to introduce the founder and chairman of the Schiller Institute, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

The Crimes and Downfall of British Liberalism and The New Paradigm of the Future of Humanity

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I'm greeting all of you who are watching this internet conference from all over the world, and I think you are all aware that the human species right now is confronted with an unprecedented crisis, which not only threatens the cost of many millions of people through illness and hunger, to sweep away many of the institutions which people thought to have been granted until now, and to plunge large parts of the world into a new dark age, including culturally, but it can also lead to a thermonuclear war that would potentially wipe out all of humanity.

This crisis is more far-reaching than that of the 14th century, when the Black Plague wiped out one-third of the population from India to Iceland. It is more serious than the Great Depression of the 1930s, because it can potentially destroy more economic substance. And if war does break out, it will be definitely more consequential than the world wars of the 20th century, because it would probably involve the deployment of thermonuclear weapons.

Due to globalization and the internationalization of many systems, including the internet, nuclear weapons, we are all sitting in the same boat. And unlike previous epochs, when one part of the planet was prospering and another was collapsing, this time there will be no partial solutions. More than ever before in our history, we as a community, as one mankind, are challenged to agree on new principles that can guarantee the long-term fitness of mankind to survive. That is the point of this conference: How can we identify the causes of this crisis, eliminate them, and open a new chapter in universal history that leads our existence out of geopolitical confrontation, into a level of reason that befits the identity of mankind as a creative species?

Some people may wonder why, in the middle of a pandemic and financial crisis,

I'm also bringing up the question and the danger of nuclear war? Because the outrageous and malicious accusations against China made by the British secret services MI6 and MI5, and their propaganda outfit, the Henry Jackson Society of London, the Atlantic Council and various "cluster agents" on both sides of the Atlantic, blaming China for the COVID-19 pandemic because it supposedly either delayed the information about it, or even used biological warfare against the West. This comes down to an outward building of an enemy image for war. The insolence with which the Henry Jackson Society, the hard core of the liberal neocons and British war party on both sides of the Atlantic, is demanding billions of dollars in compensation, can only be seen as a provocation designed to prepare the ground for a strategic showdown.

That is the hysterical but ultimately desperate reaction of an Empire that realizes that it's all over, and that the world will never again return to the already unravelling strategic orientations of a unipolar world, the so-called "Washington Consensus" and the "rules-based order," that it was able to maintain at least as a facade until the outbreak of COVID-19. The calculations of the war party were wrong; it over-hastily declared the "end of history" following the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was also linked to the illusion that China had only to be given membership in the WTO in order to automatically develop into a British-style liberal democracy; and that all other countries would also be transformed into western democracies via a regime change policy either through color revolutions or interventionist wars.

China's unique world-historical cultural achievement – that of not only lifting 850 million of its own people out of poverty, but also for the first time, giving developing countries, with the New Silk Road, the prospective of overcoming the colonial policy that is still implemented to this day by the IMF, as well as poverty that caused – was met with disbelieving horror by the various mouthpieces of the British Empire. After the western media had ignored the largest infrastructure program in history for about four years, attacks on so-called "autocratic regimes" like China, Russia, and others, were suddenly escalated by the same media, which have profiled themselves since 2015 in the "witch hunt" against President Trump, in collusion with the coup attempt of the British secret services.

But once the figures were released in March and April that showed that China had not only been able to crush the pandemic more effectively, but also to overcome the economic consequences of the crisis much more easily than the Western countries, which the privatization of the health sector had left totally unprepared for the pandemic, the tone towards China became shrill. The "rules-based order" of Western democracies, the only "democratic legitimacy," has been

shaky for a long time, and it now threatens to collapse, while Beijing is pursuing a “strategy of unrestricted warfare” it was claimed. The fact of the matter is that the liberal system of the British Empire has failed with a bang. But that does not mean that the forces allied to the Empire cannot still inflict enormous damage in their agony, for example by instigating a world war.

It is high time to rectify the names, as Confucius would say. If the idea is to draw up a list of guilty parties and compensation due for the current crisis, then it has to be the list of the effects of British liberalism, whose protagonist Winston Churchill carries the main responsibility for the lack of the most important aspect of the postwar Bretton Woods system that Franklin D. Roosevelt had intended; namely a credit mechanism for overcoming colonialism and industrializing the developing sector. Because of this lack, the British Empire’s control over the so-called Third World was perpetuated in the postwar period. This situation was then exacerbated after President Nixon terminated the Bretton Woods system in August 1971, which led to successive deregulations of the financial markets, the infamous out-sourcing to cheap-labor countries and IMF conditionalities. The one and only purpose of this whole policy was to maintain colonial looting and prevent any serious development in those countries.

How could anyone in the so-called “advanced countries” – and we now see with the coronavirus pandemic just how advanced they are – assume for even one minute that the brutal poverty in Africa, Latin America, and some Asian countries is self-evident or self-inflicted? If the West had done for the last 70 years what China has been doing in Africa since the 1960s, but especially in the last 10 years now, namely building railways, dams, power plants, and industrial parks, then all of Africa would enjoy the level of development you see in South Korea or Singapore or better today! Africa, as a result of these policies, has virtually no health system, no infrastructure; half of the population does not have access to clean water, sanitation, or electricity, because the British Empire deliberately suppressed them, working through the IMF and the World Bank, through the World Wildlife Fund, which considers the protection of an insect species in cases of doubt as more important than the lives of millions of people! If you take into account the overall effect of this policy, you will come up with a figure of millions of people whose lives have been shortened by hunger and untreated diseases! Contrary to the myth that the British Empire ceased to exist once and for all with the independence of the colonies and the handover ceremony of Hong Kong on June 30, 1997, it still exists in the form of neoliberal monetarist control of the world financial system; a control that has always been the quintessence of empires.

Another example of pure propaganda from the Empire is to say that Third World countries simply don't want to develop. The reality is that even the concept of the UN Development Decades was de facto eliminated with the end of Bretton Woods, and its replacement by the idea of population reduction, the Club of Rome's crude ideas about the supposed limits to growth, and the misanthropic notions of John D. Rockefeller III, as he presented them at the UN Population Conference in Bucharest in 1974, or Henry Kissinger's scandalous NSSM 200 from the same year; which were just vapid molds of the assertions of the evil Pastor Malthus, the scribbler of the British East India Company, who in turn plagiarized the ideas of the Venetian "economist" Giammaria Ortes.

Lyndon LaRouche reacted to this paradigm change when he began, in a series of studies in 1973 on the effects of the IMF policy, to warn that the growing under-nourishment, weakening of the immune system, lack of hygiene, etc. would lead to the emergence of global pandemics. After the thousands of speeches and writings by LaRouche, which have circulated in the intervening five decades over all five continents, no one can say that the current pandemic was not foreseeable! Especially since LaRouche's entire life's work was dedicated, among other things, to working out development programs that would have exactly prevented it!

The fundamental reason why the liberal paradigm and the underlying the current transatlantic "rules-based order" have failed, and why the Establishment has proven to be so completely unable to reflect on the reasons for this failure, is linked to the axiomatic basis and the generally accepted assumptions of this paradigm's image of man, as well as its concept of state and science.

After the initial emergence, during the Italian Renaissance, of ideas and forms of a State that consciously fostered the creative capacities of a growing proportion of the population and the role of scientific progress as a source of social wealth, the feudal oligarchy of the then-leading empire, Venice, launched a deliberate counter-offensive, in which Paolo Sarpi, as the leading thinker of that Venetian oligarchy, put forward his teachings, out of which the Enlightenment and liberalism ultimately developed. The idea was to control the scientific debate, but to deny the ability to know and to discover real universal principles, to suppress the Promethean potential – by force if need be, to reduce people to the level of sensual experience, and to turn the backwardness of "human nature" into a dogma.

From this tradition came the mechanistic scientific tradition of Galilei Galileo and Isaac Newton, the game and information theory of John von Neumann and Norbert Wiener, and more recently the algorithms that underlie the derivatives

trading of today's casino economy. The empirical and materialistic dogma and decadent image of man peddled by Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, John Locke and John Stuart Mill remain to this day the basis of British liberalism and the virus that has contributed more to the current state of the world than anything else.

The oligarchical mindset of the British Empire, which denies all men, but especially all colored men, the divine spark of creativity is expressed in full clarity in numerous writings and statements, if people only care to look for them, from Prince Phillip's notorious wish to be reincarnated as a deadly virus, in order to help reduce the overpopulation of the human race, to the despicable outlook expressed by Adam Smith in his 1759 *Theory of the Moral Sentiments*:

"The administration of the great system of the universe ... the care of the universal happiness of rational and sensible beings, is the business of God and not of man. To man is allotted a much humbler department, but one much more suitable to the weakness of his powers, and to the narrowness of his comprehension, they are of his own happiness, of that of his family, his friends, his country... Nature has directed us to the greater part of these by original and immediate instincts. Hunger, thirst, the passion which unites the sexes, the love of pleasure, and the dread of pain, prompt us to apply those means for their own sakes, and without any considerations of their tendency to those beneficent ends which the great Director of nature intended to produce by them."

Since these attributes all apply equally to animals, then it is obviously also okay to cull the herd periodically, just as the Spartans killed the Helots, when they thought they would become too numerous. This misanthropic image of man is amplified through pure racism, as Bertrand Russell expressed it so unashamedly in *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization*:

"The white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without the help of war and pestilence... Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary."

It is precisely this racist ideology which was the justification for colonialism, the slave trade, the opium wars, and, to be honest, it is ultimately also the reason for the monumental indifference shown by large parts

of the population in the West when they hear the news about the locust plague in Africa and in some Asian countries, which could have been eliminated two months ago for a cost of only \$75 million.

And nothing has changed in the fundamental support for eugenics among representatives of the Empire. That was emphasized once again by a columnist of the *Daily Telegraph* in an article in early March by Jeremy Warner:

“Not to put too fine a point on it, from an entirely disinterested economic perspective, the COVID-19 might even prove mildly beneficial in the long term by disproportionately culling elderly dependents.”

It is these barbaric premises of the liberal dogma, although it is hardly fashionable to admit their existence in the so-called developed countries, that led Lyndon LaRouche many years ago to stipulate that the combination of the four economically and militarily most important countries in the world – the U.S.A., China, Russia, and India – was required to carry out the urgently needed reorganization of the world order. This reorganization, however, must begin with the explicit and definitive rejection of the image of man of this liberal dogma and its political implications. The British Empire in all its forms, but above all in its control over the financial system, must be ended.

These four nations – the United States, China, Russia, and India – urgently need to convene an emergency conference and adopt a new Bretton Woods system that realizes FDR’s full intention, by creating a credit system that guarantees once and for all the industrialization of the developing sector. It should begin with the implementation of a world health system that builds up a health system in every single nation on this planet. First of all with a crash program to fight the coronavirus pandemic, but then reaching very quickly the same standards that were set out in the Hill-Burton Act in the U.S.A. or as it was the health standard in Germany and France before the privatization in the 1970s. As Roosevelt put it in his speech on the State of the Union in 1941, in the famous declaration of the “Four Freedoms,” where he stated: “The third [freedom] is freedom from want – which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants – everywhere in the world.” First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt made it her personal mission to ensure that these Four Freedoms were incorporated into the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In Lyndon LaRouche’s 1984 “Draft Memorandum of Agreement Between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.” that defined the principles and the basis of the Strategic Defense Initiative which he proposed, and which was declared the official policy of the

United States by President Reagan on March 23, 1983, and which was repeatedly offered to the Soviet Union to cooperate on a comprehensive nuclear disarmament program. LaRouche defined the conviction that represents an absolutely crucial aspect of his life's work and the mission of this organization. The first article of this paper, the principles of which also apply to the cooperation among the four nations and all others who choose to join this new partnership, states:

"The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and b) Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the benefits of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and all. The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary, economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and those relatively subordinated nations often classed as 'developing nations.' Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there can be no durable peace on this planet. Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both, the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers."

In view of the escalating anti-China campaign, launched by British intelligence, which has people in President Trump's entourage attempting to outdo each other almost hourly in their accusations against China, including Secretary of State Pompeo, [Director of Trade and Industrial Policy] Peter Navarro, [Senator] Lindsey Graham, and [Fox TV host] Tucker Carlson, while various demonstrations of a show of force by the U.S. and NATO forces appear to be limited only by the number of COVID-19 infections among some of their crews, the existential question is posed of how the world can get out of this dangerous escalation. Are we doomed to relive how the overtaking of the ruling power by the second most powerful leads to war, as has already happened twelve times in history?

The combination of the coronavirus pandemic, the world hunger crisis, the impending financial hyperinflationary blow-out, and the depression of the global real economy is so overwhelming that it should be clear to every thinking human being that mankind can only get out of this crisis if the economic potential of the United States and China – supported by the other industrialized countries – is jointly deployed and increased in order to create the capacities needed to ensure medical care, infrastructure, and industrial and food production. It is

in the existential interest of every individual and every nation on this planet to work towards this goal. We have to create a worldwide chorus among all other nations and many millions of people to demand just that!

The conflict between the United States and China only exists if those forces in both parties in the U.S. prevail, that are in the tradition of H.G. Wells "Open Conspiracy," with the idea that the U.S. accepts the model of the British Empire as the basis of an Anglo-American controlled unipolar order, they can run the world. This vision of HG Wells' was carried on by William Yandell Elliott, the mentor of Kissinger, Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, up to the neocons of the Project for a New American Century (PNAC). If, on the other hand, the United States harks back to its true tradition of the Declaration of Independence against the British Empire and of the American System of economics of Alexander Hamilton, then there will be a great affinity with China's economic model which contains many of the principles of Alexander Hamilton, Friedrich List, and Henry C Carey. In the same way, the father of modern China, Sun Yat-sen, was very much influenced by the American System.

At the urgent emergency summit of the U.S., China, Russia, and India, and at the then immediately necessary founding conference of the New Bretton Woods System, the heads of state can take up on the spirit of the original Bretton Woods conference, at which the head of the Chinese delegation, H.H. Kung, submitted Sun Yat-sen's proposal for an "International Development Organization." Kung, one of Sun Yat-sen's brothers-in-law, said in his speech in Bretton Woods:

"China is looking forward to a period of great economic development and expansion after the war. This includes a program of large-scale industrialization, besides the development and modernization of agriculture. It is my firm conviction that an economically strong China is an indispensable condition to the maintenance of peace and the improvement to the well-being of the world. After the first World War, Dr. Sun Yat-sen proposed a plan for what he termed 'the international development of China'. He emphasized the principle of cooperation with friendly nations and utilization of foreign capital for the development of China's resources. Dr. Sun's teaching constituted the basis of China's national policy. America and others of the United Nations, I hope, will take an active part in aiding the postwar development of China."

As I said, Roosevelt supported the internationalization of this development policy during the negotiations, and he considered the increase of a high standard of living worldwide as the key to global stability. And he saw the way to do so in the internationalization of the New Deal policy.

The four main nations of the world – the United States, China, Russia, and India – must now establish a New Bretton Woods system and together with all nations that wish to join, a new paradigm in international cooperation among nations that is guided by the common aims of mankind. The fourth of Lyndon LaRouche's four laws defines the qualitatively higher economic platform, the higher level of reason, of the *Coincidentia Oppositorum* of Nicholas of Cusa, on which the contradictions of geopolitical confrontation will be overcome.

International cooperation among scientists who rely exclusively on verifiable universal physical principles must replace the primacy of politics based on ideology and interests. Research into the "life sciences," a better understanding of what causes the characteristics of life and its origin in the universe, is the prerequisite for the fight against the coronavirus and all other potential virological, bacterial, and other disease processes. As part of the world health system, we need to build up collaborative medical research centers internationally, where the young scientists of all developing countries will also be trained. The profound experience of the coronavirus pandemic is that the provision of health care must be a common good, and not serve to maximize profits for private interests. The results of this research must therefore be immediately provided to all universities, hospitals, and medical personnel in all nations.

Another area in which international cooperation toward the common goals of mankind is indispensable, is the achievement of energy and raw material security, which will be possible with the mastery of thermonuclear nuclear fusion and the associated fusion torch process. The international ITER project at the Cadarache facility in the south of France, a tokamak nuclear fusion reactor and international research project already involving the cooperation of 34 countries, is a good start, but the funding of ITER and other models of nuclear fusion must be massively increased. One of LaRouche's central discoveries is the interconnection between the energy flux density used in the production process and relative potential population density. The mastery of nuclear fusion is imperative, not only for the living population, but especially for manned space flight.

Space research itself is the one area that would be unthinkable without international cooperation and which, more than any other branch of science, demonstrates in a positive way what the pandemic demonstrates in a negative way: That we are actually the one species that is determined by its future, and whose long-term survivability will depend on our learning to better understand and master the laws of the universe – including the at least 2 trillion galaxies that the Hubble telescope has been able to verify. Defense against asteroids,

meteors, and comets is only one among many important elements of this. For developing countries, unlimited participation in research projects is the best way – through scientific and technological “leapfrogging” – to create the preconditions for economies that are able to provide all citizens with a good and safe life.

Nicholas of Cusa already wrote back in the 15th century that all discoveries in science should immediately be made available to representatives of all countries, so as not to unnecessarily hold back the development of any one of them. He also found that concordance in the macrocosm is only possible when all microcosms develop in the best possible way. The New Paradigm that we need to shape for cooperation among nations, must start from the common interest of all mankind, towards the realization of which all nations and cultures, in counterpoint as it were, as in a fugue, are intertwined and rise dynamically to higher stages of anti-entropic development.

Are we, as human civilization, able at this late stage of events to avert the tsunami of pandemics, famine, financial crisis, depression, and the danger of a new world war? Then the world needs this summit of the four nations now! If such a summit were to announce all these changes – a New Bretton Woods system, the four great powers joining hands in building up a global development program in the form of a “New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge,” a world health system, an international crash program in fusion and related research, a massive upgrade in international space cooperation, and last but not least, a dialogue of the Classical traditions of all nations with the aim of sparking a new Renaissance of Classical cultures in a similar, but even more beautiful way than the great Italian Renaissance overcame the horrors of the Dark Age of the 14th century – then a new era of humanity can be born!

Is there a reasonable hope that we can overcome the current profound crisis of mankind? I would say, absolutely! We are the only creative species known so far in the universe, which has the ability to discover new principles of our universe again and again, which implies that there is an affinity between our creative mental processes to these physical laws.

One thought that elucidates this optimistic perspective concerns one aspect of space research; namely, the seemingly accelerated process of aging in conditions of weightlessness, and the change of this process in hyper-gravity. A better understanding of this “space gerontology” is obviously crucial for the future of manned space travel to Mars and in interstellar space, and it is expected that it will significantly increase the ability of humans to have a longer healthy life.

If you consider that Schubert only lived to be 31 years old, Mozart 35, Dante 36, Schiller 45, Shakespeare 52, and Beethoven only 56, then you have an idea of how much the geniuses of the future, with a life expectancy of 120 or 150 years, will be able to contribute to mankind's development!

Therefore, join us in putting an end to the British Empire! And let's create a truly human future for all of mankind! Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you, Helga! Our next speaker is His Excellency, Mr. Dmitry Polyanskiy, the First Deputy Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations.

HIS EXCELLENCY DMITRY POLYANSKIY: Thank you very much, distinguished colleagues. Thank you, Mrs. LaRouche for your very interesting presentation; there are a lot of things to process, and I'm sure we will do it. I am a diplomat as you know, and being a diplomat implies a little bit different way of speaking, so I can add to your presentation a couple of observations from a political and diplomatic perspective.

It's absolutely sure that COVID-19 has created very serious problems for the whole of mankind. The most important of which is saving lives, ensuring our common security, bio-medical safety, and the preservation of human environments which should be comfortable and pose no threats to life and health. It has become absolutely clear that no state, no matter how powerful and wealthy it is, has all the tools to fight the pandemic. Everyone had to introduce drastic measures that can be potentially harmful to the national economy to contain the epidemic. We don't know yet the scope of these consequences that most of the countries of the world will face; it is still to be calculated. So far, after almost half a year since we first heard about the coronavirus, no one has the vaccine, and no one has the efficient treatment proposals so far. We absolutely can win, but this is not the time of blaming and stigmatization. It's the time of cooperation and supporting each other. It's also not the time of contests – who did what, and who was more successful than others. It's not a beauty contest. It is really time to help, to share experiences, and to listen to each other, and to find ways to work together to face this unprecedented challenge in modern times for the whole of mankind.

Russia is ready to face this challenge together with our partners. That is why, while taking all the necessary measures to combat the coronavirus at a national level, we also believe that is our duty to provide assistance to the others, to

our partners. So, when we're still at the very early stage of the spread of coronavirus, at the beginning of February, we donated items of personal protective equipment and medical supplies to China, which was very badly affected at this time. Teams of Russian doctors and virology experts were also sent to Italy and Serbia, who were in a more advanced stage of pandemic at that time.

Now my country is also struggling with very big forces combatting the pandemic. That's why we now also welcome any assistance that can be rendered to my country, and we cooperate in this regard with many countries – with China, with European states, with the United States. As you know, early in April we delivered a plane load of humanitarian aid to New York, and we said this was done with open hearts, and we would accept any assistance we deem necessary at a later stage, which we already understood at this time we would inevitably face. That's how cooperation is organized. Again, it's not a beauty contest; it's not a situation when somebody says we succeeded and somebody failed the exam. It's not the time for this. It is the time to display readiness to render assistance and to give a helping hand. That is how all the responsible global actors should behave.

Now, when the situation in China started to stabilize, China is actually helping the whole of the world, including Russia, and we welcome very much this help. We think it's normal. Recently, a number of African states addressed to Russia, asking for help in combatting the pandemic. We are considering these demands in Moscow, and I am absolutely sure that we will come to rescue it at a later stage when we will make a major breakthrough in our fight with the pandemic. That's what we are doing right now. It's also very important to point out that we are convinced that the response to this global threat should also be global. It would be a mistake to fragment and lump matters within our national borders.

We are absolutely convinced that the United Nations must play a pivotal role here. It is important that we all support the WHO [World Health Organization] as the main specialized UN agency and help it to coordinate global measures, and listen to its recommendations. These past months, the WHO has become the center of all information on the pandemic. I believe that anyone who studies the chronology of its actions, statements, and specific decisions, will be convinced that the WHO was efficient. Moreover, the fact that the WHO has played and continues to play a major role in countering the pandemic, is reflected in a recently adopted consensus resolution of the UN General Assembly, and the final declaration of the G20 extraordinary summit. It is also important not to forget about the declaration adopted by the G77 and China, that stresses the coordinating role of the World Health Organization in global efforts. We need to

insure universal medical service coverage through this organization. Again, it's time to be united and not to blame somebody, and not to stigmatize any country because of what it did or didn't do. We should really support the WHO, we should make it a pillar of our efforts to combat the coronavirus now, and maybe at some later stage, because there are a lot of predictions that there might be repercussions of this pandemic earlier.

It is quite clear that the spread of the coronavirus has very badly impacted the economy. Again, I will repeat that it's still very difficult to assess the damage and the consequences for economic development of the world and especially certain countries after the pandemic. Of course, the pandemic also very badly affected business, trade, investments, as well as currency exchange rates. We are still in the middle of it, so we can't really start rectifying all this damage and finding workable solutions for this. You also can see that what is happening has increased demand for various products which have become in bigger demand than some countries could make them available. So, it's also time for coordination. We believe that the G20 countries should play this role, and they should be in the driving seat of working out an economic agenda to help all of us establish a common framework for mutual economic responses to reload the world economy after these deep and profound shocks that were caused by the pandemic.

It is also, I will repeat it once again, it is also time for deep and frank solidarity, regardless of political agendas and preferences. We especially need to pay attention to developing countries, which face enormous challenges and should be assisted first and foremost.

I want to mention one more topic in this regard. It is also important that the media and social networks behave in a responsible way, because we are mostly speaking about the impact of the coronavirus on the health care system and economics. But it's very difficult to assess the damage that is being done to the minds, to the perception of the users; those who are now in self-quarantine. They really are very hungry for any information that is available for them. That is why in this time it is especially important that mass media exercises restraint and a responsible approach, and does not spread fake news and information that has not been verified. The consequences of this can be really very profound. We attach a very big importance to this, and we try in Russia at the national level to combat all this fake news that is being circulated. We try counter them with information that is really proven to be good and to be reliable for the public.

It is also very important to assess, and this is maybe a question for

philosophers. What will be the impact on human behavior? Will we be shaking hands again? Will we be giving each other hugs after the coronavirus is over? Or, will psychologically people try to avoid closer contact? Will they still keep social distancing even after the virus is over? Because this might change the way mankind behaves, and this might also have very deep and serious implications for concrete individuals who are more vulnerable maybe and very eager to be embraced by the society, and for socialization. We need to think about this, and not to go into extremes in this regard; not to change the civilized behavior of mankind.

Another thing is also, we should avoid the situation where the world would totally go online, because now of course these online services have proved to be very useful, and they really are in big demand. This is normal; this is very good because it economizes a lot of resources. But it shouldn't substitute human to human contact. I can tell you that in diplomacy, there are a lot of things that can be conducted only through personal contacts. There are a lot of confidential discussions that can't proceed online. There are a lot of limits even now to sincere communication and discussion of topics, because we can't so far meet personally, and we have to rely on this electronic means of communication. Again, we shouldn't go to this extreme, because it's very alluring to turn a lot of our activity online, and to organize a lot of meetings without physically looking at each other and feeling the emotions of each other. It's very practical, but it's very wrong. I think we also need to be aware of this trap which can await the world after the pandemic.

I will not speak any longer. I will be ready to take any questions for the time I am here. I would also at the end would like to say that the Chinese language – China was mentioned here already several times, and will be mentioned I'm sure many times more. The words "crisis" contains one character which is also "opportunity"; so it's very wise that every crisis is also an opportunity, not only a challenge. So, we must come out even stronger out of this crisis, and we must work together and forget about certain things that seemed important to us because of some emotion or wrongly interpreted information. We need to see the end; we need to see the light at the end of the tunnel. We need to understand that only cooperation, coordination, and global response are what mankind needs right now. It's not the time for falling out and quarreling, and for finger-pointing and blaming anybody. It's time for helping; it's time to be compassionate; it's time to be generous. It's time really to listen to each other, and to propose common, workable solutions to the world, which is in big need of these solutions. Thank you very much, and I wish a big success to your conference. Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Mr. Polyanskiy. Our next presentation will be given by the Counsel General of the People's Republic of China New York, Ambassador Huang Ping. But I have to say something about this. This is prerecorded because he is now in Boston for the purpose of meeting a plane arriving from China, which is delivering much-needed medical supplies for the people of Massachusetts. As some people know, that has now become a hotspot of coronavirus. It was requested that he and others be there to receive that plane. Elected officials from the United States will also be there. As I understand, young students from China who have been stranded in the United States will also be returning. So, we're going to play that statement, and then we're going to be going to questions. At that point Counsellor Zhou Guolin, head of the Science and Technology section of the consulate, will be standing in for the Ambassador. We'll also be asking questions to Helga and to Mr. Polyanskiy.

AMBASSADOR HUANG PING: Mrs. LaRouche, President of the Schiller Institute, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my great pleasure to join this video conference hosted by Schiller Institute. We meet at a challenging time when the COVID-19 pandemic is ravaging the globe. Many families have suffered from this disease and lost their loved ones. Countless health care workers are fighting against the virus on the front line. At the outset, I want to express my deep condolences to all the families plagued by misfortune, and pay high tribute to those who are still holding posts at this extremely difficult time.

China was among the first countries hit hard by COVID-19. Under sudden attack of this unknown enemy, the Chinese government and the Chinese people have been undaunted and made a robust response. We have put the people's well-being front and center since the outbreak began. We have acted upon the overall principle of shoring up confidence, strengthening unity, ensuring science-based control and treatment, and imposing targeted measures. We have mobilized the whole nation, set up collective control and treatment mechanisms, and acted with openness and transparency. What we fought was a people's war against the virus. With hard efforts and great sacrifice, China emerged as one of the first countries to stem the outbreak. Domestic transmission has been largely stopped. Confirmed cases have declined to around one thousand, with dozens of daily increases that are mainly imported cases. Meanwhile, China has managed to restore its economy and society step by step to a normal order. Across the country, 98.6% of big industrial plants have resumed production, and 89.9% of employees on average are already back to work, a significant force to pull the world economy back on

track.

Since the outbreak of COVID-19, China actively joined global efforts in combatting the disease in an open, transparent, and responsible manner. China timely updated the WHO, publicized the genome sequence of the virus, and shared our prevention and treatment experience without reservation. We have been offering assistance to the best of our ability, which has been widely recognized by the WHO and the international community. President Xi Jinping had phone calls with 29 leaders of countries and international organizations, and attended the Extraordinary G20 Leaders' Summit on COVID-19. Premier Li Keqiang also talked on the phone with multiple foreign leaders, and attended the Special ASEAN+3 Summit on COVID-19. Between March 1 and April 10, China exported around 7.12 billion masks, 55.57 million pieces of protective suits, 3.59 million infrared thermometers, 20,100 ventilators, and 13.69 million goggles. As of April 12, we have dispatched 14 medical expert groups to 12 countries, and the Chinese medical experts had 83 video conferences with their counterparts from 153 countries to assist relevant countries in responding to the epidemic.

At the same time, we always care about the safety and health of overseas Chinese citizens. The whole diplomatic front has been mobilized and moved promptly to collect basic information of Chinese nationals abroad and their difficulties. We rallied them in a united campaign against the virus through mutual assistance. We helped them have access to local health providers and through remote diagnostics to those in China. We sent joint task forces to offer services and support. We put in place special consular protection mechanisms, and chartered flights to bring home Chinese citizens who had been stranded abroad due to the outbreak. We find ways to solve problems for overseas students, and delivered health kits to every student in need. Recently, an important task of my consulate general was to assist under-aged Chinese students in our consular district to take ad hoc flights back to China. Although New York city is the epicenter, and there is a high risk of infection at the airport helping students get on board, many of my colleagues signed up the task without any hesitation.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the pandemic is still ravaging the globe, with more than 200 countries and regions affected, over 2.6 million people infected, and 190,000 died. It is likely to further spread in Africa, South Asia, Latin America, and other underdeveloped regions, causing more casualties. Countries that have been through the apex of the first outbreak must be vigilant about the second wave of outbreak. Even if we come out of the pandemic, we may face a domino effect: economic recession, social unrest, food crisis, refugee waves, and even international conflicts. Some people say that this is the biggest crisis facing human society since World War II. People around the world are in

anxiety, and expect the international community to work out solutions together. As the two largest economies in the world, China and the United States are becoming the focus of global attention on whether they can lead countries to tide over this crisis.

As you know, the China-U.S. relationship is in an unprecedentedly difficult period. The United States sees China as a major strategic competitor, and is implementing a China policy of comprehensive containment and suppression through the "whole government strategy." As a result, this relationship is increasingly facing the risk of derailment. Much needs to be overcome for the two countries to abandon differences and focus on cooperation. As the impact of this crisis on the world is rapidly fermenting, it is necessary to rethink our approach to growing China-U.S. relations, for the interests of not only the two countries, but the whole world at large. I would like to make three points for your consideration.

First, the epidemic highlights the interdependence between China and the United States. Neither side can survive the challenges without support of the other. In the 21st century, it is an unstoppable trend that different countries will be increasingly interconnected, thus having more common interests and challenges. The human society has indeed become a community with a shared future. In the face of global challenges such as infectious diseases, climate change, and terrorism, even great powers like China and the United States cannot manage by fighting alone. In his recent phone call with President Trump, President Xi stressed that the two countries should join efforts, strengthen cooperation in areas such as outbreak preparedness and response, and contribute to building a relationship based on non-conflict or confrontation, mutual respect, and win-win cooperation. This points out the direction for the future development of our bilateral relations. Looking ahead, the two sides need to strengthen global governance cooperation in public health, economics, and finance, and establish joint prevention and control networks. We should collaborate in developing vaccines and drugs, better coordinate macro policies so as to counter the downward pressure on the world economy and maintain world stability and prosperity.

Second, the epidemic underscores the profound friendship between Chinese and American people, which serves as the mainstream of our relationship. As the virus takes toll in China and the U.S., our two peoples have chosen to mutually support each other instead of being indifferent across the Pacific. When China was in deep distress, people across various sectors of U.S. society lent a hand to us, for which we are always truly grateful. Now the U.S. has become the epicenter of the world, with more than 900,000 people diagnosed and more than

50,000 deaths. The Chinese people relate to the difficulties American people are going through, and we are willing to offer assistance to the best of our ability in return. According to incomplete statistics, China has provided the U.S. with over 2.46 billion masks, meaning 7 masks for each person in the U.S., plus nearly 5000 ventilators, 258 million gloves, 29.2 million surgical protective suits, and 3.13 million goggles. In the past few weeks, we have received numerous genuine [expressions of] appreciation from American people. I believe our two people's friendship will become even stronger through the test of this battle. Our two governments must pay heed to the mainstream of our two peoples while growing this relationship. We cannot be caught by some extremists who keep sowing seeds of discord and decoupling between our two nations.

Third, the epidemic reveals the China-U.S. relationship is still facing complicated problems. In solving the problems and differences, we must stop appealing to the dark side of humanity and look to the bright side. Since the outbreak of this epidemic, especially after the situation in the U.S. got severe, we have noticed many negative voices about China in the United States. Some people accused China of concealing the outbreak, some even made up the story that the virus came from a Chinese lab and vowed to hold China accountable. Some people stigmatized China and discriminated against ethnic Chinese. I want to point out that there are some different views on the source of the virus in the international community. Virus tracing is a serious scientific issue and should be carefully assessed by professionals with scientific evidence. COVID-19 is a completely new virus, and its outbreak is unexpected. All nations need some time to understand the situation and respond to it. It is impossible for China to issue a warning to the world in the very early stage because of a small number of unknown cases. Some countries also initially mistook the COVID-19 for a common cold or pneumonia. Infectious diseases may break out in any country or any ethnic group. We must do our best to prevent discrimination against any country and group in this pandemic. American citizens may also encounter increasing discrimination abroad as the situation here gets worse. To blame and scapegoat other countries, to incite racial discrimination and xenophobia, will do no good in enabling the world to cope with the epidemic and its impact, nor will it help unite us in addressing other global challenges in the future. They will only bring chaos to the global governance, and cause more harm to peoples around the globe.

Ladies and Gentlemen, former U.S. president John F. Kennedy has realized very long ago that "When written in Chinese, the word CRISIS is composed of two characters – one represents danger, and the other represents opportunity." The COVID-19 crisis has indeed brought unprecedented challenges to the world, but it also offered unprecedented opportunities for countries to break new ground. I

believe if we take a long-term perspective, remain courageous, cooperative, and innovative, we will be able to overwhelm the challenges, turn the crisis into opportunities, and unlock a better future for China and the United States, and for the human society. Thank you.

SPEED: We're now going to go to questions for approximately half an hour for all of our speakers up to this point. And I want to just say that if you have questions, you can send them to questions@schillerinstitute.org. I'm going to read the first question, which comes from New York City, it's from a member of the Schiller Institute to the Russian representative, Mr. Polyanskiy. The question is: "Recently, Kremlin spokesman Peskov publicly discussed President Putin's call for an urgent heads of state summit of the Permanent 5 members of the UN Security Council. He described President Putin's call for what Peskov called 'a truly visionary summit'. Given the great issues today of war and peace, the COVID-19 pandemic, and others, what format can be used in the very near term to hold such an urgent summit? Thank you."

POLYANSKIY: Thank you very much for this question. This is a very important issue, and we are in the process of discussing it right now. The summit is on the agenda. As you know, there was a Russian proposal to hold a summit of the five member states. It was done before the pandemic, and of course, we have in mind its happening physically, not online. This is of course, a bit of a middle-term perspective. For the time being, there are a lot of ideas to organize a video summit of the five members states. We think that this will be a successful endeavor, but of course, we don't need a summit for the sake of the summit. We need to breach our positions a little bit in order to make this summit possible to produce a certain impulse toward cooperation. That is why the agenda is now being very suddenly worked on. We are preparing documents, possible outcome documents of this summit. I'm sure that it will take place at a bit later stage, but we shouldn't wait too late for it.

As I told you, diplomacy is mostly an art of communication, and of course communication should be perceived as physical communication first and foremost. You can't do everything online; there are certain limitations to this. There are also certain challenges to online communication. This is not very favorable for sincere, open communication between the five members right now. But we are trying to do our best to substitute them with online means of communication. I am sure that in a very short period of time, you will hear some concrete ideas in this regard. Thank you.

SPEED: OK. Our next question, which will be directed in general to the panel, was from Ambassador Xolisa Mabhongo. He is the Deputy Permanent Representative of the South African UN Mission. He writes this question: "There is interest in several Africa countries either to introduce or expand nuclear energy. At the moment, South Africa possesses the only nuclear power plant on the continent, located in Koeberg, near Cape Town. Koeberg nuclear power plant has been operated safely for nearly three decades, and produces the cheapest electricity in South Africa. Although there has been a rapid development of renewable energy in recent years, coal remains by far the largest source of energy for the country. For South Africa and other African countries, nuclear power would supply a clean source of energy, enabling us to meet our domestic and international commitments to address climate change. It would also be an important source of base load electricity. For a country like South Africa, nuclear is the main alternative base load source of electricity to coal until realistic storage technologies for storing renewable energy are developed. The speakers on the panel may therefore wish to address the issue of a regulatory framework for nuclear power from their own experiences. Regulation, safety, and security would be the building blocks in the African continent as most countries would be getting into nuclear energy for the first time." What I'll ask if the Chinese representative has anything to say about this question, and then we'll go to Helga, and then we'll go to Mr. Poyanskiy.

ZHOU GUOLIN: This is a very big question by the ambassador of South Africa to the United Nations, but I think at this moment, new energy one of the most important sources for future energy to be developed. Notice in China we have already had a lot of development and efforts to make new energy available, like windmills and hydropower, like even tidal wave energy and a lot of others, also from plantations, as well.

At the same time nuclear energy is very important, also in China. After a few decades of development in China, nuclear energy development is very rapidly in China, also. South Africa is the same situation. I'll just mention, there's only one nuclear power plant in Africa, that is the only one in South Africa. To my opinion, that is to say, for nuclear energy the most important matter is the safety. Of course, we know it is a clean energy. I still remember that a short time ago, that Mme. Zepp-LaRouche just mentioned the ITER, the thermonuclear fusion reactor which is in Cadarache, France, which is also one of the very new ways to make fusion nuclear energy to be available in the future, maybe in a few decades of time.

We are just making as much energy as possible through different ways to make this new type of energy available in the future, because it is better than the

traditional nuclear energy.

Anyway, in this regard, as the Science Counsellor in the General Consulate in New York, one of my opinions is that we need to strengthen cooperation between Africa and China, between the U.S. and China, between Russia and China, among all countries, we are kind of stakeholders: We need to get together to enhance, as our two distinguished guests just mentioned, only with cooperation internationally are we going to be successful in the future. So in terms of this, we think nuclear energy is probably one of the hopes for making more and efficient, and sufficient energy available in the future. Thank you.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Just briefly, I fully agree with Mr. Zhou, that international cooperation will be crucial: Africa will have the largest population in the world fairly soon, hopefully if this pandemic can be contained, and then, nuclear energy will be absolutely crucial. And I can only say, do not follow example of Germany! I think the exit from nuclear energy by the Chancellor Merkel was probably the biggest mistake of her government, and she made a couple of other ones. And I think even Europeans, who have been very anti-nuclear will come out of this crisis – this is my modest prediction – with the realization that you cannot have an industrial nation without nuclear energy. And in the meantime, until the Europeans get back to their senses, I think what you said Mr. Zhou is absolutely true: There must be an international cooperation among the pro-nuclear countries in the world, all helping Africa to access nuclear energy.

So, I think that hopefully, we can eventually overcome this absolute, irrational fear and demonization of nuclear energy, which is not grounded in science. Nuclear energy is an absolutely manageable technology, mankind can control nuclear energy, and all the cases which are always cited as the proof of the opposite, can really be refuted. So I think the way to go for the time being is to go for an international cooperation, as you said, Mr. Zhou.

SPEED: Mr. Polyanskiy?

POLYANSKIY: Thank you very much, Dennis, for this question. It's really a big issue right now, what would be the future of energy in the world, and I don't think there is a contradiction, or argument, between those who argue for development of nuclear energy, and for those who are speaking about increasing the share of solar and wind energy, the cleanest energies available.

The fact is the share of renewable energy, the real clean, renewable energy, I'm not speaking about biofuel in the world, is still very modest, and there are

certain limitations to this, on the one hand. On the other hand, there is the demand of mankind for energy is growing and we, in Russia, think that nuclear energy is one of the best responses to this challenge. That's why I absolutely agree with Helga LaRouche when she said that one should stop demonizing nuclear energy and citing the examples from the past.

As far as Russia is concerned, we have gone a long way since the emergence of the new Russia, and we have now very advanced technologies. We're eager to help out many countries in the world to build their nuclear power plants, and we are absolutely convinced that these power plants are safe. And that's why we think it would be a very good solution for the whole world to combine different sources of energy, not only nuclear, but also natural gas, which is quite a clean source of energy.

You know everything is relevant: Even some people say that the future is for electric cars, and they claim that this is cleanest energy technology available. They are, of course, right. But on the other hand if you want to charge a battery for an electric car, then of course, you will need a certain amount of conventional energy. And it can be produced by not very clean sources. Also, it's a question of disposal of electric batteries, which can be very damaging for our planet.

So everything is very philosophical, and there are always two ends to every issue, to every question. And we think that international cooperation in the field nuclear energy should be developed, it shouldn't be stigmatized, it shouldn't be linked to any political calculations: It should be first and foremost based on the demands of humankind, and the possibility to provide clean and safe technology, to ensure the existence of nuclear energy. And as I told you, once again, Russia disposes such technology, and Russia is ready to help the whole of the world, including Africa, which is of course in big demand of energy, and this demand will be growing.

But, I would like to use this opportunity, also, to say goodbye to everybody and to thank everybody for the attention. I have another videoconference in a couple of minutes. That's why I wish you very fruitful work and I wish you all the success, Helga, and to you, personally, I'm always very glad to communicate with you. Thank you, very much.

SPEED: Thank you.

The next question is from Earl Rasmussen, who is the Executive Vice President the Eurasia Center, and he is asking about the collaboration during the

pandemic. He says: "Today we are faced with a global pandemic, which is challenging every country in the world. It seems to me that this is time to bring all together, set political divides aside, and work collaboratively to solve this present need. Yet, I see some countries with just the opposite occurring, where countries are hoarding needed supplies for themselves, trying to leverage conditions to continue foreign policy objectives, and create even more divisiveness. These actions only compound the situation and create an environment filled with mistrust, where what is called for is trust and a cooperative engagement. What steps can we take to improve international cooperation, to break down political barriers in order to not only solve today's pressing needs, but those of the future as well?"

I'm going to ask that Helga you might take that, and then Mr. Zhou.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think addressed that in a way in my initial remarks, because I think we have to reach a point where the idea that each opinion is as good as the other has to go, because we would not be in this crisis if all these opinions would have been so great. And I want to refer to the great thinker Nikolaus of Cusa, who, in the 15th century said that in his view, the only reason why people from different nations and different cultures can even communicate with each other, is because they all have scientists, they all have musicians, they all have poets, and it is those poets, who, because they speak a common language, even if they speak, formally, a different language, they speak the language of science, of art, of great cultural ideas, that they can communicate with each other.

And I think in practice we have seen that in the international space cooperation, international scientific conferences, where scientists don't have these kinds of problems which are artificially imposed by the politicians because they're more interested in the subject, in the advance of science, in the beauty of collaborating in cultural projects – if you look at an orchestra, you normally find anywhere – be it in Asia, in the United States, or Europe, you find instrumentalists from all over the world.

So it is really that which unites people which is the common search for truth, the common truth-seeking in these areas. And therefore, I made in my initial presentation the proposal that one of the lessons to come out of this pandemic and the breakdown of the whole system, which we will see a hyperinflationary blowout, you know, just in parenthesis, if you look at the assets of the Federal Reserve which have almost tripled since the beginning of the year, and they're supposed to double again in the next weeks! – we are in a hyperinflationary blowout – that's just in parenthesis.

But, if we are to come out of this crisis, we have to take all the elements of the crisis together, and address all of them, because I don't think a partial solution will solve any aspect of it. And how do you arrive at a scientific solution? You get the best scientific minds together, and let them define the policy: The artists, the scientists, the people who can communicate on profound ideas.

And I think politicians – you know, I think the image of the politician should also change. It should be more people who are either scientists or are really skilled people who know these principles, and the leaders of governments should be more like Plato's philosopher king, and they should really try to be truth-seeking people, and then I think all the problems can be solved.

ZHOU: I think I've got three steps to deal with this pandemic. This pandemic, you know, this pandemic is from epidemic, so it's become more and more serious; it's all human beings in the world, in particular in New York as the epicenter, as the new epicenter in the world.

And to first establish, to make more awareness of the fact of this disease, for all the human beings across the whole world, make everybody understand the damages caused by this coronavirus, which is very terrible. It's really takes lives, of all people, possibly. So this is the first thing, is to make people understand, you need to probably, for example, in public places, you need to wear masks, you probably need to wear gloves, you need to protect yourself; you need to protect others. So this is the first one, which is to make awareness of this coronavirus.

The second one is to share experiences. Because there are now more than 200 countries have been infected by this coronavirus, and a lot of countries have undergone a lot of experiences, like in China, because China was first hit by this very terrible coronavirus, in late January; in March it was very severe. So, we have already had a lot of experience in this case, we could share with other countries. Also in European countries, Italy, Spain, there were a lot of experience. And now in the United States, also. So we need to share the different experiences of all of these experiences for how to cope with this enemy, the human beings' common enemy.

And the third one is we need to cooperate on research. You see, at this moment, because we don't have a vaccine, yet; we don't have very efficient drugs or medicines, yet. This is the most difficult period. If we have a vaccine, or a very good drug, then we will contain the coronavirus from spreading.

In this case, we need to clean our hands, and in all of the institutions involved, for example, the CDC in the U.S., the China CDC in China, and also other centers, other hospitals also, public housing institutions, we need to altogether to join hands: Only in this case will we make a concerted effort so we can cope with this harmful enemy.

These are the three steps: Awareness, sharing experiences, and joining hands for research work. Thank you.

SPEED: We're going to be returning to questions in a little bit, and again, we want to thank everybody because there are a lot of questions coming, we want to encourage those. And you can bring those to questions@schillerinstitute.org .

We're now going to return to a couple of people that we have yet to hear from and the first is Jacques Cheminade. Jacques is a longtime representative of the LaRouche philosophical outlook in France. He is the president of Solidarité et Progrès. He's a former French Presidential candidate, and he is a friend of the real America, not the fake America. So, Jacques are you with us?

A Europe Not To Be Ashamed Of

JACQUES CHEMINADE: I'm happy and honored to share with all of you, our challenge, "A Europe Not To Be Ashamed Of."

I had a discussion, a few days ago, with Swiss author Jean Ziegler, about the emergency initiatives to be taken to build a new paradigm in international relations. He fully supports our objectives, being a historical advocate of justice, and sharing of food for all. In that context, we immediately agreed that Europe, as it is, is a desperate case, a lost cause, to be ashamed of. The hotspots in Turkey or in Libya, speak for themselves against us. Our mission is therefore, given the fact that European nations must play their part in this universal symphony – a harmonious *tianxia*, as the Chinese would say – our mission is to create instruments to be able to play the part of a Europe, a Europe not to be ashamed of.

I am going to start, briefly because it does not deserve much time, talking about what the European Union is presently doing or mostly not doing. It behaves like a leaderless group, a leaderless group of oligarchical waste, to be frank. The recent European Councils prove, despite the absence of the United Kingdom, that the same spirit of divide and rule, and the same spirit of submission to the dictatorship of money, prevail. To get out of this despicable and self-destructive mess, we need to evoke within ourselves the best of our cultural and

economic traditions, for the advantage of every European nation and for all the other nations of the whole world. Is that utopian idealism? No, just the reverse. Because it is the selfish ideology shared, until now in the recent years, by all, the realistic and pragmatic ideology, that destroyed our common immune system, our public health, and our financial immune system. The result is that, confronted by the pandemic, we had none or not enough masks, tests, respirators, and we were unable to forecast something that our leaders claimed was unpredictable.

All those leaders failed, like Hamlets, not individually as such, but because their adaptation to the individualistic, selfish monetary greed of our society led their impotence to become criminal by negligence. To govern is to predict, and not to predict leads to one's loss. Leonardo Da Vinci adds ironically that "not to predict is already to moan." So let's briefly see what the European Union and the European states have done or not done. To say it with one example, they have imposed "just in time" – *flux tendu* as they say it in French – just-in-time short-term financial rules to our hospitals, ruining their capacity to react properly. In reality, it is states that should rather function as good public hospitals, devoted to collective responsibility, truthfulness, and care for all, providing not figures and statistics as such, evaluated in monetary units, but ideas and initiatives to be simply more human.

So the first thing that Christine Lagarde, the head of the European Central Bank (ECB), the true armed branch of the European Union, what Christine Lagarde had to say was: "Debt cancellation is inconceivable, maybe it will take dozens of years to pay, but it must be paid back." Then, as the United States and the United Kingdom are doing, the European Union and the European states are throwing around billions and billions of euros, in part to save producers and assist consumers through more debt during this pandemic, but most of it is to infuse more addictive money into the financial circuits of the oligarchy. To make it simple: they are distributing electronic impulses called money, mostly to avoid a bankruptcy of their whole system. This is no more a so-called market economy, but a market economy without a market, where all the gamblers continue to gamble with tokens and marbles distributed by the central banks, which is the ECB in Europe.

Let's be precise: The ECB used to be compelled by its own rules to repurchase securities from the banks, but only of a certain rating. It meant state bonds or triple A or A first-quality bonds. Now it decided, on its own, to repurchase high-yield debts, junk bonds of lost causes. So with fake electronic money, the ECB saves everybody, in a similar way as the American Federal Reserve! Beyond that, on April 9, the European Union finance ministers decided to create a

facility package of EU540 billion – EU240 billions from the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), EU200 billions from the European Investment Bank and EU100 billions from the European Commission. But most of it is borrowed, so-called leveraged money, borrowed on the markets! That money mostly goes back into the financial circuit, lending the borrowed money, the ECB is then a sort of go-between lender of last resort for the benefit of the scammers! The European states, on their side, organized massive, national aid packages: EU410 billion for France, EU1,100 billion for Germany, EU475 billion for the United Kingdom, comparable to \$2,200 billion of the United States. Most of it is based on what? On new loans and deferral of charges, accumulating more debt without creating the means to reimburse it!

To make it understandable beyond the obtuse technicalities: The pandemic has only been a revealer of a financial hoax, based on an insane system of indebtedness, and a trigger for the crash but not the real cause! It is because of the financial situation *preceding* the pandemic that nothing was done to prevent it! “Logically, it did not pay” in the short term, to do something. Then when the pandemic occurred, there were no masks, no ventilators, no tests, and the only possible solution to deal with it was the confinement, the lockdown of the population. It had to be done, and it was done, but in an improper way, without any real cooperation among European nations, which as a consequence blocked the economy. And the solution has been to issue more fake electronic money, to counterbalance the halt of the economy, and prevent any bankruptcy, mainly, again, for the benefit of the scammers! More debt to save an over-indebted system, and most of it to save the initiated sharks! Then, suddenly, a Wall Street recovery occurred, through management of the bubble of all bubbles, without any chance, however, to have a real physical economic recovery within such a fake system.

Still, in Europe, the worst is to come: Because there is not enough money to keep the system going, the European Commission plans to either borrow EU1,000 billion on the markets or to take the European Community budget as a guarantee to print EU1,500 billions of so-called “perpetual debt,” based only on the payment of interests financed by an ecological tax, the capital being never reimbursed. Truly, we are aboard, what was called in the Middle Ages, the “ship of fools,” with arrogant captains pretending to give orders among icebergs, and bankers repeating frantically, as the Governor of the Banque de France François Villeroy de Galhau, repeating “You will have to repay this money! You will have to repay this money!” Of course, not the gamblers of British vintage and their associates, but all of us, producers and consumers together.

So, let’s get out of this mess! This European Union and the heads of its member

states are an oligarchical waste. Let's rebuild with the spirit that prevailed during the 30 Glorious Years of the European reconstruction after World War II, to do better – to do better, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, as it is needed to meet the challenge.

The starting point is that the best antidote against any pandemic is international cooperation. All the speakers have said it. This means human solidarity to build a win-win system, as the Chinese President has defined it in many, many of his speeches. The European Union, and more generally, the states of the west side of our hemisphere, unfortunately, follow in an opposite direction. Proof of it, is the disgusting fight among states to buy the masks that each of them lacked because of their selfish policies. And also, the individual incapacity to understand, when one of such masks is available, why it is necessary to put it on, not for one's own individual protection, but to protect the others from our exhalations. These two occurrences show that the concept of the advantage of the other, which was the foundation for peace among nations in the Treaties of Westphalia, which correspond to the Confucian principle that what you do for others is what brings you on the way towards the *Ren*, this founding concept of civilization, both in the East and the West, has been somehow lost in our Europe of the 21st century. Our mission is, therefore, not only to do for the other all the good that we wish he could do for us, but to create the best conditions for her or him to create the good for all. It is notable, in that context, that China, Russia, and Cuba were the nations which came to help Italy, while in France and Germany, and all the more in the United States, many selfish voices denounced that as a propaganda operation, even though their own countries had done very, very little.

Second, comes the implacable commitment to tell the truth, which is symbiotic with the advantage of the other. Our official Europeans have become liars, it should be said. In France or in the United States, because we had not been able to produce or buy enough masks, they first claimed that they were not necessary. The spokeswoman of the French government even claimed that they were too difficult for us laymen to wear, "too difficult to put on, even for me," she said. This type of lie is not to be blamed as a typical characteristic of this pushy woman, but is a result of a financial world where lying is thought to be a clever move to win, at the expense of all the other; lying has become, in that sense, a perverse art.

Third, if you look at the world, and at others right in the eye, inspired by a commitment to truth and to common good, you can anticipate what would happen, as opposed to what all our Western leaders are saying about the coronavirus. In fact, it's even worse: they claim that it was impossible to anticipate something

unexpected, while they accuse the Chinese government not to have anticipated the importance of what they themselves have missed! Even worse, there is a campaign, as was said before, to scapegoat China and blame her, and even sue her, to pay heavy damages!

To anticipate, is to measure the consequences of what you do or fail to do, and that is what is truly called to govern. If you measure those consequences, and therefore your own responsibility, you can forecast a phase change. Not by deducing, inducing or extrapolating from what exists, but by measuring effects of acts on the future. This is what the Pastorian epidemiologists – the various doctors who worked with Pasteur – and virologists called “sentinel medicine,” a medicine related to the space-time of the sick, which looks with the eyes of the future, to the relation between their physical environment and their sickness, always expecting change, and surprises, and taking them into consideration in order to progress. If instead, you drop human priorities in favor of linear statistics of financial profit, you are doomed to commit political crimes.

Commitment to the advantage to the other, truthfulness and anticipation is what is required: Then what they call “black swans” today, can be expected consequences of disastrous decisions for humanity. This is why Lyndon LaRouche, fully committed to the destiny of humanity, was able to predict the disastrous consequences of the August 15, 1975 decoupling of the dollar and gold, ushering in an era of financial and moral deregulation – financial and moral deregulation, together – which would lead, if nothing was done to change the directionality of the society, which would lead such societies to global pandemics. He wrote various warnings on this issue, that other speakers will talk about, but such warnings were not taken into consideration, out of financial greed, out of the failure of our societies.

Then came the Washington Consensus, an agreement of the Western powers to compel the not-yet-developed states to reimburse their debts at the expense of all their infrastructure projects in public health, education and transportation, a debt much higher than the lent money because of the piling up of compound interest. It is through such a process that these not-yet-developed countries became “underdeveloped,” as they were called. This criminal behavior has led to the present situation and demands an immediate intervention from us in the West, together with China and Russia, to launch a top-down program of a global anti-pandemic mobilization. This is what Mauro Ferrari, president of the European Research Council of the European Union, tried to do, to enforce a scientific program to fight the virus, but he had to resign on April 8, in the middle of the pandemic, because his program was not even examined by the European authorities. We have ourselves, from the Schiller Institute, proposed our

LaRouche's "Apollo mission" to defeat the global pandemic because heads of state pretend to be mobilized, as if in a war, but are unable or unwilling to lay out strategies, propose mobilizations or think differently. The truth, is that they are prisoners of at least four viruses which inspire their anti-human policies or paralyze their possible intentions to fight, they are either paralyzed or anti-human.

The four viruses, which altogether represent the viruses of empires founded upon slavery or serfdom through debt, are the financial virus, the Malthusian virus, the geopolitical virus, and the bureaucratic virus. Any form of international cooperation for the common good demands the eradication of such viruses, which in our European history have spoken different languages and accents, but who are today definitely British, the British Empire, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche explained before.

The financial virus should be obvious for most of us. There are no dark forces dooming us in some dark places; we are being robbed as the British Empire always did and does, throughout a world where the Sun never sets. It is based on the management of an odious and illegitimate debt, never based on useful programs to create platforms of development, but on the endless possession of financial assets. Such a system is unable to promote the discovery of new physical principles generating, when developed as technologies, an increase in the potential relative population density. The relation between that potential relative population-density, and energy flux-density was the fundamental discovery of Lyndon LaRouche. Today's Europe is unable to provide the means to sustain at the present level even its own population: The needs to sustain its present density are above the potential necessary to improve its future density. so therefore, this is how LaRouche established scientifically that the West is, within its present way of functioning, doomed: The ECB or the American Federal Reserve may produce trillions of fake money, but never masks, ventilators, steel, bridges, airplanes, machine tools in general – they are unable to issue credit for a better future, because their eyes are fixed on what I would call the sterile nostrils of the past, not on the minds of those who in the past created the conditions for our future.

The second virus is Malthusianism, the social expression of the financial virus. It stands on the so-called "fact" that the world is composed of limited resources, and that production growing in an arithmetical proportion while the population increases in an exponential, geometric way, and this can only lead to total depletion of resources. Like what? Right, like a virus or as a cancerous metastasis, which is exactly what the Club of Rome had to say about us human beings. I confronted Aurelio Peccei, the president of the Club of Rome, on this

issue. And Helga confronted other members of this Malthusian crowd. Therefore, humans have to reduce their consumption and their reproduction, also, to adapt themselves to limited resources. Could this be true? Yes, if the world was defined as a relatively fixed whole, producing limited resources – well, yes, this is the world of the financial oligarchy! It means an entropic universe, ruled by the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which is true in a closed environment; socially, again, its environment defined by the rule of the financial oligarchy!

But the real universe as a whole is different: It is in continuous expansion and does not obey the Second Law of Thermodynamics, only valid in a locked-down system. The human being is in agreement with that law of development of the universe, being human because of his creative capacity: He elevates to the level of new resources what was waste at a relatively inferior stage of development. The very founding of science is this capacity beyond induction, deduction, and the Aristotelian principle of non-contradiction. This capacity to find solutions to existing problems, as Einstein said, with a mode of thinking of a higher form than that which has generated those existing problems. True, genuine science is anti-entropic. Europe, in that sense, has become a problem in itself: The European Union is an entropic box full of bureaucrats. It is laughable, yes, but its consequences are not: All Malthusianisms, whatever form they take – and the British Empire is a clear proof of that – lead to racism, crime and self-destruction.

The third virus is the geopolitical virus, the one-world expression of the financial and Malthusian viruses. It is the policy of the City of London and Wall Street, the British Empire, as it was said, heir of Venice and Amsterdam. For those present-day neo-conservatives, on both sides of the Atlantic, the political universe is a battlefield where enemies are doomed to fight, the winner grabbing all the power and all the money at the expense of the losers, whatever the cost of the battle, in terms of destruction or deaths of human beings. So-called Global Britain, in terms of the Henry Jackson Society: financial globalization, Malthusianism and geopolitics, with always the same ideology and criminal way of behaving, even if it has today Five Eyes, instead of just one and a monocle. Such a world, unable to generate more human power, inescapably leads to war to grab more of the limited resources.

The last form it takes is the bureaucratic virus. It is the typical virus of the European Union, the virus of the servants, the virus of a voluntary bondage. It is an order based on a finished world, like the world of the present viruses, always submitted to an outside power and opposed by its very nature, to the inclusion and development of *any* creative idea. Fearful, and through its fear,

the servant of the other three viruses, fearful, like all administrative systems. All administrative systems are like that, if it is not directed by a strong political will, they become addicted to that evil proclivity to bend. It is the very nature of the European Union, subjected to an outside federator, as de Gaulle once said, the rule of the Anglo-American form of the British Empire, with a euro junior partner of an international dollar, not the currency of the American nation, but that of the world markets, of the men who rob the world, as accurately described by one Nicholas Shaxson.

Against that destructive universe, Professor Didier Raoult, of now hydroxychloroquine fame, has something very interesting to say. In an interview with *Le Monde*, given at the end of March, he said the following: "I think that it is about time that doctors return to their position, together with the philosophers and the persons that share a human and religious inspiration, at the level of moral reflection, even if some prefer to call it ethics, and that we need to get rid of mathematicians, which are but meteorologists in this domain." This is as valid for choices of public health measures as for the definition of international cooperation among nations. Statistics and mathematics maybe define a useful realm of already-created entities, but could never generate something new, breaking with the rules of the game for humanity, either new physical principles, discoveries of principle, or forms of better social solidarity. To pick up mathematics and administrative rules as ways to make the main decisions in times like ours is therefore a crime against creativity. The European Union and the way our states are organized, as entities obeying neither human solidarity nor creative powers, make of us the victims of the viruses that I mentioned before, the deadly viruses.

That is why I am speaking to you today: To call for a Renaissance of Europe in a true concert of nations. Think about it one moment: Let's evoke among us now Cervantes and Goya, Erasmus and Comenius, Rembrandt and Leonardo, Rabelais and Dante, Schiller and Leibniz, and so many others, first of all Beethoven on his year, this year. We need them to inspire a true Europe, looking as far as China and America, a true Europe to be a bridge and not a dead-end on the way to the graveyard. We need a new, young, more dedicated and more human leadership, who in turn needs our knowledge. Let's think above us and act together to save from the coming hunger, death and locusts, Burkina Faso, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, Kenya, Chad, Zimbabwe: Let's be again patriots and world citizens, with a renewed passion for our nations to bring the better of them to the advantage of the others, for a win-win project of civilization, a World Land-Bridge, as it has been our policy defined by Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, a World Land-Bridge from the Atlantic to the Sea of China, eastward and to the Americas westward.

I hear from my balcony people joining hands and clapping to express their solidarity with our caregivers. The caregiving of our nations are the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche. Many of us are going to tell later about those laws to promote and nurture human creativity against all abuses. Not as a code or a formula to repeat, but as a power coming to challenge us from the realm of human thinking, from the noösphere.

We owe to our people in the hospitals, to our farmers, to our industrial workers, to our aged and often abandoned fellows, to the potential of the handicapped and the working poor, to our neighbors of all continents, also to our Yellow Vests, to make of these Four Laws the principled ways leading to our future, shaping a Europe no more to be ashamed of. Let's find together the vaccines against our four viruses, to accomplish great things, let's be truly unlocked and unblocked very soon.

SPEED: I want to thank Jacques Cheminade for his remarks, and particularly his reminding us that this is the 250th anniversary of the birth of Ludwig van Beethoven.

The next speaker is Mr. Michele Geraci. He's an economist from Italy, he was also the former undersecretary to the Development Ministry in Rome, played a critical role in the East-West dialogue with China, a tradition that goes back in Italy to at least the 13th century. We're very happy to have him with us from Italy.

MICHELE GERACI: Thank you very much. I'm very happy to be here. I will give a quick thought on some of the hot topics for the next 15 minutes more or less. I would like to draw from some of my experience that you just mentioned as part of the Italian cabinet until recently, and also in my capacity as one of the main enthusiasts about Italy joining the Belt and Road Initiative with China, that followed my ten years spent in China.

What I've seen in my year at the Italian government is that we have been facing a deep crisis. We have a big dilemma that has halted progress in our society, and the dilemma is between competent and representative nests in the members of the cabinet. The assumption has been, up to today, that politicians who obviously had consensus of the people take the role of politicians and then make decisions based on the analysis, the input from the people who work within the ministries, the directors and so on. And, this model does not require a politician to be particularly knowledgeable about a specific subject.

Now, in the past, we used to have more stability in government, so the politician actually would continue to be in ministries for a number of years, during which they could, little by little, acquire some expertise in their own field. However, we have seen in the last five years, the government changing every year, every year and a half. Take my example, 15 months in the government. Now, that period of time is obviously not enough to allow a politician to gain relative competences and skills, because of the high frequency change. So they need to rely on the directors, the employees, the civil servants. However, they face another problem, the opposite: They've been there for many years, 10 years, 15 years, no incentives, no promotion, no bonus, no rewards; they cannot go higher too much, they cannot go down, they cannot be fired. So they themselves have very little incentive to efficiency and productivity. And, again, this worked well in the past, because changes, external variables were not as frequent and as intense as they are now.

So, if I look at how government were run 10, 15, 20 years ago, well, a politician would stay there a long time; the civil servant with not too much impulse, at least if they knew what was enough, they would pass it on to the politicians, they would have time to learn, and the system pretty much would work.

Now, the speed of changes of external variables don't allow people to learn in time, within the timeframe of their mundanes. And this creates a very serious lack of competence among both the politicians and the civil servants layers. And obviously, the political decision-making process of policymakers, they have nothing to hang on, they have no data, no analysis on which they can make decisions, and therefore, we have entered what I would call a world of randomization of the political decision-making progress.

So the question that we have asked is, should the politicians be experts? And how do we move the line between what [inaudible 53:30] they should represent the people no matter what their background is, they can be well-educated or not educated at all, but as long as they have votes, they should be ministers? How do we come up with a solution to this dilemma, with the fact that we need experts, and we don't have them in needed political or civil servants' layer – and I'm talking in general. Of course, there are very good people, at both levels, but in general, this is the problem that we are witnessing.

Now, when we don't have enough knowledge, you base your decision on feelings, on old stories, on what you were told, but you read and have time to process and think through about. And so, you tend to make not just decisions, but also statements that have a disconnect with reality.

And now, I bring the example of growing anti-China sentiment that we have seen, even in the Italian public debate in Europe and in the Western public debate. There are many reasons for that, and I don't want to elaborate, because they're very well known. The one that I want to bring to your attention, was this mismatch of knowledge and time to learn that does not allow people to learn. And this was in a way, also one of the main goals why I pushed so much on Italy joining the MOU [movement of understanding] on the Belt and Road: Because regardless of the economic benefit to join this infrastructure project, at least we succeeded in having the Italian general public discuss about China, like it had never done before. For the last 12 months, the media, the politicians, have brought China back at the center of their discussions.

Now, 90% of what I hear is completely wrong, but we do step by step. At least we are discussing China, we're discussing the Belt and Road, we are discussing the effect of these global changes, artificial intelligence, technological development, climate change that people – trust me, they were, yes, formerly disgusted, even at the government level, but really not well-addressed for their intrinsic nature. So this anti-China sentiment that I see, on the one hand, I am worried, because I see it increasing, and everyone writes on the previous statements by other people, without thinking too much. On the other hand, I'm going to be optimistic, and because it's based on a lack of knowledge, I do hope the way the knowledge increases, and people have the time to learn, study and maybe take part in events, such as this one today, they will reverse back in their criticism and at least form an opinion based on fact and analysis. And this is really what we have been trying to bring to the Western-, Italian-, European Union-level discussion table. Analysis, fact, data, not just concept based on old stories they naturally get wrong.

Now, I want to bring the example of the virus: I heard about "black swan." I compare it more to a "gray rhino," an animal that is there, visible, but people ignore it. They either pretend not to see it, or they cannot see it, but it's an event that was there, and this was what really happened in Italy. When we first knew about the Wuhan situation in mid-January, toward the end of the month, we in Italy had all the time to plan, both the lockdown, the economic measures, the financial measures, how to discuss with the European Union, with the Central Bank, with the European Commission – we are now, at the end of April, three months later, still discussing what to do, what measures to take, whether to use app for contact tracing or not – three months later! And while this was a "black swan" in November, in December, maybe for China, which may not have expected such an outcome, for us in Europe, it was a "gray rhino": We had the luck to look into the future, just by looking at what was happening in China, in Korea!

But we didn't. The "gray rhino" is sitting there, people turning their heads away, not wanting to see it. Why? Because of this idea that I see ingrained in many of my colleagues, that is, basically this: Whatever China does is wrong. There is possibly nothing that we can learn from China, when we do benchmarking exercises, we probably should not even look at China, we should not even ask, let alone, the questions.

And this is really one of the most serious problems that we are facing in our society. Because that is mixed with the psychological problem to say, that the problem that we have in our own countries is mostly because of our own mistakes. But, as in story-telling, we need to find external reasons, we need to create a monster, which is not us, but someone else, so we can fight it, we can blame it, we can fight it, and then we can be the hero to solve the problem.

Of course, this is all imaginary. And this does not solve the situation. It may create some popular support, because people will believe the story; a large majority of the people would be inclined to believe the monster/hero story, and this increases consensus for politicians, increases misunderstanding in the population, and completely gives our countries like the final stripe in making it able to actually respond to the core root of the problem. So, it's almost as if we live in a disillusion novel.

This is what we have seen in these few months. The thing that really makes us different, and I again compare our Western values with the Chinese values, and the thing that really makes us difficult to accept, maybe sometimes objectively, is that we live in a society where the individual, of course, comes first, where the dream is an individual dream, the American Dream is an individual dream, it's the dream of a person. In China, it's a collective dream, it's the dream of the society as a whole of the country. And yes, there is of course, an element of the individual, and people of course take advantage of it, but the general trend, that the big difference that I have noticed is this collected versus individual dream.

So, we do not only find it difficult to accept learning from this model which is very different from ours, a model that we fear could invade as in Europe. But, really, we have seen very little evidence of China really wanting to export their social, economic and political model to Europe. Of course, they know it would never work.

But this puts us in a crisis, because now, we are asking ourselves, does free trade work, or not work? Does printing money work, or not work? Does the European Union work or not work? So far, I've seen, for example, the European

Union being good at solving problems created by the very existence of the European Union itself: So it's a meta-solution to a problem. There is no marginal value that is immediately visible, including solving maybe the action of Mario Draghi, during the eurozone crisis. Yes, he has stopped the crisis, but the crisis was there, because we had a common currency; other countries with individual currencies did not need a European Union solution: they solved it according to their own means, and pretty much everyone did relatively well.

So, the thing that really, may I say, "bugs" us most in Europe is this philosophical conflict about the "model," the "democracy" or not, the collective versus individual, is that we are maybe starting to realize that the average Chinese person does not care very much what we want to sell them in terms of a model. I have seen, with some exceptions of course, generally very happy. They put value in other values. They attach value to other things, not the things that we do. And this is something that we really – and this is my personal effort, when I was in the government, and now, while I'm back in academe, to try to tell our people that not everyone shares entirely the value – and certain values may be universal, yes, but they get cascaded down to the individual in different extents, in different layers.

I conclude by repeating what Helga said before: We probably need a Renaissance. We need to look back 400, 500, 600 years and it is from here that really, our Europe society can reemerge. This is something that I've argued for, now for a number of years and I'm very happy to hear it again, today. This is both a cultural challenge, but it's also a cultural asset that we have, and we must use. And it is also one of the potential responses to the challenges of artificial intelligence, that may wipe out many of the jobs of many of the tasks; but perhaps it would find it hard to attack these soft-skills, the arts, and creativity.

The Belt and Road, I hope it is something that could help bring two worlds closer to each other, increasing reciprocal knowledge and understanding, and when the knowledge increases, the perceptual risk decreases; and just like in financial investment people, are more willing to take steps, to get closer, and maybe to do more business together, more exchanges, and they would look more at the opportunity and not at the threat.

I'll stop here, and leave it for Q&A. Thank you, very much.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Mr. Geraci. We're going to go right to the questions

& answers now. And I think what I want to do, just for a moment, given the format and the multiplicity of the participants, I want to ask Helga if there's anything that you would like to say at this point, before I begin with the questions. We do have many, but I just wanted to know if you had any reactions that you wanted to convey at this point?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No, but I would like to ask Mr. Geraci a question myself.

Given the fact that you have been living in China for 10 years, I think it would be very useful for our international audience if you would just give us some of your personal experience. Because, you know, my experience with the Chinese people is that they're really very benevolent. I find them almost naïve in their outlook, in their openness. And I think the Western people have a completely different mindset, and therefore they expect many times things which I find they're projecting on Chinese, or what they claim Chinese intentions are. But, maybe you can give us your view on this matter. Because I think, if we want to get out of this crisis as a civilization, I think to develop trust, and to develop a new way of getting rid of prejudices and getting rid of wrong ideas which are based on ignorance, is one of the most important ingredients. So, if you could just tell us what your findings are about your 10 years in China?

GERACI: Thank you. Thank you, a very interesting question.

I've seen widespread people very nice, very welcoming. I have had luck, almost like anyone who has ever lived in China for a decade, to see a transformation that for us, a columnist to analyst, is like a dream to see it under our own eyes, what a country can do; and by doing this analysis, we also had the luck to meet the people! So I was lucky enough to talk to, of course, the Premier and the President, but also any farmer. I took the initiative to make a documentary myself in the rural area. So I really tried to learn about China, both on a geographic and on a society layer, trying to cut to the cross, and I've seen a widespread sense of welcoming, curiosity, and I have been very much welcomed in all my jobs, I traveled around, I've been helped when I was in difficulties. And this I think is the essence of China, and to some extent, of many Asian countries.

Now, the question would be, why is like you said, that some people may have a different perception? And I think this is due to what I would call, a bias sample. People, for example in Italy, have a perception of China from what they have seen since 1982, when the first people from Wenzhou moved to Italy, and of course, there was a competition in the textile industry, which has, in the eyes of some Italians, destroyed our own industries, or our competition. We continued

to have the rhetoric that China, and the value of the renminbi, they do subsidies to the companies and so we suffer from unfair competition by China. And so this animated a people to people feeling.

So people transcend this concept, which is macro-label between government to people-to-people, and that, unfortunately brings some antagonism towards individuals, to the point that during – this was at the end of January in Italy: We started to have a little bit of maybe racist or anti-Chinese sentiment, and I myself, I took the initiative to go around in Milan, in Rome, in the areas where most of the Chinese people were living, and being seen in the restaurants, shaking hands with them, to exactly give the idea that the virus does not have a passport.

Anger, if I may, I even predicted that we should be most worried not about the Chinese who travel from Wuhan to Milan, which obviously was a concern, but mostly my worry was from people from Northeast, not to Italy, from Milan – Italians, who would travel to China, and come back to Italy. Because I had seen the Chinese attach a lot of importance to this virus and I've seen the reaction to their behavior, and in a way, almost the safest members of the commune, because they knew how to do it; the Italians underestimated the risk, not because of their own fault, because of the reason I said before. And so, it was probably due to some of them that the virus arrived "*en masse*" as we have seen in Milan and Veneto – also because those are two regions that trade a lot with China. So, where goods travel, also people travel.

Now, I think the niceness of Chinese people may also be related to the level of income. So this is a process that maybe we've seen throughout societies. Poor people maybe things would be nicer, people in the middle who have a higher perception of themselves that the reality tend to be a bit nastier; and then you need to go really higher, higher, people who are extremely successful who don't need to impose their own personality. So, at the moment, because the Chinese population is still made largely by very, very low-income people, I would say, that yes, the large majority of Chinese people are very nice, and the invitation to people who listen to us, is do not extrapolate what you see in this environment, because you also have not nice guys in Italy, in France, in Germany, in China – everywhere. If you do business, you are representative of a subsegment. The population is a different thing.

My invitation is go, travel, and get lost in the countryside of China, to see and meet what the real China is.

SPEED: Yeah, OK! That's a favored method of travel for many of us, particularly

in your country, Mr. Geraci.

GERACI: Please do, in a couple of weeks when things get better. We will welcome you.

SPEED: We're going to go to our first question, which is from His Excellency Ambassador Cheikh Niang. He is the Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Senegal to the United Nations. Here's his question: "Within the new international relations paradigm that you are advocating, how do you think we can effectively reform the current global governance framework, in a way that will allow the fullest participation of the Global South, both in addressing political challenges, more common in that part of the world, and in correcting the yawning economic imbalances between the developed countries and the developing ones? And how do you envision to get around the unavoidable hurdles to arrive at such a reform?"

I'll go to you first, Helga, and then to Jacques, if he has a response, and then back to Mr. Geraci.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the combination of the crises which is becoming – in the beginning, you know, people played it down, "it's just a common flu," or very few people knew what a pandemic is, that a pandemic is something which is a global phenomenon, and it has specific characteristics, in terms of how you contain it. And given the fact that the coronavirus is really a new virus about which we don't know yet a lot, or at least not enough. There was an underestimation about what would be the dynamic unfolding. I think this is slowly changing. I think some people are getting quite worried about the incredible dimension of this.

Then, you have the undeniable fact that the present trans-Atlantic financial system, for sure, but in one sense, also the global system, is blowing out. The money pumping by the central banks is reaching a dimension where we are getting very close to, as it was maybe in the summer-fall 1923, in Germany, shortly before the hyperinflationary blowout of the system occurred. This can happen very, very quickly. If the central banks keep doing what they're doing now, and there's no indication that they intend to change it, we are shortly before such a point of no return.

Then you have the hunger crisis: This is becoming now a big subject, that the destruction of the food, the consequences of the coronavirus on the food production, the fact that the farmers cannot sell their product to the market because the restaurants are closed; because the restaurants are closed there are

no deliveries to the food banks [for the poor], so I can only tip on the multifaceted interconnection of this crisis, which will, in my modest opinion, create such a dimension of the crisis that the solution which I was talking about in the beginning – that you need the top governments of the world to say, we take responsibility for the fate of all of humanity. And while I understand that President Putin thinks the permanent members of the UN Security Council should be greium, Mr. Polyanskiy was talking about the G20, I don't think that combination of governments right now is willing to do it, simply because there are some countries involved that would rather defend the interests of the City of London and Wall Street rather than recognizing that you cannot continue on the past course.

So, I think that the best thing which can be done, is what I said also in my remarks: That we develop an international chorus of countries, of nations, *and* many individuals and institutions, that simply speak out and say, "Yes, we endorse this idea that there must be a New Bretton Woods system. You must have a credit system which will allow for the first time, the intention of Roosevelt to be realized, namely, to have the industrialization of the Global South, of the developing countries, and that must occur now."

And I cannot see any other pathway. I cannot see any kind of evolution. You need an emergency summit! And then, you cannot solve all these problems in one summit alone; there will be more summits. But I think we have to move to the idea that the common aims of mankind must be taken care of by the most important, most powerful countries, as representatives of the others. And the reason why my husband suggested, many years ago, this combination of these four countries, is not that it would be exclusive of all the others, but first of all, if you do it in the United Nations, it does not work. Two hundred countries or so is just too many, and democracy has some real flaws in terms of getting to decisions, especially under emergency conditions. But these four countries are pretty representative of the West, the United States is a sort of *primus inter pares* of the West; at least it used to have that understanding; then, naturally, Russia, China and India can be trusted to represent the interests of what used to be the Non-Aligned Movement; now it's a combination of the Global South, the African Union, the different Latin American organizations, the BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Organization of Islamic Countries – all of these organizations sort of, in my view, can be trusted by the combination of these four countries, if they work together.

So, the best which can be done, under this incredible, emergency – which will, I fear, get much worse in the next weeks and months – that the more countries and the more leaders speak out and say, "We demand such a solution," the better.

Because I think we can shape – and that’s also the purpose of this conference of the Schiller Institute – I think we can shape the public demand that such a solution be put on the agenda.

That’s my answer.

CHEMINADE: I would only add that, with his limited means, Senegal had been doing quite well. They have a very good Pasteur Institute, not with French people, it’s Senegalese – and they are planning to produce masks for a few cents, and tests for say, about \$1. So there is this sense of the interest of the nation, of the country.

This is extremely valuable in the context that Helga said before, which means that all these nations of Africa, they would bring something into an association, to develop Africa, of the United States, China, India, and other countries, including France and including Turkey, for example, Africa can bring a sense of its own interests in its scientific development, and a sense, also, of social harmony. And this sense of social harmony in Africa, combined with a sense of social harmony of China, and what we can bring from the Western countries, including, of course, the United States, and France in Western Africa, and other countries in Eastern Africa, these can bring a combination which Africa would be a sort of catalyst for this change in the world. And this would demand an input of all of us, to create that, and Africa would be not a country that only needs to be helped, as such, but a country that would make a jump into the future exactly like China did.

GERACI: I think let a lot of what I would say has been said already.

SPEED: Very good. Now, I understand that we are about to hear from Bassam el-Hachem. He’s a professor at the Social Sciences Institute at the Lebanese University in Beirut. But I remember him from about 30 years ago or maybe more, with some activities we were doing both in France and also here, in America. I haven’t heard from him for a long time.

While we’re working on getting Mr. el-Hachem online, I should just say, in a few moments after a few more questions, we have a particular presentation around what is called the LaRouche Legacy Foundation. This involves our reprinting the works of Lyndon LaRouche, who passed away Feb. 12th of last year. I want to make sure that people know that, and there will be a link to encourage people get their own copy of the first volume of Mr. LaRouche’s collected works that we’ve

printed.

Are you able to hear us? There you are, haven't seen you in at least 30 years.

BASSAM EL-HACHEM: Yes. How are you?

SPEED: Not bad. Glad you're still around!

EL-HACHEM: Thank you. I'm going to speak in French. I think we're prepared to do something about that. [as interpreted]

Mme. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, my friends from the Schiller Institute, dear listeners, I cordially greet you from Byblos in Lebanon, and it is precisely on Lebanon that I will focus my remarks. My country is going through a terrible economic and social crisis. This is known, since we know Cheminade and Christine Bierre in Paris over the years. But we are suffering in miniature, the global problematic issues which the conference is dealing with, among them, the crisis of an unprecedented popular uprising, which started on Oct. 17, and which to this day invincibly continues its course, despite even the present lockdown.

I only have 5 or 7 minutes, so I will go to the essence of the matter. I will make small points on the list.

Concerning the crisis and breakdown crisis in Lebanon, there are three main aspects. First, there's a financial and economic collapse taking shape with a public debt which is close to the astronomical figure of \$90 billion, which corresponds to 170% of the GDP, coupled with a very heavy debt service, the equivalent of 10-11% of the GDP; and a budget deficit amounting in 2019 up to 16% of GDP, but also coupled with a serious deficit in the balance of payments.

Secondly, the real living conditions in Panirus [ph] are in continuous decline, until things come a deterioration of the purchasing power of incomes following an endemic stagnation of wages, going hand in hand with increasing taxes on imported products, which is close to 80% of products consumed in Lebanon. And as of summer 2019, the beginning of an amputation of the pay of public service and armed forces retirees. And also unemployment rates in the order of 30-33% of the workforce living in Lebanon, especially among the youth, which is pushing young Lebanese into exile.

And thirdly, there's the scandalous dilapidation of infrastructure and the services which they provide. Electricity which is now being cut, and lockouts. As far as the forces which are behind this crisis, I see the following, there

are three parts. First, fundamentally, there's the problem of the corruption in power, the main coordinates which have not changed since the beginning of the '90s, except for some minor adjustments since 2005. Besides small changes, corruption actually never ended.

Secondly, there's a fundamentally rentier economic and financial policy in force since then, favoring indebtedness and attracting capital to be placed in treasury bills at annual interest rates reaching at one point, the very worrying threshold of 40-45% on the treasury bonds. This resulted in an increase of the debt of the state, accumulation of private fortunes resulting from just embezzlement, to the detriment of the public interest, and the subsequent ruin of agriculture and industry, from which potential investors diverted to the advantage of purely financial banking investments.

Thirdly, of course, the war in Syria and its harmful effects on the Lebanese economy with the influx – and I'm not speaking about the last 60 years from the Palestinians and the tragedy of all these refugees who flee from the war in Syria and its harmful incidents on the Lebanese economy, from a huge mass of Syrians who are fleeing the war, exerting about 1 million persons who were added to the 4 million population of Lebanon. This created an overwhelming picture of the Lebanese workforce, and the market for local products, and on the other hand an unprecedented closing of the land route, irreplaceable for the transport for Lebanese production both in industry and agriculture, to Jordan and all the Arab Gulf countries, in particular, especially the Iraqi market.

As for the obstacles to the way out of the crisis, the following can be said: 1) a systemic policy of the United States, which are the oppositions to a solution, it's a systematic policy of the United States with economic and financial sanctions coming to relay the gunboats of long ago, in the privileged service of Israel, which strangles the country of the cedar, which is pressuring the banks.

2. pressures similarly exerted by the same superpower to force this country to modify the course of the land and sea borders with Israel and occupied Palestine, which has an impact on delaying Lebanon's progress on its oil and gas exploration in the Mediterranean, as much as possible.
3. the United States of America also prohibits us by proxies any resumption of dialogue with the Syrian government, which held out with the help of its friends and allies, in particular Russia, Iran and the Lebanese Hezbollah, which hinders any solutions to our economic progress. Those are linked to the transit of our goods through the Syrian territory, as to the desire to return as soon as possible, after 1.5 million Syrian refugees in Lebanon because of the war at home since 2011.
4. glimmers of hope are a way out, however are on the horizon, but without outside help, there is a big U.S. pressure also on the IMF of not giving the required credits to Lebanon to confront its crisis.

What are glimmers of hope to get us out of crisis, and I want to conclude with that, but without foreign help we cannot succeed in putting them into application.

1. a possible recovery of public money robbed by criminals that we no longer ignore in deposits in foreign accounts, whose amount would be something like \$160-\$200 billion, which is tax money outside Lebanon.
2. The neutralization of regional factors. I just said of the Palestinian cause and the Syrian question, an essential condition for excluding regional interference from the Lebanese scene, whether it be Iran or Israel, Saudi Arabia, and so on.

And 3) a restructuring of our economy has to favor, to the detriment of the profit system, the productive sectors of the physical economy, namely agriculture, industry and technology.

All of this, and I want to close with that, however, nothing is likely to be possible, except in the context of a refoundation of relations among nations on the basis defended by the Schiller Institute, and Lyndon LaRouche on the basis of a win-win situation, and new, more balanced financial and economic order, bringing an end to the dangerous hegemonism of the U.S. practice to the extreme and giving in its place, to all nations, large and small, a voice in the management of world affairs. So, it is not to reflect on such an alternative that we are here, today, united. Thank you for listening.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Mr. Hachem. I'm sorry I didn't realize you were in Lebanon as opposed to France. I misspoke. And I hope you'll be able to continue to participate with us in the conference.

We're going to go now to our next question from Mauricio Ortiz Ortiz, the Chief Ambassador from Costa Rica to Canada. Here's his question: "In the 1940s Costa Rica decided to create a health system with universal coverage, to abolish the army, and invest in education and healthcare. Later, in the 1970s, we created 1,041 rural primary healthcare posts. We also protect, approximately 30% of our biodiversity, and two years ago launched a program to decarbonize our economy. Up to now, we have 675 cases of COVID-19, and 6 deaths, one of the lowest mortality rates in Latin America. Our desire is to exchange experiences with other countries. Will the Schiller Institute encourage the United Nations, the multilateral banks and other organizations to support the governments of undeveloped countries to invest in preventive rural health and health systems for universal coverage? How can this be accomplished with a world system which

currently focuses more on trade and profit than on social issues? And Helga, I'm going to ask that you take that up.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah, we have a call since about six weeks or four weeks ago, for a world health system. The reason why we did that, it's pretty obvious, this is one of the most fundamental human rights you can imagine, and the pandemic underlines exactly the absolute shortage – I mean, Costa Rica may be in a relatively better situation, but I think almost all developing countries are very, very far from what is needed.

Given the fact that the pandemic unfortunately, it was clear that it would become worse and worse, so I asked for a world health system, with the idea that as the pandemic is getting worse, the demand that such a world health system which would put up functioning health systems in every country on the Hill-Burton standard, of the United States Hill-Burton Act in the postwar period; or the French or German systems which used to be quite good, until the privatizations started: That every country has the right to that kind of a standard.

And the pandemic makes it clear, because even if in the beginning some countries may have thought, well, they only have to take care of themselves, the fact that it's a pandemic, which means that it's global, that it's expanding to the South, that it will come back in a second wave, and possibly even in a third wave – if you look at the Spanish flu from 1918-19, it came back in a second and a third wave which were even much worse than the first wave.

So, with that idea in mind, the understanding that we cannot continue as we have done in the past will become a growing, self-evident truth, and the idea that everybody has the right for a functioning health system is a protection for everybody! It's not just for the affected country, but we're sitting in one boat, because if we don't provide that to the developing countries, then it will come back and kill more and destroy more of our economy, and it will just get worse and worse.

So, the idea of now putting a world health system with an idea of a decent health system in every country on the table, in a certain sense, sooner or later requires, how should this be financed? And then you come to the question of the casino economy will never do it, because the reason why we are in this mess, is because they have been going for profit maximization for the last decades. That brings the question then, of the urgent need to have a credit system, a New Bretton Woods system:

I would actually ask everybody who is watching, to simply take up this demand, that the idea that every single country must be provided, first with a crash program to fight the virus, but then you need infrastructure, because even if you can take the Corps of Engineers and set up hospitals in the middle of the desert, well, you may be able to maintain that for a few days or whatever, but then the question comes, how can you build up the infrastructure?

So, in a certain sense, the answer to your question is, that we have to have global development *totally*. This is why the program which the Schiller Institute published after Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road in 2013, we were very happy, because we said, this is what we have been fighting for since '70s, so we actualized all the programs we were working on, the total development plan for Africa, for Latin America, for Asia, the 50-year development plan for the Pacific Basin, the Oasis Plan for the Middle East, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which we already called the New Silk Road in the '90s – and we actualized all of these programs in new study, called “The New Silk Road becomes the World Land-Bridge.” Now, this book was greeted very much in China, it was translated into Chinese; the Chongyang Financial Institute sent copies to all the major universities and think tanks. It was translated into Arabic. It exists now in German and in French. A second volume was produced, an extension of it, “The Extension of the New Silk Road to West Asia and Africa.”

So, if you take all of these studies together, they are an absolute blueprint for a global development plan. And I think we have reached the point where, either we get the so-called Western countries, that is, the United States and the European nations, to cooperate with the New Silk Road in the development of Southwest Asia, Africa, Latin American, Central and South America, and that has to be a cooperative effort. And we have to overcome geopolitics: I know that for many people that sounds like a utopian conception, but I'm absolutely certain that the dimension of the crisis will become so absolutely clear – between the financial blowout, the destruction of the physical economy, the pandemic, as it was mentioned earlier by one of the other speakers, potential social unrest, the refugee crisis – that the idea that you need to put on the table a solution which addresses all of these problems, in cooperation will become a more and more convincing idea. And it's the only winning idea.

So rather than focusing only a side aspect, I think we have to really move with the idea that the only solution is this concept of a World Land-Bridge to overcome underdevelopment forever. And development does not mean more quantities. Some of the greenies of the West, they always think when you say “development,” that you mean more of the same. But we're not talking about more of the same.

For example, I mentioned earlier that the representatives of the developing countries should all be immediately integrated in the training of this research in the life sciences, any breakthrough must be distributed to everybody; developing countries should do the leapfrogging by immediately training some of their young people to be on the top of the vanguard sciences so that the overcoming of underdevelopment will occur in leaps and big steps, and not just repeating all the steps made by the industrialized nations.

I think we are at a point where we either reach a completely new era of mankind, and I have said in the past, this change must be as big as that between the Middle Ages and modern times, separated by the Italian Renaissance. The change to the future has to be even bigger. We need to put mankind first. It's OK to be a patriot of your country, it's absolutely wonderful and a good thing. But the interest of a nation should never again be ahead of the interest of all of humanity, and I think if this crisis teaches us anything, then it is exactly that approach, that we have to be united by the common aims of mankind, first, and then we can settle all the regional, all the national questions after that.

So, I think we have to really fight for this big transformation into a new era of civilization, the World Land-Bridge being the absolute way to go; the New Bretton Woods being the absolute precondition, and starting with the world health system, I think we can cause an avalanche of demand in this direction until it is accomplished.

SPEED: Do either of the other have any response? Mr. Geraci, you have your hand up.

GERACI: No, I just comment on what Helga said: I think the emphasis is, yes, on humanity is important. The question then remains for countries like Italy and even mine which was a so-called "nationalist" government, the belief is that you can help others only if you are first stable on your own feet, a little bit like planes, where you first put you own mask on, you stabilize yourself, and then you're able to help others. I think we all agree that the goal should be humanity; I think the question would be then, what's the path? What are the first building blocks to reach that goal that we all agree on.

CHEMINADE: Yes, we have absolutely to change our thinking. If you look at the preceding world thinking of these last 40 or 50 years, since August 15, 1971, but already before, it said, "how much money do we have?" And there is never enough money to do things useful for mankind. We don't have the money. So, that was always the answer.

How vicious it is right now! Because when the world's this collapse of the financial markets, then they issue money, but not for mankind. They issue money to save their own interest and their own financial markets. So we have to absolutely shift our world thinking and thinking in terms of what's necessary for mankind. Then, it's because of that that we produced this "LaRouche's 'Apollo Mission' To Defeat the Global Pandemic." We started from what is needed globally. And then we established how we would lead credit and the financial means to accomplish this. So it reverses completely the world thinking, to add to what Helga said.

SPEED: Thank you. We have a special presentation. I just received a copy of this – I don't know if everybody can see it online, but *Lyndon LaRouche Collected Works*, and this is put out by the LaRouche Legacy Foundation. And Helga you may have something to say about this, and we have we can also show.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, let me quickly say: First of all, we have created the LaRouche Legacy Foundation which has the aim to preserve the work of my husband, and make it available to the whole world. We want to put out his Collected Works, and that's a big job! Anybody who has known Lyn, he has written, on a good day, 80-100 pages – print ready! – with all the footnotes, with all things which normally the editorial does, and I have not counted it yet, but if this Collected Works series becomes into the 50, 60, even 100 books, I would not be surprised.

Then we have all the videos. We have the letters, the memorandums, the internal communications to important people around the world, in governments and so forth. So this is a gigantic job, which I think, in terms of the historical significance of Lyndon LaRouche, is absolutely crucial. I think it is almost – I don't want to call it a tragedy, but I want to call it an unbelievable coincidence, that one year, approximately one year after he died, on Feb. 12th last year, you have the absolute fulfillment of all the things he said, *many, many times*, in speeches, in conference addresses. And if you now look, the breakdown of the whole system – he had said in many times, in many ways with many predicates. And I know that many people will say, "Yeah, that's LaRouche, he exaggerates, it will never come to that" – now we are here! If you read what Lyn said in the '70s, in the '80s, in the '90s, in the 2000s, you will be surprised.

This first volume is just some of the most important economic works: *So, You Wish To Know All About Economics? The Science of Christian Economy; Earth's Next*

Fifty Years, and some other writings. I would really urge you to get a copy of this book, and make it your joy, to acquire every single book as it comes out, which the Legacy Foundation wants to do, at least two per year, maybe quicker. I want you to contribute, so that we can speed up this work – make it your own question to preserve the legacy of Lyndon LaRouche.

I made a video last year to somehow give you some of the reflections of why I think this is important. Maybe we can see the video now, and then I'll make some concluding remarks

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Hello to all of you. Many of you have participated in the outstanding memorial for my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, or you have viewed the video in the meantime, and then, you got a taste of what a beautiful mind my husband really had, and how important the ideas are for the world today. As a matter of fact, I would put him on the same level of thinkers, those thinkers who maybe you have only one per century, and would change, through their intellectual contribution, the entire body of knowledge of their time, and lay the foundation for future generations to come. So I put him on the same level as Plato, Nikolaus of Cusa, Kepler, Leibniz, Einstein, because he contributed to all of the works of these great thinkers something unique: the LaRouche method of thinking. And I'm absolutely convinced, that if we would publish right now his collected works, which is a gigantic task, because he was one of the most prolific writers of this time, it would have the same effect as the introduction of Plato to the Italian Renaissance.

Now, let me explain to you what I mean by that: The Italian Renaissance was prepared by many factors, by the work of Dante, Petrarca, many sculptors and great painters, but what really caused the spark to really make the Renaissance what it became was the introduction of Plato and the thinking of Nikolaus of Cusa. Nikolaus of Cusa belonged to a circle of humanist thinkers who believed that you had to go back to the original documents of all times, of all events, and handwritings.

So in this capacity, he was sent by the Pope to find out if the Filioque question was in the early documents of the early councils of the Church. Now, the Filioque was the question which had separated the Orthodox and the Catholic Church: It was the question, does the Logos emanate only from the Father, which was the belief in the Orthodox Church, or does it also emanate from the Son, Filioque. Now, Nikolaus went to Byzantium, and he did find all the handwritings of the early councils of the Church, which did contain the Filioque.

This was a complete breakthrough because that meant that he could convince the

fathers of the Orthodox Church to come to the Councils of Ferrara and Florence. So, in 1437-38, he came with a whole delegation of about 700 people, the Emperor of Byzantium, the Patriarch, and many scholars; he traveled from Greece to these councils. And already on the way, because he talked to people like Georgius Gemistos Plethon, who was the 83-year-old adviser of the Emperor and he was the top scholar of Plato in Greece. He actually wanted to introduce Plato, to have a Renaissance in Greece, and hew as refuting Aristotle. He thought that Aristotle had absolutely misrepresented Plato's ideas, or he was not capable of understanding them. He said, Aristotle is completely incompatible with Christianity.

So, the dialogue between Nikolaus and all of these scholars, meant that Nikolaus had a breakthrough, already on that trip. He came to develop a method of thinking which he was very self-conscious about, and he said: I'm now saying something which no human being has ever thought before, and that was, the principle of the *concidentia oppositorum*. This is the idea that the One has a higher value and higher magnitude than the Many, and that the human mind can always overcome contradictions by developing a level of reason on a higher plane which gives you a way to solve problems which were not solved on the lower plane. And that idea, indeed, was the completely breakthrough in thinking, because Aristotle had said, you cannot have something being true and being the opposite of something, not being true; and all these thinkers, including Nikolaus said, this is a completely low level of thinking, because you remain on the plane of contradictions, while Nikolaus in the *Apologia Docta Ignorantia*, which was his rebuttal of a scholastic professor from Heidelberg, Johannes Wenck, he said Aristotle is really a very low level of thinking, like the ratio of an animal, but no better. While the method Plato developed, and which I now develop further, is like the creative thinking being self-conscious about itself. It's like standing on a high tower, and from that viewpoint, you can see the searcher, that which is being sought, and the process of searching, and that gives you a completely different approach.

Now, this delegation arrived in Ferrara, and there were many lectures hosted by Cesarini, who Cusa had devoted his *De Docta Ignorantia* to, and all these scholars then listened to Plethon, and Bessarion, who was the Archbishop of Nicaea, and they were introduced for the first time to the entire works of Plato, which in the rest of Europe, other than Greece, had been completely lost after the fall of ancient Greece, after the Peloponnesian War. There were a few copies in some monasteries, but nobody could read Greek, and when Petrarca tried to learn Greek, he couldn't find anybody who would teach him, so he never was able to access that. But he knew that this guy, Plato, had to be extremely important, because Augustinus, in his writings referred to them.

So, these lectures sparked an incredible intellectual ferment, and fortunately, among the listeners was somebody from a very wealthy family, namely, Cosimo dei Medici, and he financed a crash program for the translation of the works of Plato.

The combination of Cusa' writings and the emergence of the entire works of Plato laid the foundation for the paradigm shift which separated the Middle Ages from the modern times – the Middle Ages being characterized by scholasticism, Aristotelianism, belief in witchcraft, superstition; and then, the new ideas, the new paradigm, a new image of man emerged, and a completely new conception that there was the possibility of infinite perfectibility of each human being, that science and technology could study the laws of the universe, and that this would be the basis for the improvement of the living standards, an increase in population: So it was a complete revolution and it laid the foundation for everything good coming out of the European history for the following 600 years to come.

I'm absolutely convinced that the publication of the collected works of Lyndon LaRouche would have a similar, if maybe even more powerful effect today. Because, what do you have today: You have, in the West, a complete cultural crisis. You have a collapse of moral values, you have the sciences dominated by utilitarianism and the idea of profit. Many scientists are just bread-scholars: They work for their salary, but they are not trying to find truth. I mean, this is a known phenomenon among all the faculties around the world, that if you get enough money, you publish whatever you are told to publish.

Now, the cultural collapse of the West is obvious to everybody – the drug epidemics, the terrible youth culture, the ugliness in the so-called arts, and many more such phenomena. So, I'm absolutely convinced that if we would publish, now, as quickly as possible the collected works of Lyn, it would spark an incredible excitement, because the ferment already exists: Because while the West is in a Dark Age, that is not the case for all of the world, because the New Silk Road, sponsored and originated by China, that spirit, the Spirit of the New Silk Road, has already caught on in about 126 countries which have joined the Belt and Road Initiative, and who have the idea that there will be a completely new time when poverty and underdevelopment can be overcome.

I participated just three weeks ago in the Asian Dialogue of Civilizations, which was an extraordinary event in Beijing. Forty-seven nations participated, and they were all very proud of the Asian ancient civilizations, going back many thousands of years, – 5,000 and more – and they were conscious of the fact that many of these civilizations were cradles of all of humanity.

Now, they think that the Asian Century is coming, or has actually started, and that the West is in a condition of decay. I think what the Asians are doing is great; it's a great inspiration, but I also think we cannot leave Europe, the United States, to collapse, but that we need to have an approach where all countries and all continents prosper at the same time. And I'm absolutely convinced that this can only be done, that all countries are joining the New Paradigm, that we develop Africa together, with the Africans; that we will overcome underdevelopment in Latin America, in Asia, and all the pockets of underdevelopment in the United States and in Europe; but that we need a Dialogue of Cultures bringing back the best traditions of all Classical cultures; but that especially, the most advanced thinking ever thought, which was the thinking of Lyndon LaRouche, will really spark a similar fundamental Renaissance in the sciences and the arts, and the whole discussion of the image of man, what happened in the Italian Renaissance, happening for the future of humanity.

If you think that is a worthwhile idea, then I would ask you: Be generous and help us to make that work. You can help in many ways, and contact us and we will find a task for you to be a part of this exciting project. But also think that we need your financial support to do that, but do it in the spirit that it is upon us, now, to shape the new epoch of civilization, which hopefully will be the age where human beings will relate to each other as human beings, and that the future of mankind will be like the relations between Wilhelm von Humboldt and Friedrich Schiller, or Albert Einstein and Max Planck, and that nations will relate to each other in a completely new spirit, something which Nikolaus of Cusa called the *spiritorum universorum*, the New Silk Road Spirit, and that the works of my beloved husband are the crucial spark which will make that possible.

[end video]

SPEED: Helga do you have some final remarks?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: We would like to send out copies of that book to many libraries internationally, so obviously, we do need support to do that, but I think if we would have these books available for students, for curricula, I'm absolutely certain that the specific method which my husband developed, – we will hear more about it in the next hours, and tomorrow. But I think that the specific LaRouche method of thinking is the most advanced thinking which mankind has produced so far.

Now, you may say, "She says this because she loved her husband." But it's more than that. It's that also, but I'm absolutely certain that the contribution which Lyndon LaRouche has made is of absolute importance to the solution of the

world problems like now. And that's why I just want you to buy the book, to think how you can help, and think about spreading the ideas of my husband. Because I think that that is – first of all, you will be completely shocked, to see what he said, how early. As you heard with the two videos, which Dennis played at the beginning, many of what he said is as actual as if he would have said it this minute. And that unique power to anticipate and to make a correct prognosis, and then, come up a solution, that is something which must be studied by many, many people around the world. That's is what I want you to know.

SPEED: The link to LaRouche Legacy Foundation is on the Schiller Institute conference page,

<https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org/collected-works/volume1>

I'll make a comment of my own: We were known as Ramsey Clark said – Ramsey Clark, being the attorney for Lyndon LaRouche at the point that LaRouche was unjustly incarcerated. He talked about the idea that the "LaRouche people were the book people," referring to the story *Fahrenheit 451*, by Ray Bradbury, which talks about all the time when human knowledge was being persecuted. And what happened was that a group of people who refused to allow civilization to die, became "books." They were the living embodiment of various works. That's what we are. And that's what Lyn was: He was a living embodiment of over 2,500 years of Western civilization, and much more besides.

We again say, if you go to the Schiller Institute conference page, the link for <https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org/collected-works/volume1> is there and if you go there and purchase it, we'll not just appreciate, but you'll appreciate it.

I understand that we have someone here in New Jersey, Daniel Burke who is an independent candidate for U.S. Senate, among other things and he's been doing some work of a very specific nature with respect to today's proceedings. Daniel if you're there, go ahead.

DANIEL BURKE: Good! Thank you very much, Dennis. My name is Daniel Burke, I'm a LaRouche independent candidate for U.S. Senate in New Jersey. I'm 33 years old, my wife and I, we have a 2 year old daughter; I've been a member of the LaRouche movement for about eight years.

And my message is for the students and youth participating in this conference, and people who are thinking about them.

Four weeks ago, Helga joined a videoconference with 70 people from 12 different countries on 5 continents: these were primarily students and youth. She appealed to them to build an international youth movement, and since then, we've held a series of classes, readings and videoconferences among youth, in different languages, drawing them into this event.

Join us in building that youth movement, to inspire the tens and hundreds of thousands of students and youth we need to get the governments of the world to adopt our approach. The LaRouche movement is not here merely to loosen the grip of popular beliefs. The nations need a new organizing principle, they need a new scientific hypothesis of what mankind is, and will be. And it has to be agapic, loving in the divine sense.

Is it true that we're insignificant specs of dust, in a cold, amoral universe? Or, a cancer on Mother Nature and deserving of all the punishment we received? If you reject those ideas, as you should, then what are we, in fact? The power that lies at the essence that is intrinsic to all human individuals is willful creativity, an ability shared by no animal species, to increase our power in and other the universe, by uncovering its laws – laws which are imperceptible to the mere senses.

It's very difficult, one thinks, to consider your personal positions within such a profound scheme. It's not easy to take seriously the dreams that all people share at some point in their early lives, of ending poverty, war, famine, and disease. It seems as though everyone has abandoned those dreams. "Who am I to say I know better?"

However, consider which is healthier for your soul. Should you accept, instead, the condescending voice of cynicism that says, "No one person can make a difference; let the Infinite scroll soothe your rumpled ego?" Or, should you accept those who say, "I can fix all the problems of humanity. Just eliminate human beings!"

Now, I'm asking you to join the LaRouche movement. Take the Devil by the nose, attack the corrupt and stupid axioms that allow the City of London and Wall Street fascists to gain control; and prove to yourself the true nature of mankind.

We're asking you to join us in ensuring that there's a growing force of students, workers, scientists, teachers, farmers, doctors, nurses, poets, artists demanding a new paradigm, and the actions needed to make it happen, beginning with Mr. LaRouche's four economic laws.

Then, in fifty years—when I would be 83 and my daughter 52—we will have seen the greatest growth in human culture, science and economy ever known in history. And we can consider that our own contributions may have been absolutely necessary for it to happen.

In two weeks, on May 9, we will hold the second International Youth Video Conference. Help us to organize it. Work with us to mobilize the greatest number of people into meaningful action for this new paradigm. You can sign up for the youth video conference at the link on the screen, <http://bit.ly/si-youth>, which I encourage you to do immediately.

If you, yourself, are not a youth, please share this with a youth that you know. Help us to reach out to them and introduce this solution-concept for humanity, and nix the crisis.

Thank you!

SPEED: Thank you, Daniel. Let me just say that we're coming up a bit on time; we have about 18 minutes or so left. I'm going to be combing a few questions, here, which I'll direct to the panelists, asking one and then see if the others want to respond.

I want to take the first question from Her Excellency, Mrs. Fatima Braoulé Meité, Ambassador of the Republic of Mali in Canada. She asks:

"COVID-19 has an effect, in particular, on the most vulnerable in society, be it those in Africa, in Europe, in America, or anywhere else in the world. Most of these people have a poor education. They have little access to health care, and are often jobless. The result is a higher rate of mortality. So, in fact, COVID-19 exposes all that should have been done—but was not—for all these people. Every state should now re-examine how to better intervene in all the social fields, even it means to nationalize some services, which had gone to the private sector.

"Unfortunately, Africa is little discussed, when considering the actions that should be taken in the post-COVID-19 world. The only Western voice with the courage to propose a structural solution for the African countries was that of [French] President Emmanuel Macron, when he proposed the cancellation of the African countries' debt, in order to allow these countries to fight the COVID-19 while tackling, in-depth, the structural problems. Unfortunately, his call has

not been heeded. This opportunity for political dialogue on the post-COVID-19 era, and the change of paradigm which the Schiller Institute offers on what should be our new way of acting, must take care of this question, and support President Macron's proposal and open the ways and the means necessary for that."

She then asks for a comment. Let me take the liberty to combine that with something that also came from an African diplomatic mission in Ottawa—a very short question that I think can be done as a corollary to this:

"We have noted the recommendation for a summit between the huge powers, that is, the United States, China, Russia, and India. In your view, which of these countries do you think will better push for the interests of African countries, especially on economic matters?"

I think what I'm going to do, is slightly revise what I said, and ask Jacques [Cheminade] to answer first, and then, I'm sure, the other two of you will have something to say; and then we'll go from there.

CHEMINADE: Macron sometimes says words that may be useful. He called for this cancellation of all of the African debt, not only the debt of the poorest countries. He also issued a declaration with Tunisia, supporting UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres' [call for a] world ceasefire.

This is good, but they are things in themselves. What you need is a higher standpoint. This higher standpoint would mean the programs of development needed by Africa, and with whom. And how France could work with other nations to create this combination, this international cooperation that is needed for the development of Africa. This is not done.

Look at what was not done in France for the elder people in the retirement or nursing homes. What was not done by the Yellow Vests, what was not done inside the nation, this cannot be something separate with what's done for African countries. You need an overall poise, supported from inside France for an absolute commitment for mankind.

This is not yet there. We're doing our best to create the spirit for that, but it's a very difficult situation, because there are all types of influences, including our own Macron, like Trump [in the U.S.]. There are not good people around both of them, going in a very different direction.

Also, there are provocateurs in the whole country, as you see in the United States. We have the same in France. People are calling for May 4 as a day

against the lockdown: "Go [back] into the streets, be free, be happy!" So, you have all that, also happening in the United States. It's used to disrupt our countries.

The only way that our countries could escape this offensive of disruption, is to have a real commitment to everything that was told of today.

So, at this point, for example, the French media never covered LaRouche, except once or twice, to slander him; and seldom covered me. They only covered me during the Presidential elections, but after it was finished, full silence against our ideas. That, for me, would be the Rosetta Stone of what is done or not done, and we should judge from that standpoint.

SPEED: Helga, do you want to say anything about that, or should be continue?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think that there are a lot of good proposals, by Guterres and others. For example, I think the end of sanctions is absolutely a requirement. And, naturally, the case-fires are also very important; the debt moratorium, the Jubilee—all of these things are absolutely crucial.

But I think what is lacking, as Jacques was just indicating, is how to remedy—even if you eliminate all the debt. Where do you get the new money? For that, you need a credit system. In the aftermath of this conference, we will publish a selection of articles by my husband on the New Bretton Woods system. A credit system would be beneficial for everybody. Okay, maybe the Fortune 500 would not be the winners of this, but everybody else—the middle-level industry of the advanced sectors, the countries of Africa.

We published the first comprehensive book about African development in 1976. It started with an integrated infrastructure program for the whole continent. It has ports, highways, fast train systems, industrial parks, industrialization of agriculture. In the book are described large projects, like the Transaqua project to bring water back to Lake Chad.

There was an absolute clarity on what needed to be done to immediately start to industrialize the African countries, naturally with their participation and their say-so as to what should be done and what should not be done.

But, I think it's not a question of a lack of clarity of where to start. Many countries in Africa are now committed to having a middle class, to becoming a middle-level-income country in the near future. And that is absolutely achievable.

I think that is what needs to be put on the table, but it can only be done with a New Bretton Woods system.

SPEED: Since Mr. Geraci is an economist, I'd like to ask him what he has to say.

GERACI: On this discussion of debt cancellation, I think there was a proposal by Macron, or maybe by [French Minister of the Economy and Finance] Bruno Le Maire, who probably asked only for a debt delay repayment, not cancellation.

And so, I think, like Jacques said before, sometimes these are announcements that have very little relationship with reality.

I would like to answer Her Excellency from Mali. This is a problem we also have in Italy. We worry a lot about where to get the money from, how to finance it, who should give it to us—but very little attention is paid to what to *do* with the money.

I think we need to have the other side of the question very well developed, because this has been the problem in the past, including Italy—that we have 155% debt-to-GDP, going to 160% very soon—because we really don't have an industrial plan; we don't really have a plan to support the economy during this [coronavirus] crisis.

If I may advise all our listeners and ambassadors and policymakers who are listening: Draft, in details [unclear word: 12:15.6] industrial plan. Because, when the plan stands on its feet [is stood up?], the money comes. Finance tends to be a little bit more forgiving, and it reaches to where the good ideas are. I want to balance the focus of my takeaway from today. Let's not just focus on where to get the money from, but really each country, county, city, region should have a very well-developed and integrated plan of what to do with it.

I'm talking here as a former investment banker, myself. As much as we may not like finance, individual investors' money flows to where there are good investment opportunities. Of course, some of these projects are not there to make money; they are social projects. But, nevertheless, the plan needs to be equally detailed, even if there is no financial return, just to maximize the money.

SPEED: Okay, thank you. We have a lot of other questions that we're not going to be able to get to. There is one presentation in particular that I want to get

to. We're going to show a couple minutes of it. It was recorded for this conference by Antonio "Butch" Valdes, head of the Philippines LaRouche Society. We are going to have this available online. And we'll try to show the full presentation in our final panel tomorrow. I'm going to show just a few moments of it here, because I want to make sure that people know about it and know what he had to say. And then we'll return to a final question, which will be to Helga, and then conclude.

Butch Valdes: Presentation to the April 25-26 Schiller Conference

(note- the first part of this was in the Sunday briefing. Here is the full presentation.)

Greetings from the Philippine LaRouche Society. Thank you for allowing us to share our insights, as to how we find ourselves playing a significant role in the global peace effort. For most of us observant with both international and local affairs, the past decade has been most foreboding, causing heightened apprehension due to increased tensions among the superpowers.

The overthrow of the 2014 Ukraine leadership by, admittedly, the CIA, and the subsequent encirclement of Russia and China by Obama's Asian pivot were major steps being taken by the Western allies, asserting military dominance over those who dared to defy them.

At about the same period, the destruction of Syria, care of the manufactured ISIS and mercenary terrorists used in the overthrow of Libya's Qaddafi was in full operation, intending to take out President Assad, to replace him with a puppet government. But they did not expect President Putin of Russia, and President Xi Jinping of China to collaborate in deterring effectively the British and Obama move to fast-track the world into a war.

And just to move quickly forward, neither did they expect a leader of a client state – or a better description is a "compliant state" – to be thrust into the Presidency of our Republic, by an overwhelming majority. Duterte made no promises, except to fight terrorism and do battle with the drug syndicates. Even if his vocabulary needed some refining, he said, "my admirers readily tolerated the expletives." Because he epitomized the anger long suppressed by the alliance of falsely elected government officials and the oligarchic corporations causing desperate conditions of life.

Yet nothing has so unified the country, more than the incident where, shortly

after his election, even before his inauguration, Obama gives him a call, to remind him of the obligations that the previous corrupt government had made with him, regarding the Visiting Forces Agreement and the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Act, virtually establishing the Philippines as the most proximate U.S. military base facing China, and consequently its nearest target in case of a nuclear confrontation between the two powers.

What seemed to get Duterte more incensed, aside from the condescending tone of Obama, was the threat that unless our President submit to these dictates, he will withdraw a \$700 million assistance earmarked by the U.S.A. for the Philippines. Duterte retorted by saying, "he can keep his money and go to hell! We are no longer your colony."

I believe many Filipinos got enamored to the newly elected leader, after this. Until this day, four years into a six-year term, he still enjoys an 87% popularity and approval rating. For once, over so many decades, including the administration of Marcos, and those before him, the Filipino people felt like a truly sovereign nation.

Inevitably, this strained relationship brought us closer to Russia and China. Yet, subsequent improved relations with the U.S., upon the election of another phenomenal leader, President Donald Trump. It's worth noting that whether President Duterte knew the implications of what he did, when he asserted our independence, we in the Philippine LaRouche Society could not resist with the voice out to constituents and friends in government our approval of these events. Immediately, we knew that the Philippines was going to play a key role in establishing peace in the Southeast Asian region.

But so, too, did the soldiers of the CIA, George Soros, and deep state, or whatever the names they are called. They went into a relentless campaign to disparage the President, using the mercenary opposition and mainstream media in accusing Duterte as a China puppet, who had placed the country into the "debt trap," conveniently ignoring that we have been in one for the past four decades, courtesy of the IMF and world's money-lenders.

The demonization of China has been well-orchestrated, ironically including the so-called "leftist" elements, whose former battle cry was to put down American imperialism, are now massively demonstrating against the expansion plans of China and her intentions to attack and occupy the Philippines – now calling on their American imperialists to protect poor Filipino fishermen.

Despite all these geopolitics being played by characters associated with the

financial oligarchy, manipulators of Wall Street, politicians and a host of other British agents, we observe that Trump is standing his ground, not to be lured into intrigues concocted by people in his cabinet, or mainstream media on China's and Russia's intentions toward the United States. It is obvious by his confident demeanor that his relationship with Putin and Xi Jinping is far from being antagonistic – which bodes well for the whole world.

But we all know, that matters have taken a very sharp turn, for the worse, recently. The pandemic will not spare the Philippines, and many third world countries similarly situated. The resulting economic conditions will turn from bad to worse, for all countries. It is not good for the world's population, but definitely a boost for the intentions of those who want it destroyed.

If not for China's Belt and Road Initiative, started in 2013, the global infrastructure program, historically the greatest project ever conceived by man for mankind, linking all seven continents by land, by high-tech transport systems, now with 150 registered nations willing to join, there will be no alternative project of this magnitude that can match the staggering effort being undertaken by those, who, like the mythical god Zeus, will destroy the mortals. These mortals, who in a short 30 years, have risen from decrepit conditions to becoming the second largest economy in the world; a people, the most extensive railway system doubling that of the world's combined; a country, which has started to help develop the African continent, the most exploited people in the planet, constructing a railway from South Africa to Egypt, covering 9,000 miles, roughly three times the length from New York to California; a country which has brought its whole population of 1.4 billion above the poverty level: They did not do it by occupying other countries, nor did they intimidate others to buy their goods, or control their currencies, and establish 600 military bases all over the world to enforce their will over others.

They did the way other great thinkers and leaders would have done: Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon LaRouche. There is a saying, that the tree that bears much fruit will attract those who will throw stones at it. The U.S. and other countries have two options: One is to join those whose vision of the world is based on geopolitics, in which they stupidly take sides and ally themselves with whomever they consider to possess greater military might, in anticipation of a world nuclear conflict. Or, collaborate with China, Russia, India, and over 100 other countries, the Philippines included, in a global collective effort to stem the devastating effects of an ongoing collapse of the world financial system, in confluence with a pandemic which threatens human population with millions of deaths. In a real sense, the world's faith and 8 billion lives lies in the hands

of one Donald Trump: His decision time is running short, because the enemies of mankind are on a massive effort to stop him from doing what is right.

We in the Philippines will do what we can to influence our decision-makers, not to fall into the China demonization trap. We are confident that the local opposition and the leftist elements have not been able to convince our people that China has taken control of the Philippines. On the contrary, it's the U.S. naval assets which are sailing and docking in our ports, needing no permission to do so.

Just as Trump is the principal obstacle to World War III, Duterte's presence is a deterrent to the deep state, to use us as a launching pad for a preemptive strike against China. It is certain that both these leaders are among the top in their demonic list.

We join Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the whole LaRouche movement, friends and the rest of the world, in making this clarion call for all to hear: That where there is great crisis, there is great opportunity to make the necessary changes for our civilization to succeed. It is our duty as human beings to be worthy of the creative powers given to us by our Creator. We in the Philippines commit to do our part, in a true agapic spirit to save humankind of self-destruction, in the name of Truth, Justice, Peace, and Development, so help us God. Thank you.

SPEED: So, if you want to hear more of that exciting presentation, you can get it from our website. As I said, we'll try to get the entirety of it played tomorrow on our concluding panel.

This is the final question for this panel. It is from Ambassador Samson Iteboje, the Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations. Here's the question:

"Her Excellency, Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, talks about the need to establish a new world health system, and for the United States, China, Russia and India to be the front-liners in that regard. This is an ideal.

"But the ideal must be put on the same wavelength with reality to determine the practicality of this ideal. The reality today, is what she refers to as 'casino economy,' or, 'neo-liberal system of the West.' In her view, the neo-liberal system of the West has inherent flaws, hence its unpreparedness to cope with COVID-19.

“My question is: In the face of the upsurge in nationalism, how can the world achieve the new world health system that you are clamoring for?”

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I thank you for that question, because I want you to remember what was in the video played by Dennis in the beginning—Mr. LaRouche talking about the U.S. Presidency; that it’s the President, not the Congress, not the Cabinet, but the President of the United States who represents the entire country.

Obviously, we also have designed this Schiller Institute conference with an eye on that particular perspective, because I think the problems of this world can only be solved on the level of the leaders. I think President Trump, given all the trouble he has had, starting with Russiagate, the efforts to impeach him—all of this—comes from the same circles that are now behind the anti-China campaign: MI5, MI6.

Why do they hate him? And why does the House of Lords say they will do everything to prevent a second term of President Trump? Because he has responded to some of the aspirations of the American people. They have voted for him; he has started to have a good relationship with President Xi Jinping; he wants to have a good relationship with Russia; he has relatively no problems with Prime Minister Modi.

Given the fact that you have such an incredible crisis, the casino economy and the Wall Street and City of London forces are not all-powerful. They can be overruled. If you ask yourself, “Where should it come from, if not from the top leaders from the most important governments?”

If you at what President Trump said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly, one-and-a-half years ago, he said that every nation has the right to take its own nation first. America first, but also Philippines first, Mali first, Germany first, France first. That must not be a contradiction, because the very design of the New Silk Road is based on the principle that there should be an absolute respect for the sovereignty of the other country; there should be the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs; respect for the different social systems.

If you take what I said earlier, that you put mankind first, there is absolutely room for an alliance of perfectly sovereign nations. And it happens to be that that is already in the American foreign policy tradition, because that was the approach John Quincy Adams took, who had exactly that idea. Also, that it was not the purpose of the United States to go outside and chase foreign monsters,

but that the idea was to build such an alliance of republics.

I think that is what we have to do. The EU is useless. It does not represent the interests of its members, and it keeps doing things which further the dissolution and disarray. So, is that a problem for Europe? I don't think so. We should go back to the idea of Charles de Gaulle, of a "Europe of the fatherlands." De Gaulle also said that French people are not cows who eat grass, but the French people should have a mission.

Everybody should have a mission! And, if that mission of every country is in the direction of the one humanity, you can solve this problem and you can overcome these contradictions. In a certain sense, it does require the method of thinking of Lyndon LaRouche, but also of Nikolaus of Cusa's "the coincidence of opposites."

There can absolutely be the interest of every nation presented by patriots, without that they become chauvinists. You can have the interest of the patriots of the different nations relating to each other and furthering their interest in a win-win cooperation, where everybody works for themselves, but at the same time, the interest of the other.

That was the principle of the Peace of Westphalia. The Peace of Westphalia, the beginning of international law, resided in the fact that after 150 years of religious war of which the 30-Year War was only the final concluding part, there was almost nobody left to enjoy the victory. So, for four years, people sat down and worked out principles which started with "the interest of the other." That is really the principle we have to have.

We have to have worldwide development—a world land-bridge, the New Silk Road extending to all continents, including the rebuilding of the United States. Anybody who has recently been in the United States has seen that the infrastructure is in a terrible condition. You need to build new cities; you need a modern transport system. You need a transport system in Latin America; in Africa.

What we're really talking about is a global system of infrastructure building, starting with the health system, but extending into all other areas of infrastructure. And then, once you have established such a common economic interest, which will be in the interest of every country, because even the United States would gain a lot more by participating in all of these project, than with the present policies of the military-industrial complex. They think they have to preserve raw materials, and so forth.

But that's not the source of wealth! Read LaRouche, and you will find out why this is the case.

Once you have established the common economic interest, you can build a common security architecture. NATO is obsolete. NATO should have been dissolved at the end of the Soviet Union. Now we need an economic basis for a new security infrastructure which serves the security interests of every single nation on this planet. It can be done!

That is the kind of change we have to think about. The strategic defense of the Earth, the idea that we are unprotected against the danger of comets, of meteors, of asteroids, should be a common aim. Early warning against volcano eruptions, against tsunamis, a common defense against viruses and other diseases.

All of these things are so pressing, that if we put our efforts all together, I think we can change the agenda. In a certain sense, it's not an option. It is the absolute necessity to get out of this crisis.

So, that is why I'm optimistic. Because sometimes, when there is not enough reason you can appeal to, then the policy of the burning shirt may help to get people's asses out of their chairs.

SPEED: All right. So, I want to thank everybody for participating today. I think that was a heartfelt sentiment that was expressed there a moment ago, with which we all agree. I want to thank His Excellency Mr. Dmitry Polyanskiy, First Deputy Representative of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations; His Excellency Ambassador Huang Ping, Consul General of the People's Republic of China in New York; Counsellor Zhou Guolin, head of the Science and Technology Section of the Consulate.

I want to thank, of course, Jacques Cheminade, Chairman of Solidarité et Progrès; Professor Michele Geraci, from Italy, who was very important in bringing about the Memorandum of Understanding between China and Italy, and very important in our understanding today of how Americans should think about the people of China, as opposed to simply seeing them as "the Chinese," as a kind of abstraction.

And, of course, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

I want to thank all of you for being with us. We are going to be continuing our conference. This is just the first panel. Panel 2 starts in just under an hour.

It's called "For a Better Understanding of How Our Universe Functions."

[I also want to say that this \[holds up newly released printed book\] is the first volume of Lyndon LaRouche's Collected Works.](#)

[You can purchase this volume online.](#)

I want to welcome all of you to your first experience with Lyndon LaRouche, if it is your first, but I also want to encourage everyone to get everyone else that you know is thinking about how our civilization has to be rebuilt, to tune in to the rest of this conference. You can, of course, do that, as I said, beginning just about an hour from now. Thank you, and we'll see you in a little while.

[At vende nedbrydningen af selve samfundets struktur](#)

Den 16. april (EIRNS) – I løbet af de sidste 15 dage, siden 1. april, er det samlede antal mennesker der er smittet med coronavirus fordoblet, steget fra 1 million den 1. april til over 2 millioner i dag. I disse to uger seksdobledes de amerikanske dødsfald som følge af COVID-19, fra 5.100 den 1. april til over 30.000 i dag, den 16. april.

I de sidste dage af marts meddelte den amerikanske finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, at centralbanken ville kanalisere mindst 4 billioner dollars til at redde det bankerotte transatlantiske finanssystem på skatteydernes regning. Denne redningspakke er allerede en størrelsesorden større end den katastrofale redningspakke til det finansielle system i 2008 – og en størrelsesorden farligere og skørere. I 2008 blev den amerikanske Kongres afpresset til at revidere deres oprindelige afvisning af TARP-hjælpepakken, da Wall Street og City of London fortalte dem, at hvis de ikke godkendte det, ville det efterfølgende kaos kræve en undtagelsestilstand.

Hvilken pistol-mod-panden-taktik bruger det britiske imperium denne gang for at få deres vilje? Hvordan har de for eksempel "oversvømmet zonen" omkring præsident Donald Trump? – som den tidligere britiske ambassadør i Washington tidligere så malerisk har udtrykt det.

I løbet af de samme to første uger i april har briterne og deres amerikanske kriminelle kumpaner kraftigt optrappet deres fremstød for at udløse krig mellem USA og Kina – netop de to nationer hvis nære samarbejde er nødvendigt for at tackle COVID-19-pandemien og til hurtigt opbygge et verdenssundhedssystem, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret til.

Tidligere væmmelig retorik og tilskyndelse til handelskrig er eskaleret til åbne anklager – der som sædvanlig har deres oprindelse i britiske efterretningstjenester og derefter siver ned til deres amerikanske kolleger og godtroende neokonservative i Trumps følge – at Kina ikke alene skabte det dødbringende coronavirus i et laboratorium i Wuhan, men at de måske endda har inficeret deres egen befolkning for derefter bevidst at slippe det løs som biologisk krigsførelse mod USA og Vesten.

I løbet af disse to uger er der også opstået et nyt træk ved den dødbringende dobbeltkrise med COVID-19-pandemien og sammenbruddet af det transatlantiske finanssystem: institutionelt sammenbrud og kaos kan ses overalt i hele verden. Fødevarer- og andre optøjer er begyndt i Sydafrika, Indien og andre steder; folk i Europa og USA fortvivler over ikke at kunne finde nogen rationel løsning på krisen og skælder i stedet ud over de vedtagne nedluknings-foranstaltninger; og regeringer og multinationale institutioner viser sig ikke at være den opgave voksen, som planeten står overfor.

Vi er vidne til nedbrydningen af selve samfundets struktur – et sammenbrud, der kun kan vendes på samme måde, som den gyldne renaissance løftede menneskeheden ud af truslen om udryddelse under 'Den Sorte Død'.

LaRouche-bevægelsen og dens venner og allierede mobiliserer internationalt til Schiller Instituttets kommende konference den 25.-26. april, der er indkaldt for at tage fat på og løse denne eksistentielle krise foran os. Det gør vi motiveret af den vedvarende ide om menneskets værdighed, der er nedfældet i de følgende linjer skrevet af Lyndon LaRouche i juni 1976, fra slutningen af hans essay, "Latter, Musik og Kreativitet":

"Der er en syg verden, der skal genopbygges. I denne verden – der er karakteriseret ved de modbydelige lingvistiske sprogfolk – plages vi af flokke af humørløse, ukreative, nævenyttige lømler, der bedst kan beskrives kort og godt som en undertrykkende grå farve, der tenderer imod en ildevarslende gul. Ellers er den generelle befolkning psykologisk duknakket med en byrde af voksende frygt – frygt, hvis nøjagtige karakter og former disse personer foretrækker ikke at kende – hver især trasker miserabelt fra det ene velkendte, grå sted til det næste, 'og på bedste beskub forsøger at tage sig af sit eget

personlige forehavende'. I mellemtiden vokser stormene... Der er storme af udbrudte og truende regionale krige, og overordnet truslen om generel kombineret atom-, biologisk og kemisk krigsførelse på verdensplan. I mellemtiden breder syge rotter sig, og de dødbringende nye bølger af ødelæggende epidemier spredt sig mod mennesker, dyr og plantevækst.

Vi må ryste dette af os, og opbygge verden, da det står så umiddelbart og forunderligt i vor magt at gøre det. Vi må i mellemtiden vække videnskaben, feje affaldet væk, og ellers blive en generation som fremtiden vil se tilbage på med varm stolthed over forfædrene. Mens vi gør dette, må vi le en hjertelig latter, latter hovedsagelig på grund af spændingen, som vi med rette får ud af vores bedrifter. Lad der være musik til.”

[‘Alle mennesker skal være brødre’: Fra COVID-19 til Det nye Paradigme LaRouche PAC Manhattan-projekt; dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Hussein Askary og Jacques Cheminade](#)

Lørdag den 4. april 2020. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Jacques Cheminade, LaRouche-bevægelsens leder i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat samt Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, talte om USA i forbindelse med LaRouche-bevægelsens mobilisering for at vedtage Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske politik globalt, for at tackle den udprægede mangel på udvikling rundt om i verden. Der er ingen ‘nationale’ løsninger på COVID-19 eller finansielle kriser som sådan, alene globale løsninger.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Goddag. Jeg synes det bliver meget tydeligt nu, at vi befinder os midt i, eller i begyndelsen af, hvad der ser ud til at blive den værste krise i menneskets historie. Det står allerede klart, at sundhedssystemerne i Europa – i Italien og Spanien – i USA ikke slår til. Der er ikke nok medicinske forsyninger, ansigtsmasker, respiratorer, læger, sygeplejersker, intensiv-enheder. Det står også meget klart, at denne pandemi – pandemi betyder, at det er en verdensomspændende epidemi – spredt sig meget

hurtigt til udviklingslandene. Man kan være sikker på, at hvis den rammer lande som Haiti, eller de 55 afrikanske nationer eller store befolkede nationer i Asien, vil situationen blive endnu værre. Det er meget tydeligt, at de ikke har tilstrækkelige medicinsk forsyninger; de har ikke engang et sundhedssystem. De har ikke rent vand. Idéen om at isolere sig selv og vaske sine hænder betyder intet, for sådan noget findes ikke for mindst halvdelen af befolkningen. Og det betyder, at denne ting er ved at komme helt ud af kontrol.

Så formålet med denne konference og dette møde i aften er at starte en kampagne for at sætte ét enkelt spørgsmål på dagsordenen. Det er, at vi er nødt til at reagere på dette som en enig menneskehed, og at vi må droppe alle andre dagsordener. Vi er nødt til at opbygge et verdenssundhedssystem; vi er naturligvis nødt til at gear op for at forsvare folket i USA, i de europæiske lande. Men i betragtning af det faktum at det er en pandemi, vil dette ikke være tilstrækkeligt. Denne virus vil mutere; den vil vende tilbage, og den vil vende tilbage i bølger, og i stigende grad ødelægge vores reelle produktion. Det vil have en alvorlig indvirkning på fødevarerproduktionen. OECD (Organisationen for Økonomisk Samarbejde og Udvikling) har allerede fremsat erklæringer om, at de forventer, at den økonomiske effekt vil være en reduktion af den industrielle produktion i OECD-landene på 30%; man vil få millioner af arbejdsløse. Derfor er vi nødt til at have et komplet skifte i dagsordenen for udelukkende at producere for en effekt; nemlig at opbygge et sundhedssystem i hvert eneste land i verden med den samme energi, den samme lidenskab, de samme midler.

Præsident Trump har indført undtagelsesloven 'National Defense Production Act'. Guvernør Cuomo har opfordret til en hidtil uset mobilisering af alt sundhedspersonale – læger, sygeplejersker, omskoling, uddannelse af unge. Dette er skridt i den rigtige retning, men det skal ledsages af en opbygning af den industrielle produktion for at producere alle de nødvendige midler til at bekæmpe denne pandemi. Det betyder hospitaler i hvert land; det betyder beskyttelsesdragter, ansigtsmasker, respiratorer. Hele industrien skal indrettes med dette for øje, indtil vi har besejret denne pandemi.

Der er ingen måde, hvorpå centralbankernes likviditetspumpe vil kunne fortsætte igennem denne mobilisering. Der er mennesker der siger, at dette kommer fuldstændig uventet, at dette er et komplet chok. Altså, vi kan bevise, at dette ikke er tilfældet. Lyndon LaRouche advarede siden 1971 om, at dette ville ske, da han advarede om konsekvenserne af, at Nixon forlod Bretton Woods-systemet. Siden 1973 og 1974 advarede han i særdeleshed om, hvad den økonomiske effekt af de betingelser som IMF og Verdensbankens politik pålagde udviklingssektoren ville være. Og han advarede om, at pandemier ville blive resultatet. Hele hans livsværk var at advare om den kendsgerning, at monetarisme – denne anden

dødbringende virus som Dennis talte om – ville resultere i pandemier. Man kan ikke sænke levestandarden på hele kontinenter over længere tid uden at fremme lavere livsformer i biosfæren til at tage over; nemlig vira.

Ideen er at starte en mobilisering på verdensplan, en mobilisering som fuldstændig vil ændre paradigmet. Vi har opfordret til et topmøde med de vigtigste lande i verden – USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – at de må holde et topmøde for at ændre systemet; at blive enige om at få en ny verdensøkonomisk orden, der skaber mulighed for, at ethvert land på denne planet kan overleve. Der er bevægelser i denne retning. Netop i dag talte præsident Trump i telefon med Macron, den franske premierminister, og de blev enige om at fremskynde et lignende forslag fremsat af præsident Putin i begyndelsen af januar, hvor de fem faste medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd straks skal indkalde et hastemøde og enes om øget samarbejde mellem FN's nationer om at gå i denne retning.

Schiller Instituttet indkalder til en international internetkonference den 25. og 26. april. Længe før omfanget af pandemien stod klart, var målet med Schiller Instituttets konference at formulere et program, der kan hjælpe med at forme diskussionen for topmødet mellem disse stormagter. Vi er nødt til at have en drastisk aksiomatisk ændring. Der er allerede mange diskussioner, som er nyttige og skal understøttes; såsom ophævelse af alle sanktioner for at give alle lande mulighed for at bekæmpe pandemien. At holde en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile; at stoppe for alle militære handlinger, men der er brug for mere. Der er brug for en massiv mobilisering med opbakning fra mange mennesker og mange organisationer, for fuldstændig at ændre dagsordenen.

Der findes en vellykket model for, hvordan coronavirus blev besejret, i det mindste midlertidigt; det var hvad Kina gjorde i Wuhan og Hubei-provinsen. Det vil sige, at man må have total testning; man bliver nødt til at have identifikation af de mennesker, der tester positivt, man må isolere dem og sætte dem i karantæne. På den måde kan infektionskæden brydes, og virusset kan besejres. Problemet er, at det har vist sig, at det ikke er muligt at gentage denne model i den transatlantiske verden, simpelthen fordi testudstyr ikke er tilgængelige, fremstillingsvirksomhederne var ikke klar endnu. De vestlige regeringer bortødslede den varslingsperiode, som de fik gennem den kinesiske intervention.

Men det må der nu sættes fart i, ved hjælp af den form for mobilisering som jeg talte om. Den apokalyptiske dimension af hvad vi står over for vil stå meget klar inden for kort tid. Al forvirringen, alle de falske nyheder om, at coronavirus kun ville være som en slem influenza, al denne misinformation vil forsvinde sig. Der vil være en åbenhed over for at diskutere et helt nyt

paradigme.

Der er også behov for at gøre det meget klart, at bagmændenes ideer, de folk og kræfter der er ansvarlige for, at vi endte i denne situation i første omgang, ikke må sejre. I dag er der for eksempel en artikel af Henry Kissinger i Wall Street Journal med overskriften "Coronavirus vil for evigt ændre verdensordenen". Vi skal huske, at Kissinger måske ved, at timen er ved at være inde, hvor den gamle verdensorden uopretteligt og for evigt forsvinder. Men vi må ikke glemme, at det var Kissingers politik med NSSM 200 (National Security Study Memorandum 200 er et amerikansk dokument om befolkningsreduktion, *red.*) der blev aftalt i 1974, og som var en stor del af denne morderiske malthusianske affolkningspolitik mod udviklingslandene.

Dette memorandum, som først blev offentliggjort i begyndelsen af 1990'erne, sagde, at befolkningen i visse udviklingslande må reduceres og kontrolleres, fordi der er store ressourcer, som alle er i USA's strategiske interesse. En anden af 'gerningsmændene' var den onde politik fra Romklubben, der begyndte at sprede denne idé om, at der er grænser for vækst, og at man er nødt til at gå over til en økonomi med nulvækst. En løgn som straks blev tilbagevist af Lyndon LaRouche, der skrev en meget vigtig bog med titlen 'There Are No Limits to Growth' (Der er ingen grænser for Vækst). Det var også John D. Rockefeller III's politik, der på FN's befolkningskonference i Bukarest samme år – 1974 – begyndte at tale om overbefolkning, befolknings eksplosion og andre sådanne malthusianske ideer.

Disse mennesker er mordere. Hvis I ønsker at se beviser, så se på hvad Jeremy Warner skrev den 3. marts i Daily Telegraph, hvor han sagde, at der er en fordel forbundet med coronavirus. Det er, at den frasorterer de ældre. Det er klart, at Warner er på linje med prins Philip, der på en offentlig konference om religion sagde, at han ønsker at blive reinkarneret som en dødbringende virus, så han bedre kan hjælpe med at reducere verdensbefolkningen. Eller lyt til hvad Sir David King, den ledende videnskabelige rådgiver for både Blair- og Brown-regeringerne, der åbent sagde, at de ældre må ofres af hensyn til økonomien. Disse malthusianeres synspunkter må bringes for en ny Nürnberg-domstol, fordi det helt klart gælder for dem, at de vidste eller burde have vidst, hvilke konsekvenser deres politik ville have for Den tredje Verden.

Selv den tyske hærstøtte tank, Det Tyske Institut for Forsvar og Strategiske Studier, har netop fremsat et krav om en tilbunds gående undersøgelse af, hvordan verden så blindt kunne gå ind i katastrofen. En sådan undersøgelse er allerede foretaget. Den har vi foretaget igennem de sidste 50 år. Lyndon LaRouche advarede igennem et halvt århundrede om, at nøjagtigt dette ville ske. Også i

det tyske parlament var der, i 2012, i forbindelse med SARS-pandemien, et scenarie på den såkaldte modi-SARS – hvilket betyder modificeret SARS – der sagde, at en mulig pandemi kunne nå frem til Europa, USA og Asien. Mærkeligt nok udelod de Afrika, så hvis man taler om pandemien og man udelader Afrika, er det meget underligt. Men det blev også ignoreret.

Hvad der er brug for nu, er en hidtil uset – og jeg mener virkelig hidtil uset – mobilisering. Jeg opfordrer jer alle til at deltage i at opbygge en alliance af mennesker, der vil deltage i Schiller Instituttets konference den 25. og 26. april. Og jeg vil have jer til at nå ud til mange organisationer og mennesker i Nordamerika, Europa, men også Latinamerika, Asien, Afrika. At nå ud til FN-organisationer, til ngo'er, til Verdenssundhedsorganisationer med det ene formål: At vi er nødt til at geare op for at opbygge et Silkevejs-sundhedssystem i alle lande. Vi må opnå en dampromleeffekt af mennesker, der straks kræver hospitaler, ICU-enheder, men også mad. Fordi der allerede er fare for, at denne pandemi ledsages af en fødevaremangel på grund af sammenbrud af dele af fødevareproduktionen, fra de berørte mennesker, osv.

Men hvis vi samtidigt ønsker at opbygge et nyt sundhedssystem på verdensplan, er det meget tydeligt, at det ikke kan gøres med den nuværende kasinoøkonomi. Så er der brug for Lyndon LaRouches fire love. Det vil være nødvendigt med en global Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling for at finansiere et sundhedssystem i alle lande. Vi har brug for en nationalbank i hvert land, og disse nationalbanker skal være tilsluttet et Nyt Bretton Woods-kreditsystem. Resultatet af dette må også være et helt andet sæt af værdier. Absolut ikke den liberale orden og 'Oplysningstidens' værdier, som Kissinger beder om, men hvad vi i stedet har brug for er en tilbagevenden til humanistiske værdier, til ideen om menneskeheden som én menneskehed. At vi sætter de fælles interesser for menneskeslægten foran de nationale interesser, og at vi kommer ud af dette med et helt nyt paradigme for kærlighed til menneskeheden og et nyt system for internationale relationer, der sætter samarbejde over konfrontation. Hvis vi alle er forenede i denne ånd, tror jeg, at vi kan forvandle denne forfærdelige krise til en chance for hele menneskeheden ved at ændre paradigmet til at blive virkelig menneskeligt, som en menneskelig art.

Trump genoplever dirigistisk, økonomisk system; forsvarer samarbejdet med Rusland og Kina

Den 4. april. Præsident Trump har modigt initieret en nødtvungen kontrol over USA's økonomi, gennem dirigistiske metoder, der i sin tid var kendt som det "Amerikanske System" til politisk økonomi, opdaget og implementeret af Alexander Hamilton og hans tilhængere, specielt Mathew og Henry Carey, og deres tyske medarbejder, Friedrich List. Trump har opildnet både erhvervslivets og militærets ledere, samt institutioner, til at pålægge den amerikanske industri og infrastruktur en fordringsbaseret økonomi, for at imødekomme de akutte behov fra en befolkning konfronteret med en eksistentiel krise uden sammenligning i den moderne historie. Han gør dette i åbent samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, på trods af den hylende modstand fra de neo-konservative og neo-liberale, der kontrollerer de politiske partier og den korrupte presse. Trump har haft lange, produktive samtaler med præsidenterne Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping gennem den seneste uge, og pga. hans anstrengelser kommer de første to fragtfly, medbringende medicinske forsyninger til at hjælpe med at redde amerikanske liv, fra Rusland og Kina.

Man ville næppe erfare dette ved at følge de offentlige amerikanske nyhedsmedier. I stedet læser man i Bloomberg at "efterretningstjenesterne" har sendt en hemmelig rapport til præsidenten, der viser at Kina lyver om dødsfaldene i forbindelse med coronaviruset i Kina, imens den Europæiske Unions udenrigspolitiske kontor tordner om at Putin spreder misinformation om viruset "for at undergrave Vesten og skabe en ny verdensorden.". På samme tid forsøger hårdkogte hoveder i det militær-industrielle kompleks at hive præsidenten ind i nye krige mhp. regimeskifte i Iran og Venezuela, med formålet at provokere en konfrontation med Kina og Rusland.

Trump svarede utvetydigt igen på "efterretningstjenesternes" svindel. Spurgt om Rusland havde vundet en "propagandasejr", ved at sende medicinske forsyninger, svarede Trump, "Jeg er ikke bekymret for russisk propaganda. Det vil måske redde mange liv.". Og om Kinas angivelige løgne om antallet af COVID-19-ofre, sagde han, "Jeg er ikke en revisor fra Kina... Vi ved det virkelig ikke. Hvordan ved vi hvorvidt de under-rapporterede?". Han udtrykte klart, at "vi ikke har modtaget" en sådan efterretningsrapport, "men vi havde et fantastisk opkald forleden nat [med Xi Jinping]. Vi samarbejder om en masse forskellige ting, inklusiv handel.".

Men alligevel kræver både republikanske og demokratiske ledere en økonomisk, og sågar en militær, konfrontation med Kina! I et brev til Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo (hvis verbale stormløb mod Kina snart gerne måtte efterlade ham uden arbejde), bebrejdede republikanere fra Repræsentanternes Hus Kina, for COVID-19-krisen, og forlangte "tilbageslag" for deres angivelige underminering af verden, og for at forårsage "ubeskrivelige lidelser.". Den republikanske Senator Rick Scott opfordrede sågar til en kongresundersøgelse af chefen for Verdenssundhedsorganisationen (WHO), Dr. Tedras, fordi WHO's ros af Kinas beslutsomme indgriben (karantænemethoden i Wuhan) angiveligt viser at Tedras er en marionet af Kinas kommunistiske parti!

Ironien er, at præcis de dirigistiske metoder, som Præsident Trump genoplever, er præcis de samme som den kinesiske regering brugte til at skabe de sidste 40 års mirakel, hvorved de er blevet verdens førende nation i high-tech-infrastruktur, og bringer nu denne teknologi til resten af verden gennem Bælte og Vej-Initiativet. Dette er ingen overraskelse. Det er ikke "socialisme" versus "kapitalisme," men nærmere om det Amerikanske System versus det Britiske System. Kineserne har været tilhængere af Friedrich List og Henry Carey siden Sun Yat-sens tid. Lists dokumentation af Storbritanniens brug af "frihandels"-dogmet, for at fastholde sine koloniers tilbageståenhed, er almen viden for hver eneste kinesiske økonom, ligesom Hamiltons protektionistiske politik, nationalbankspolitik, og et fokus på infrastruktur, som nøglen til industriel og videnskabelig fremgang. Måske kunne nogle af vores Havard-ideologer lære noget om det Amerikanske System fra Xi Jinping.

Faren forbliver at Wall Street udløser en multi-trillion redningsaktion af den næsten to tusind billioner store derivatboble—nu værdiløs spillegæld. "CARES"-loven, underskrevet af præsidenten, der tildeler \$2,2 billioner i støtte til borgere og erhvervsliv, som er ramte af nedlukningen af store dele af økonomien, er både berettiget og nødvendig, såvel som præsidentens forslag for et \$2 billioner stort program for infrastruktur. Men skjult i processen, er de mere end \$4 billioner, der går til centralbanken (Federal Reserve) for at redde finansboblen—et hyperinflationært initiativ som vil undergrave enhver fremgang i den reelle økonomi, og hurtigt vil tilintetgøre dollaren.

Den eneste vej frem er de komplette Fire Love, fremlagt af Lyndon LaRouche efter krakket i 2008. For at opildne denne nations patrioter, og borgere i hele verden, for at realisere denne politik, skal det størst mulige antal personer organiseres til at deltage i Schiller Instituttets online-konference den 25.-26. april.

Systemer er menneskeskabte – Du kan ændre dem når en bryder sammen Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast m. Helga Zepp-LaRouche d. 1. april 2020

Den 1. april. Da Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav et overblik over den fatale krise som menneskeheden står overfor, påmindede hun seerne om at "Systemer er menneskeskabte", og kan forandres når de bryder sammen.

Hendes mand advarede, så tidligt som i 1973, om at det globale neoliberale system, der kom til da Nixon afsluttede Bretton Woods systemet, med dets politiske holdninger til billig arbejdskraft, billige råmaterialer og den spekulative kasino-økonomi, ville lede til nye globale pandemier. Hvis du sænker levestandarder, vil lavere livsformer tage over, sagde han.

Vores nutidige dobbelte virusangreb, fra coronavirus pandemien til kollapset af finanssystemet bekræfter præcisionen afa LaRouche's advarsler. Det som gør situationen værre, er Vestens moralske arrogance. De som promoverer Grønne "løsninger" i dag, ville dømmes menneskeheden til et folkemord meget værre end Hitlers.

Der er dog en reel modstand mod disse politikker. Hun beskrev den passion, som udvist af nogle unge mennesker på et ungdomskonferencekald med hende i tirsdags, hvor mere end 70 personer engagerede sig i diskussioner om hvordan man skal gå fra det kollapsede system, til et Nyt Paradigme ved at mobilisere med agape og de magtfulde ideer som vores bevægelse har.

Samtalerne mellem præsident Trump og hans modparter i Kina og Rusland repræsenterer et træk i den rigtige retning – bidrag med os i at organisere vores internationale konference for at sikre at disse ideer bærer frugt. Ben (Schiller Instituttet) <http://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/>

– Systems Are Manmade – – – You Can Change Systems When One Breaks Down –

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to our webcast with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's April 1, 2020. We're clearly in the midst of one of the most profound crises in modern history with the combined effects of a financial system that's blowing out, and as well with the expanding pandemic of coronavirus. It's clear that the old way of thinking no longer works. So, Helga, what's your assessment, especially with the situation in the United States seeming to be heading out of control?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It is an unprecedented crisis, and I think none of us has experienced anything like that in our lifetime. Maybe it was like that in the world wars, but it quickly is developing such a seriousness of the situation. I think that reality dawns on some people belatedly, but it is unavoidable, because the elements are that not only the coronavirus is hitting the United States and Europe, but it will really be extremely bad for the developing sector. We will come to that in a second. But I think first to start with the United States, yesterday's White House coronavirus taskforce meeting, which was given by President Trump and his health advisors [Dr. Anthony] Fauci and [Dr. Deborah] Birx was really completely sober and sobering. What they basically said is that if everything is being done right now, maybe the number of deaths can be reduced to 100,000 or 240,000 people. But if things go wrong, it may be 1-2 million. Right now, it does not look like this is going to be an easy job. If you look, for example, to situations like New York and New Jersey where you have the hotspots, with the highest infection rates exponentially growing right now, it is quite desperate. Despite Governor Cuomo trying to get sufficient ventilators for the expected outbreak, he said he was only able to get 2500 ventilators in two weeks from now from China, but that he is lacking 15,000. Obviously all the other states in the United States were in a bidding war to get ventilators until FEMA took it over, and is now organizing it centrally. Ventilators are in the critical phase of the coronavirus infection, that which is lifesaving. If there are no ventilators, then these people will just die. It is a very serious situation. For an industrialized country, it has unbelievable social consequences. For example, they let out the prisoners in Rikers Island, a famous prison, and they are now, because they have no other place to go, hanging out in Penn Station where they get food deliveries from the guardian angels. Then, you have 114,000 homeless children in New York alone, who used to get meals in the schools. So, you have all kinds of social consequences which really show the underlying problem of the lack of infrastructure investment, the privatization and dismantling of the health system over the last decades; all of that is now really coming to a point of complete crisis. There are incredible

efforts being made to retool some of the industries, there is an air bridge which has been established with many planes from China and other Asian countries – 50 planes all together. There were yesterday, the first Russian airplane coming to the United States delivering medical support. So, there is an incredible mobilization going on, but it is also very clear that this is a pandemic, and you will have mass unemployment. Some people are saying that the unemployment in the United States may go up to 30%; so this is really an unbelievable crisis.

SCHLANGER: Helga, you talk about the crisis affecting the United States, and how desperate it is. What are we seeing now in countries like Africa? India has got a total lockdown; Indonesia is now in the midst of a developing crisis. This is obviously much more dangerous in the developing sector.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: If you think that the United States is a very well industrialized country – or, at least it used to be. If you go to Africa or the other developing areas of the world, supposedly developing, not so developing countries, it will be really very bad. You have some countries like South Africa, Kenya, Lagos is completely overwhelmed already, where you don't have that kind of a health system. And you have already infectious diseases; you have HIV, tuberculosis, famine, malnutrition. This is really a powder keg. The head of the World Health Organization [WHO], Dr. Tedros, said that both in the United States and in Africa, the next two weeks will tell how bad the crisis will be. But so far, there is a certain delay factor, because of the poor transport connections of the African continent to the rest of the world, it arrived relatively late. But now it's there, and there is the absolute danger that this will spread. You have half of the world de facto locked down; that's incredible! You have India, a country of 1.3 billion people, in a lockdown. But that obviously is relative, because many day workers – people who just work for a day's pay in big cities like Delhi – are now all fleeing these big cities, because they don't earn any money, and they have absolutely no reserves. So you see these pictures where these poor people get on crowded buses, where they are absolutely not in a position to keep social distance, and then they are trying to rush home to their rural areas. But there is no health system. Despite the fact that Prime Minister Modi had quite some success with the "Clean India" campaign, and the "Modi Care" where he tried to improve the health care system, naturally this is all not enough. You have places like Jakarta in Indonesia – 10 million people in one city. Half of the people don't have access to clean water. A similar situation is in many developing countries, including Mexico, including Peru. So, we are really looking at an unprecedented world crisis. The danger is that this will overwhelm the health systems; there is not enough production possible. The winter, which is now developing in the Southern Hemisphere, will

favor the spread of the virus. You really will probably see many millions of people dying. I think this makes very clear that we need urgently a completely different system. Nothing will be like it was before. I think we have to go into a mass mobilization internationally; which the Schiller Institute is already engaged in, to establish a new world economic order. We have called for that for a very long time, but immediately in this situation it requires a summit of the most important powerful countries: China, Russia, India, the United States. They have to establish a new system. What we need is a completely new system. All the rules of the liberal economy, of the neo-liberal model, the cheap labor markets, the out-sourcing, all of that has to be replaced; and it has to start with the immediate building of a world health system where a decent health system is being built up in every single country. That must be the beginning of an industrial revolution for the whole world. Nothing short of that will do. That means we need a New Bretton Woods system, and a new credit system to finance that. If you agree with that, then help us in this mobilization, because what is at stake are the lives of many millions of people, and maybe yourself.

SCHLANGER: Over the last few days, President Trump had discussions with President Xi Jinping of China and President Putin of Russia. Do you see this as a positive step towards the idea of a summit? These are bilateral discussions, but so far we haven't seen a response to your call on the level needed.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think it's a step in the right direction. The fact that Trump and Xi Jinping re-established contact, that there were discussions between the health ministers, that the United States started to accept this air bridge, that Trump started to discuss with Putin. All of these things are very positive, but they fall short. Also, the proposal by UNCTAD [UN Conference on Trade and Development], which proposed to have \$2.5 trillion for building up the health sector in the developing sector, is a step in the right direction. \$1 trillion is for debt write-off, \$1 trillion is for Special Drawing Rights from the IMF, \$500 billion is for a world health Marshall Plan. That is very positive, but when you count that, it's still proverbial peanuts; because to build up a world health system needs much more than \$500 billion. That's for all the developing countries, not just for one country. It's for the entire 180 or so developing countries; if you divide it, it's just not enough.

SCHLANGER: There's a lot of talk about the time lag in doing the emergency mobilization, getting the equipment, and other things. To me, the real time lag is the almost 45 years since your husband first sounded the warning in 1974 that a shift in the financial system to a neo-liberal new kind of colonial system would lead to this kind of pandemic. People obviously weren't listening. The idea that there was no warning is completely false, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The first memorandum that the economic financial policies of the IMF and World Bank would lead to pandemics, he issued in 1973. Then in 1974, he initiated a Biological Holocaust Taskforce, which presented their findings of a study at the end of 1974. I was just rereading a report which he also initiated in 1985, which is one of several large studies which absolutely predicted why this would happen. There is a connection between the biological sphere – the biosphere – and the economy. If you lower the living standard and the energy of the system of the economic society, then lower forms of life of the biosphere just take over. He compared it at that time, and I think this is a very fitting image for today, he said that the cheap labor orientation towards the developing sector and keeping development down in the so-called Third World, has to be compared to Schachtian economics in the concentration camps in Nazi Germany. He said a lot of deaths in the concentration camps came from forcing the people sitting in these camps to do hard labor. They would have to do work for 2-3000 calories, but they would only get food for about 1000 calories. Then it was just a question of time before they would die of over-exhaustion. That is a fitting image, because if you lower the living standard of the developing countries unnecessarily by denying them infrastructure, like the World Wildlife Fund did in all their campaigns to ruin the prospects for dams, for industrial development, just blocking development with phony arguments of ecologism. What you do then is you reduce the ability of people to withstand diseases. You lower their immune system, you make them susceptible to pandemics, and this is exactly what we see today. That was clear; we discussed it in no uncertain terms. He said, these policies would have more consequences than the genocide of Adolf Hitler. I absolutely want to repeat that. When you see people today who are indifferent, who say “I don’t care. What do I care about Africa? What do I care about Latin America?”; these are people who are morally the equivalent of Nuremburg criminals. If you remember at the Nuremburg trials, the judges said, you either knew or should have known, about what was going on in the Third Reich. And concerning the condition of the developing sector, the exact same thing can be said. The people who are pushing no development, who are more concerned about the little snail in some corner than millions of people, these are people who are criminal. And that criminality absolutely has to stop. We have to start rebuilding the world. And every life in Africa, in Latin America, and in Asia is as precious as any child in Germany, or in the United States or any other place. I am consciously using this rather stark language, because this complacency and this arrogance of the Euro-centrists, or the American-centrists has to stop. We are at a point of moral and economic breakdown crisis of the whole world. We need a new system, and that has to be mobilized, and it has to be gotten through. If we don’t do that, we are risking our humanity either physically – because it is not yet clear if it doesn’t lead to war as a consequence of conditions of a breakdown crisis – or it leads to our moral

demise. I really think that we have to absolutely change this. We have to allow industrial development in every single country in the world, and we have to have a decent living standard. It is very easy, because China has shown the way, that you can bring infrastructure development as the precondition for development to every country. It is up to us in the so-called Western countries in Europe and the United States to absolutely change our ways.

SCHLANGER: I think it's also important going back to Lyn's warnings in the early 1970s that he identified individuals who were committed to population reduction, knowing this would happen. We're seeing some of these same kinds of comments. You had mentioned before, people talking about "Oh, isn't it wonderful! There are now blue skies!" There are people who are cheering on the demise of the elderly and the so-called "useless eaters", aren't there?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: There is the flagship magazine of the British Empire, which is just coming out with that line today – {The Economist}. They say, isn't it wonderful that the economy is coming to a grinding halt? No CO2 emissions. We just have to make sure that after this crisis, we are not going back to normal. There are some other criminal people who call themselves economists, who also say that if this crisis stops and is over, we have to rebuild the economy and it has to be all based on climate protection. We have discussed the reasons why the Green ecology is exactly what caused this crisis; and if we would go back to the same policies which have caused this crisis, then we clearly do not have the moral fitness to survive.

SCHLANGER: Helga, you've been talking about the rebuilding of the whole world health system. You had a conference call yesterday morning with young people, where you called on them to take responsibility for the organizing process to do this. What is your sense of the ability to mobilize youth today to take on this task?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this was very encouraging, because this was the first such international youth call, and it had about 70-75 young people from all over the world; from the United States, Mexico, Peru, Pakistan, Africa, Europe, China. I think the discussion really reflected that these young people are morally absolutely committed to make sure that they have a future. The idea that every country has the right to have a decent health system is obvious. They are committed to bring this message to a lot of other young people, to the universities. They are committed to spread it other organizations, especially in the developing sector. All of them are really tuned in to the approach that you need the world leaders of the most important countries to change the system. I think this is important, because people have not really thought about it. You

cannot sit out this crisis; you cannot just wait until it's over. This is a pandemic, and it may come back in waves. It is intersected with the breakdown of the financial system, the collapse of the physical economy. The only way to get out of that is to have a completely new system. Most people have not spent much thought on whether that is necessary or possible, or they say you can't do that. Yes, you can do it. Systems are man-made; they are not built in the physical universe. They are man-made, and you can change the system. If the old system is not suitable for the common good of the people, then it has to be replaced. We have specified many times what that must look like: You need a global Glass-Steagall banking separation, you have to end the casino economy; you have to protect the commercial banks; you have to create a national bank in every country; you have to connect these national banks in a New Bretton Woods system which provides cheap long-term credit for clearly defined development projects. Then you have to have international cooperation. I think among the young people in particular, the idea that cooperation has to replace confrontation is a very easily understood idea. There were several especially young women – which made me especially happy, because I'm all for woman-power – and they especially emphasized that the passion which needs to be mobilized for that is agape. The change which has to occur must be based on a love for humanity. In this discussion, you could get an inkling of what the kind of new system will be like; namely, that the geopoliticians will be out. The people that think you can start endless wars just to make profit, this is an obsolete idea of troglodytes. The future must belong to young people who organize the world in different ways, in the interests of each country and vice versa. That was actually a very hopeful call, and I would urge people to get in contact with us to see how they can join it.

SCHLANGER: When you talk about troglodytes, look at what's going on in Europe with the European Union; the battles that are going on around the continuation of the neo-liberal policies. This is in complete contrast to what you're discussing with the young people, the complete absence of agape. Catch us up a little bit on what's going on in the EU.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's almost a question of the past to talk about the EU. It's really right now a question mark as to how long this construct will remain in place. There is no solidarity; there is a big feud right now between Germany and Italy, France, and the other southern European countries. It's a little bit on the wrong issue; namely, this issue of Eurobonds, which I think is not a good idea. It's still in the realm of banking bail-out. Just to mention in parentheses, the Federal Reserve just yesterday opened their repo credit facility to all other central banks. That means basically that they intend to help each other to bail each other out. The Federal Reserve earlier had

allocated \$4 trillion for the bail-out of the U.S. banking sector which was characterized by Republican Congressman Thomas Massie as the biggest transfer of wealth from the ordinary people to the very rich and the bankers. This is part of the Eurobonds, so I'm not in favor of the Eurobonds. The conflict which has arisen between Germany and Holland and Austria on the one side, and these other countries on the other side, pertains to a real issue. That is that obviously the countries of the south – especially Italy and Spain, and increasingly also France – are really suffering an incredible exponential growth rate of this virus, and they have demanded some finance mechanism organized by the EU, which was blocked by Germany in particular and Holland and Austria. So, what these countries are saying is, this is the ugly face of Europe. The tone becomes quite nasty. For example, the Italian media and I think also Prime Minister Conte were saying that if that would have been the attitude of the other European countries at the 1953 debt conference in London, where half of the German debt was forgiven, which obviously was an extremely important factor in the reconstruction of Germany after the Second World War, if that had not been done, then Germany would still live on the garbage piles. So, the tone is becoming nasty, and everybody – Italy, Spain, Serbia – all say that they got more help from China, from Russia, from Cuba, even the small country of Albania was sending 30 health personnel to Italy to help. You can really see who is your friend, and who is completely only motivated by other reasons. This will remain, and I think this anti-China campaign which is coming from Pompeo, from {Foreign Affairs} magazine, from the Council on Foreign Relations, who are all still in this absolutely vicious campaign against China, I think that will vanish. Because people in this crisis see who is helping, and who is not. I think the situation in Europe maybe in a week or two weeks when we talk next time, the EU may not exist. That's not a bad thing, because it was a bad construction from the very beginning. It could not work. It never existed. There is no European people. There are many nations and many cultures, but the European bureaucracy is an evil structure which is not in correspondence to the interests of their own members. The sooner it is replaced by something else – either a Eurasian alliance of sovereign states from the Chinese Sea to Vladivostok to Lisbon – or some other kind of new alliance of sovereign republics working together for a new world economic order. That does not mean that European countries cannot work together, but they should not be under the tutelage of some supranational structure. I think we will see big changes in this coming period. It requires the active intervention of as many state citizens as possible. So, please get in contact with us and help us to try to change the agenda on a large scale.

SCHLANGER: Toward accomplishing that goal, the Schiller Institute is going to have an international conference April 25-26. Just give us a little bit of a sense of what you hope to come out of that conference with.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: We had to shift that conference which was planned for sometime, to be an internet conference, because you can't have physical conferences at this point. But in that lies also an advantage; namely, that you can reach much larger audiences. Therefore, people should start to register for that conference, because then you will be also supplied with additional information and materials you can read ahead of time to be prepared to participate as a more active person in this conference. What we will try to do is, we will try to discuss the issues at that conference which we think should be taken up these large governments. So, we will try to inform the population on the needed changes in the strategic alliance, the needed cultural changes, the need to go to a Classical renaissance of art and music. We will discuss the frontiers of science; what is necessary to defeat not only the coronavirus, but to really get a completely different sense of space medicine, of breakthroughs in optical biophysics in redefining what life is. What do we need to know to be able to combat such problems much better? And naturally, what must be the principles of physical economy when we rebuild the world economy. So, you should definitely get in touch with us, register for the conference, and be part of it.

SCHLANGER: I would encourage everyone to join this mobilization with a very simple thing. Share this webcast! Pass it around! Get your friends to watch it. Then, go to the Schiller Institute website, the LaRouche PAC website, and study these ideas. It's these ideas which were generated from Lyndon LaRouche back in the 1960s and 1970s that are not only valid, but represent universal principles. It's through a return to those kinds of principles that we can restore mankind. Helga, thank you very much for your comments and for joining us today. As you always say, hopefully we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, let's do something to move mankind in a better direction.

[Nu ved I hvad Lyndon LaRouche mente med 'faseskifte'](#)

Den 17. marts (EIRNS) – Reglerne, der syntes at styre samfundet og økonomien i går, fungerer ikke længere i dag. Og dagens regler vil være dysfunktionelle i morgen – om ikke før.

Planeten gennemlever en periode der er så svimlende, at den gør de fleste mennesker mentalt rundtossede. Den amerikanske statsmand Lyndon LaRouche

behandlede gentagne gange dette som et "faseskifte" i den menneskelige udvikling, hvor de love, der syntes at styre en proces, ændrer sig grundlæggende, svarende til hvad der sker, når der indtræffer et fysisk faseskifte. I en artikel offentliggjort den 13. marts 1997 i EIR, med titlen "London in a Phase-Twitch" (London i et 'faseryk'), skrev LaRouche: "Med 'faseskifte' forstår vi en radikal ændring i et systems egenskaber, som når isen smelter, når vand omdannes til damp, damp til plasma, eller da det første jetfly opnåede overlydshastigheder og derover. Hvad der nu sker i verdens finansielle systemer, økonomier og politisk, er lige så fundamentale forandringer som nogen af de tilstandsændringer fysikerne måtte have bemærket."

Tegnene er overalt. I USA ser vi en 'Pearl Harbor-refleks' i forhold til COVID-19-pandemiens fortsatte spredning over hele landet. I Europa, hvor Italien, Spanien og Frankrig er lukket ned (i varierende grad), og andre lande muligvis snart følger efter, åbner EU's bureaukrati for sluserne for at imødegå de økonomiske virkninger af krisen. Men kun et fuldstændigt paradigmeskifte på verdensplan vil fungere, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche igen i går. COVID-19-krisen og nedbruddet af det transatlantiske finanssystem er bare de mest synlige udtryk for en systemisk krise i det gamle paradigme, der er gået ind i dets sidste krampetrækninger. Det underliggende problem er, at det britiske liberale system har plyndret størstedelen af verdens befolkning, især i den såkaldte Tredje Verden, til grænsen af folkemord. Zepp-LaRouche understregede, at medmindre dette afhjælpes, begyndende med en verdensomspændende mobilisering af sundhedsplejen, står den menneskelige art over for en udryddelseskrise.

Et sådant globalt udviklingsprogram kræver markante forøgelse i grundlæggende fysiske økonomiske parametre (såsom vand, elektricitet og mad), som umuligt kan opnås uden et hurtigt opadgående faseskifte af den teknologiske platform for hele planeten – af nøjagtigt den slags, som Lyndon LaRouche opfordrer til i hans fremsynede 'Fire Love', især den fjerde af disse. Og denne påkrævede løsning kan umuligt finansieres uden at sætte City of London og Wall Street under konkursbehandling ved hjælp af en global Glass/Steagall-proces. En spekulativ boble på 1800 billioner \$ kan ikke længe sameksistere i det samme univers med en fremgangsrig menneskelig befolkning over hele planeten.

Ingen anden tilgang vil kunne fungere, understregede Zepp-LaRouche. Vores opgave er ikke at fokusere på de små ting og klynge os følelsesmæssigt til dem. Det er snarere at uddanne folk til at forstå tingene sådan som vi gør, og som vi blev uddannet til at gøre det af Lyndon LaRouche. Direktør for Verdenssundhedsorganisationen, Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, indfangede på nyttig vis tidsånden ved sin pressekonference den 16. marts: "Dette er den definerende globale sundhedskrise i vores tid. Dagene, ugerne og månederne

fremover vil være en test af vores beslutsomhed, en test af vores tillid til videnskab og en test af solidaritet. Kriser som denne har en tendens til at få det bedste og værste frem i menneskeheden.”

”Jeg er sikker på, at I, ligesom mig, er blevet rørt over videoer fra folk, der bifalder sundhedsarbejdere fra deres balkoner, eller historierne om folk der tilbyder at handle dagligvarer ind for de ældre i deres samfund. ”Denne fantastiske ånd af menneskelig solidaritet må blive endnu mere smitsom end selve virussen. Selvom vi muligvis bliver nødt til at være fysisk adskilt fra hinanden et stykke tid, kan vi mødes på måder, som vi aldrig har gjort før. ”Vi er alle i samme båd. Og vi kan kun opnå succes i fællesskab. Så spillereglen er: sammen.”

En førende kinesisk læge, der var involveret i krigen mod COVID-19 i Wuhan, Dr. Wu Dong, forklarede, hvad der motiverede ham til at gå med i kampen: ”Mennesker er dødelige, men det er kærlighed ikke, og jeg elsker min datter, mine patienter, mit land og menneskeheden. Som mennesker er vi alle i samme båd, og vi kommer igennem dette sammen.”

Usikkerhed under sikkerhedskonferencen

Den 20. februar 2020, Neue Solidarität

Af Alexander Hartmann

Medens disse linjer skrives, samles deltagerne i den 56. sikkerhedskonference i München (MSC). Over 500 højtplacerede internationale beslutningstagere ventes at deltage i konferencen, der finder sted mellem den 14. og 16. februar, deriblandt over 35 stats-og regeringschefer såvel som omkring 100 udenrigs- og forsvarsministre. De Forenede Stater repræsenteres af deres nykonservative udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo.

Ikke for første gang vil diskussionen blive præget af en voksende følelse af fortvivlelse hos de vestlige eliter over deres tiltagende uformåenhed til at påtvinge resten af verden deres vilje. Wolfgang Ishinger, der har ledet møderne siden 2008, offentliggjorde den 10. februar i Berlin Münchenmødets sikkerhedsberetning og kundgjorde, at dette års mødetema ville hedde ”Westlessness” (”Vestløshed”). Hvad han mener med det, beskriver han således:

“Der optræder for tiden et dobbelt fænomen, nemlig for det første, at Vesten er mindre vestligt, og for det andet, at verden som helhed er mindre vestlig. Hvad betyder det for de tyske, europæiske og globale forhold, især for vor sikkerhedspolitik?” Ischinger sagde, at der eksisterer “en vidt udbredt følelse af ubehag og uro over den tiltagende usikkerhed angående Vestens grundlæggende betydning. Mange sikkerhedspolitiske udfordringer synes at forekomme uadskilleligt forbundne med det, som nogle betegner som det vestlige projekts nedgang.”

Desuden, fortsatte han, “synes vi at have mistet en fælles forståelse af, hvad det overhovedet vil sige at være en del af Vesten. Selvom dette måske er den vigtigste strategiske udfordring for de transatlantiske partnere, virker det usikkert, om Vesten kan udvikle en fælles strategi for en ny æras stormagtskonflikter.”

Når Ischinger klager over, at vi “har mistet en fælles forståelse af, hvad det overhovedet vil sige at være en del af Vesten”, så tænker han øjensynligt først og fremmest på holdningen hos den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump. Trump vandt præsidentvalget i 2016 med et løfte om at bryde med doktrinen om de evige krige og at oprette gode forbindelser til Rusland og Kina. Siden da har de vestlige eliter forsøgt alt for at forhindre ham i at holde dette løfte og få ham afsat fra embedet; men med det mislykkede forsøg på at få ham afsat, har Trumps chancer for at beholde embedet også efter det næste præsidentvalg, tiltaget betydeligt.

Dette er fra de vestlige elitors synspunkt næsten den “størst tænkelige ulykke”: Hvis USA forlader sin afvisende holdning over for Rusland og Kina, så mangler de vestlige eliter den politibetjent, der skal gennemtvinge deres krav over for de genstridige nationer. Det britiske overhus offentliggjorde for godt et år siden en rapport, i følge hvilken den britiske politiks vigtigste prioritet måtte være at forhindre en ny præsidentperiode for Trump, fordi skaderne for det britisk-amerikanske “særlige forhold” ellers ville blive uoprettelige. Og en del af strategien for at forhindre et genvalg af Trump er at ophede krisecentre som Irak og Syrien i et forsøg på at få draget Trump ind i en krig og derved foranledige ham til at bryde sine valgløfter.

Tidligere udenrigsministre advarer om fare for atomkrig
Rent faktisk er det netop den geopolitiske holdning, hvormed de i München forsamlede repræsentanter for de “vestlige” eliter prøver at påtvinge resten af verden deres “liberale internationale orden”, selv den største trussel mod den globale sikkerhed. Den 10. februar udsendte “Aspen Ministers Forum”, en forening af tidligere udenrigsministre fra hele verden, en erklæring, hvor de forlangte

en forlængelse på 5 år af den nye START-nedrustningsaftale og advarede om, at faren for en atomkrig er stor, hvis denne og tilsvarende forholdsregler ikke gennemføres.

“I dag befinder verden sig i tilbagegang”, står der i erklæringen. “De geopolitiske spændinger tiltager, og mange stormagter fremhæver atter atomvåbnenes betydning i deres militærstrategier.” De tidligere udenrigsministre konstaterer “en øget oprustningskæmpe mellem De forenede Stater og Rusland, en øget risiko for militære uheld og en forringelse af de forhandlede aftaler om reducere af våbnene og ikke-spredning af atomvåben. Alle disse ting bidrager til en hurtigt aftagende kernevåbensikkerhed og en øget mulighed for anvendelse af atomvåben, enten bevidst eller som følge af en utilsigtet eskalation.”

De henviser til den nyeste skarpe konfrontation mellem USA og Iran, der har vist, “hvor hurtigt manglen på retningslinjer kan bringe os til kanten af en krig. Som følge af en udhuling af de internationale aftaler og de diplomatiske kanaler, nærmede vi os muligheden for en ulykke... Farerne for en fejlregning er for store til, at statslederne kunne gribe til tvetydig kommunikation, trusler og militære aktioner.” De kræver derfor “et genopliv internationalt samarbejde, der hviler på den offentlige forståelse af farerne og mulighederne for risikonedsettelse.”

Hovedophavsmændene til erklæringen er den tidligere amerikanske udenrigsminister Madeleine K. Allbright og den russiske udenrigsminister Igor Ivanov. Blandt de 23 øvrige underskrivere er Alexander Downer, Anne Moussa, Joschka Fischer, Malcolm Rifkind og Javier Solana.

Rusland agiterer for et topmøde mellem de fem stormagter. Netop af samme grund har grundlæggeren og forkvinden for Schiller Institutet længe anbefalet et nyt paradigme for internationale relationer, der ikke længere grunder sig på konkurrencetænkning mellem stormagterne, men på et samarbejde i menneskehedens fælles interesse. Efter mordet på den iranske general Soleimani den 3. januar opfordrede hun til en hastekonference mellem præsidenterne Trump, Putin og Xi for at arbejde for en bilæggelse af konflikterne. Helt tilsvarende har Ruslands præsident Putin den 15. januar foreslået et topmøde mellem stats- og regeringscheferne for de 5 faste medlemmer af FN's sikkerhedsråd, og ud fra højtstående russiske diplomaters udtalelser fremgår det, at Rusland tager dette forslag meget alvorligt.

Således har udenrigsminister Lavrov den 7. februar i en tale i anledning af et særfrimærke til minde om 75-årsdagen for Jaltakonferencen mellem USA, Sovjetunionen og Storbritannien hentydet til Putins forslag. Angående

betydningen af Jalta-konferencen bemærkede Lavrov: "Konferencen, som bragte førerne af koalitionen mod Hitler sammen, fandt sted i en atmosfære af gensidig forståelse og samarbejde. Førerne af de tre stormagter havde vilje nok til at vokse ud over deres egne ambitioner og stridigheder og udarbejde konstruktive forslag med henblik på en snarlig afslutning af krigen og opbygningen af en efterfølgende international sikkerhedsarkitektur. Jeg føler mig overbevist om, at det er rigtigt at kaste et blik tilbage på de fælles interesser i historien, når verden i dag står over for talrige udfordringer og trusler", understregede Lavrov.

Under en audiens i anledning af det russiske diplomatiske dag den 10. februar talte Ruslands ambassadør i De forenede Stater, Anatolij Antonov, om styrkelsen af forholdet til USA. Han understregede: "Vort land har aldrig unddraget sig ansvaret for sikring af fred og stabilitet... Vi værner om principperne for ikke-indblanding i indre anliggender." Og han erklærede også: "Vi vil gå vort stykke af vejen til enhver stat, der forsøger at opbygge et forhold til Rusland på grundlag af gensidig respekt og interesseudligning. Vi er overbeviste om, at forbedringen af det russisk-amerikanske samarbejde ikke blot svarer til begge landes interesser, men også vil få en produktiv indvirkning på verdens gang som helhed."

Angående præsident Putins opfordring til et topmøde mellem de fem faste medlemmer af FN's sikkerhedsråd sagde Antonov: "Hvad det angår regner vi med hjælp fra vore partnere til at virkeliggøre initiativerne... Kina og Frankrig har reageret positivt på indbydelsen, men Rusland har endnu ikke modtaget noget svar fra De forenede Stater og Storbritannien."

Også FN-sekretariatet anser sådant et topmøde for en god ide. "Vi vil hilse ethvert møde mellem sikkerhedsrådets faste medlemmer velkommen, da det forhåbentligt vil kunne føre til et øget samarbejde mellem disse fem lande i sikkerhedsrådet", udtalte FN's generalsekretær Stéphane Dujarric den 13. februar. Spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt den russiske side havde anmodet FN's generalsekretær om at arrangere et sådant møde under FN's generalforsamling i september, besvarede Dujarric ikke.

Da den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin allerede har tilkendegivet, at han vil tale på generalforsamlingen i september, og da Kina og Frankrig har tilkendegivet deres understøttelse af initiativet, behøver præsident Trump blot at tage flyveren til New York. Og hvis det er sandsynligt, at et møde finder sted mellem disse fire præsidenter, vil Boris Johnson formodentligt heller ikke blive væk.

Der eksisterer altså en reel mulighed for, at "Vestens" geopolitiske konfrontationsholdning kan afløses af et nyt mønster for globalt samarbejde. Disse udsigter kan ligge til grund for Ischingers pessimistiske ytringer. Rent faktisk bør de dog give anledning til optimisme, da det er en langt større trussel mod sikkerheden i verden, hvis tilhængerne af den gamle orden gennemfører deres hensigter.

Den, guderne vil tilintetgøre...

17. februar (EIRNS) – Fokuser ikke på et enkelt aspekt af de forskellige kriser, som menneskeheden står overfor, advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går. Denne fremgangsmåde vil føre til en fejlslagen fortolkning af, hvad der foregår i verden, og hvad der skal gøres ved det. Spørgsmålet er: Hvorfor truer COVID-19-virusepidemien med at blive til en global pandemi, hvis den ikke begrænses? Hvorfor kan det forpurrede forsøg på rigsretssag mod præsident Donald Trump blive et endnu mere ubehageligt åbenlyst statskup? Hvorfor kan angrebet af græshoppesværme, der fejer over Afrikas Horn, blive til en fuldstændig græshoppeplage, der ødelægger fødevarerforsyningen for nationer, der tegner sig for næsten 2 milliarder af klodens 7,6 milliarder mennesker? Hvorfor er den aktuelle dekonstruktion af musik og kunst på vej til at omdanne menneskeheden til en satanisk sekt? Og hvorfor sker alt dette på samme tid?

Svaret er, fortsatte Zepp-LaRouche, at "vi befinder os i en ekstraordinær tumultarisk forandring af en historisk periode, hvor de fleste mennesker absolut ikke er klar over, hvor gigantisk den transformation og det sammenbrud der foregår faktisk er". Det såkaldte 'Vesten' er i opløsning, det transatlantiske finanssystem befinder sig i en sammenbrudskrise, og dets regerende etablissement, centreret i City of London, er parat til at påtvinge diktatur og fascistisk nedskæringspolitik for at forsøge at holde sig oven vande. De har vist deres fuldstændige manglende evne til så meget som at overveje, hvorfor deres liberale imperialistiske system kollapser, eller se på muligheden for at det er deres egen politik, der har ført til den nuværende katastrofe.

Denne inkompetence blev udstillet til fulde på den netop afsluttede sikkerhedskonference i München, hvor talsmænd for det gamle regime, såsom den amerikanske udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo og formand for Kongressen, Nancy Pelosi, forsøgte at forvandle det til et skydetelt imod Kina, netop på et tidspunkt, hvor dette land gør sit yderste for at begrænse COVID-19-virussen til

fordel for hele verden.

USA og Europa skulle samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, ikke true og angribe dem, insisterede Zepp-LaRouche. Et topmøde med de fire magter, der er specificeret af Lyndon LaRouche – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – må arrangeres i de kommende uger for at håndtere den voksende kaskade af eksistentielle kriser, som planeten står overfor, og løse dem ved at sætte det døende Britiske Imperium ud af spillet og organisere et nyt paradigme til erstatning herfor. Det er en mission, der kun kan opnås ved at tage fat på Lyndon LaRouches politik og metode; LaRouche, hvis levende eftermæle af den grund må renses og mobiliseres.

[Trump på det økonomiske forum i Davos: Med optimisme mod det "grønne" folkemord](#)

Udgivet den 27. januar 2020 på Harley Schlangers blog på LaRouchePAC.com (www.harley.larouchepac.com)

Medens det amerikanske senat åbnede rigsretssagen mod Trump, holdt præsidenten selv i Davos en tale for den årlige forsamling af selvtilfredse eliter, milliardærer og mægtige, der regner sig selv som særligt udvalgte til at bestemme menneskehedens fremtidige kurs. Dette års konference havde i første række det formål at påtvinge regeringerne en "grøn" handlingsplan for at frelse verden fra de angiveligt menneskeskabte klimaforandringer. Ud over "kendte" grønne som den rasende teenager Greta Thunberg, Al Gore, Sir Nicholas Stern, Bill Gates og prins Charles, spillede desuden direktøren for Bank of England, Mark Carney, fremtidig ambassadør for FN for klimabeskyttelse og finans, en vigtig rolle.

Carney, der i den forløbne sommer pludseligt svang sig op til en nøglefigur for den grønne bevægelse, da han forkyndte, at bankerne skulle blokere for kreditter til alle de firmaer og institutioner, der ikke ville deltage i den grønne revolution – holdt hovedtalen. Han erklærede, at Bank of England sammen med de andre centralbanker fra nu af ville nægte kreditter til finansinstitutioner og foretagender, der ikke er CO2-neutrale – hvorved han ville blive drejet om for kreditter til de energikilder, der leverer størstedelen af verdens energi.

Støttet på en pseudovidenskab, der påstår, at CO2-udslippet er hovedårsagen til klimaforandringerne og at menneskeheden nærmer sig sin undergang, hvis ikke den øjeblikkeligt giver fuldstændigt afkald på fossile brændstoffer, vil Carney og hans forbundsfæller såsom chefen for kæmpefonden Blackrock, Larry Fink – der sammen med andre topbankfolk kræver et regimeskift inden for finansverdenen. Det skal ske med en kombination af skatter, økonomisk straf og statsstøtte for ueffektive, "gammeldags" teknologier, og ved at gennemføre "nul-planen" som del af en generel nedskæringspolitik.

Carney sagde i sin hovedtale i Davos, at fra nu af måtte man hele tiden stille spørgsmålet: "Hvad er Deres plan for at stoppe kulstofudledningen? Det kommer til at afgøre, hvor kapitalen flyder hen." Bankerne vil spørge, "om De står på den rigtige eller den forkerte side". Og han besluttede med at sige, at alt dette betød en grundlæggende omformning af finanssystemet".

Carneys og Finks krav om et "regimeskift", der kun, tillader investeringer i såkaldt vedvarende energi – altså tilbagevenden til en lav energistrømningsstæthed ligesom i tiden før renæssancen – er en opskrift på ødelæggelse af industrien og på folkemord. Men her hører man ingen form for selvkritiske ytringer, for dette er åbenbart den egentlige bagtanke med det hele!

For at give det hele endnu større eftertryk, forbindes dette med et radikalt politisk krav, som Finks gruppe af tidligere centralbankschefer fremsatte her i sommers på Federal Reserves møde i Jackson Hole (Wyoming): Centralbankerne skal overtage opsynet med statshusholdningerne for at sikre, at der skal tilflyde mere kredit til den grønne spekulationsboble, medens kreditter til den reelle økonomi indstilles. Dette er et frontalangreb på suveræne regeringers ret til at stille kreditter til rådighed for programmer, der øger produktionen af den reelle fysiske, økonomiske velstand, sådan som den er nødvendig for at forbedre befolkningens levestandard. I stedet for skal regeringerne blot tjene som et redskab til at betjene de bedragerer, der profiterer af spekulationsboblen, medens de pålægger den brede befolkning nye, tyngende skyldsbyrder.

I Davos førte milliardærene endnu en gang den forstyrrede teenager Greta Thunberg frem for at tilsværte alle dem, der ser kritisk på dette vrøvl. Thunberg sagde, at der ikke er nogen tid at spille, inden otte år må der finde en fuldstændig omdrejning sted. "Vi vil ikke have, at disse ting skal finde sted i 2050, 2030 eller i 2021. Vi vil have, at de skal ske nu" sagde hun. Hun belærte de "voksne" i rummet: Vort hus brænder stadig. Jeres uvirksomhed forøger flammerne for hver time, der går."

På spørgsmålet, om han var enig med Thunbergs drastiske tidsplan, svarede Carney bekræftende.

Trump talte et alvorssord til undergangsprofeterne. I disse omgivers almindelige enighed om en politik, der vil ødelægge de resterende produktive centre i verden, udløste Donald Trump bølger af hysteri, da han præsenterede en optimistisk fremtidsvision, der udgik fra betragtninger over den proces, der frembragte renæssancens kulturelle og videnskabelige landvindinger og dermed lagde grunden for den moderne civilisation. Han tog her omhyggeligt sigte på dem, der fører politik på grundlag af "klimahysteriet".

"Dette er ikke tiden til pessimisme, dette er tiden til optimisme. Angst og tvivl er ikke gode tankeprocesser, for dette er tiden for store forhåbninger og glæde og optimisme og handling. Men for at gribe morgendagens muligheder, må vi tilbagevise de evige dommedagsprofeter og deres forudsigelser om Jordens undergang. De er arvtagerne til fortidens tåbelige spåmænd... og de ønsker, at det skal gå os dårligt, men det tillader vi ikke. De forudsagde, at der ville komme en overbefolkningskrise i 1960'erne, udbredt hungersnød i 1970'erne, og at olien ville slippe op i 1990'erne. Disse panikmagere kræver altid det samme; absolut magt for at beherske, forandre og overvåge hvert eneste aspekt af vore liv."

Med denne spot over nutidens grønne "dommedagsprofeter", der går ind for en moderne udgave af den malthusianske befolkningsreduktion, hentydede han (om ikke med navns nævnelse) til så grundlæggende værker som The Population Bomb af Paul Ehrlich og Grænser for Vækst af Dennis Meadows og Jay Forrester og deres kvaksalverkolleger i Romklubben(1972).

Hvad Trump ikke sagde, men hvad nogle af klimahysteriets forkæmpere formentligt godt vidste, var, hvad der var fælles for alle disse kræfter – ud over deres malthusianske had til menneskeheden – nemlig at Lyndon LaRouche i løbet af det sidste halve århundrede igen og igen kritiserede og gendrev deres ondsindede hensigter. I sin bog "Der er ingen grænser for vækst" fra 1983 påviste LaRouche at vor tids vækstfjendtlige fanatisme lige siden 1960erne fabrikeredes ved hjælp af fidusvidenskab og misvisende computerprogrammer. I vor tid fortsætter dette med FN's klimapanel (IPCC) dommedagsprofetier, der baserer sig på den samme slags computermodeller, der igen og igen har vist sig at tage fejl.

Og endnu vigtigere: LaRouche satte den nødvendige modpol op imod disse bedragere, nemlig den sande videnskab om menneskets fremskridt. Således understregede han ofte, at vi bør kikke tilbage på renæssancens genier for at finde løsninger på nutidens kriser, og han henviste ganske særligt til Brunelleschis geniale bygning af kuplen på domkirken i Firenze, hvor de

nødvendige arbejdsmetoder udvikledes under opførelsen. I 1991 skrev LaRouche i en tid, hvor han var uskyldigt fængslet, i sin fængselscelle bogen "Kristendom og Økonomi", der bærer et billede af kuplen på sit omslag.

Præsident Trump henviste i sin tale i Davos til netop den samme ting, som LaRouche benyttede som eksempel på optimisme om fremtiden.

"For århundreder siden, under Renæssancen, kikkede håndværkere og arbejdere op og byggede strukturer, der stadig berører menneskehjertet. Nogle af de bygninger, der stadig hører til blandt de største i verden, blev opført for århundreder siden. I Italien begyndte borgerne engang på et projekt, der skulle tage 140 år at opføre: Domkirken i Firenze. Et helt utroligt sted. Selv om teknologien til at fuldende projektet endnu ikke var fuldt udviklet, gik byens fædre alligevel i gang med det, i vished om at de en dag ville finde ud af det. Disse indbyggere i Firenze accepterede ingen grænser for deres store forventninger, og derfor blev den store kuppel til sidst opført."

Trump fortsatte: "I Amerika forstår vi det, som pessimisterne ikke vil indse: at en voksende og levende markedsøkonomi, der koncentrerer sig om fremtiden, opløfter den menneskelige ånd og ansporer kreativiteten tilstrækkeligt meget til at klare alle udfordringer... De store videnskabelige gennembrud i det 20. århundrede – fra penicillin over hvedesorter med højt høstudbytte til moderne transportmidler og banebrydende vacciner – har højnet levestandarden og reddet livet for milliarder af mennesker i hele verden. Og vi arbejder videre på ting, som I vil høre nærmere om i nær fremtid, og som I, sådan som I sidder her nu i dag, ikke vil tro at vi har fundet svarene på... Men det sidste århundredes mirakler blegner i forhold til de ting, som nutidens unge fornyere vil udvikle, fordi de udretter ting, som ingen ville have anset for muligt. Vi fortsætter med at påskønne teknologi, og skyr den ikke. Når mennesker har friheden til at være opfindsomme, vil millioner af mennesker kunne leve længere, lykkeligere og sundere."

Hvad ligger der bag denne afstandstagen?

Den optimisme, der præger Trumps tale i Davos, stemmer overens med hans engagement for et samarbejde med den russiske præsident Putin for at overkomme de strategiske kriser i verden og samarbejdet med Kinas præsident Xi Jinping om at overkomme spændingerne mellem de to førende økonomiske magter. Og det er ikke tilfældigt, at de, der udnytter klimahysteriet til at retfærdiggøre et "regimeskift" i finanssektoren, også forsvarer Londons imperialisme. De forsøger at sabotere Trumps forsøg på et fredeligt samarbejde med Rusland og Kina ved at ville fortsætte de "endeløse krige", som Trump kæmpede mod i 2016, og som også

vil være en væsentlig del af hans valgkamp i 2020.

Det er ingen overraskelse, at det er de samme grupperinger, som agerer gennem et forbund mellem de britiske og de amerikanske hemmelige tjenester i omkredsen af Bush og Obama, som også organiserer regimeskift-operationen imod præsident Trumps embede, sådan som det nu sker med det forsøg på afsættelse, der drives frem af USA's senat og hviler på falske anklager, udklækkede af disse netværk. Truslen fra præsident Trump og hans sandsynlige genvalg mod den sammenbrydende verdensorden, som disse netværk fik gennemført efter den kolde krig, bliver endnu mere påtrængende, når Trump i sine taler griber tilbage til ideer, der hænger sammen med LaRouche. Længe før Trump blev et mål for deres netværk, fordømte og forfulgte de LaRouche. Men trods årelange fordømmelser og angreb vækker LaRouches ideer yderligere genklang, fordi de genspejler de højere principper, som inspirerede Amerikas grundlæggere under deres udarbejdelse af De forenede Staters forfatning.

Det fortløbende forsøg på at få afsat Trump er ikke andet end et angreb på disse principper, udført til tjeneste for disse eliter, der har forsamlet sig i Davos for at organisere den største befolkningsreduktion i verdenshistorien. Derfor reagerede de så hysterisk på Trumps tale, medens medierne fortav de ovennævnte kernepunkter og forkastede dem som eksempler på "blind optimisme". Deres største frygt er, at de mennesker, der medvirker som borgere i udformningen af deres stat for at regeringens politik skal genspejle deres virkelige interesser, vil kunne afvise magthavernes farlige pessimisme, der går ud på at undertrykke deres indflydelse.

Anmærkning:

Videoen af Trumps tale i Davos, som begynder 9 minutter ind i videoen:

[Et topmøde mellem stormagterne i 2020 giver muligheden for at sætte dagsordenen for et nyt](#)

paradigme

Den 25. januar (EIRNS) – Forslaget den 15. januar fra den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin om et topmøde i 2020 mellem stats- og regeringscheferne for de fem faste medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd (USA, Rusland, Kina, Frankrig, Storbritannien) – for at konferere om at sikre global fred, afspejler forslaget fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 3. januar, der nu cirkulerer internationalt gennem Schiller Instituttet og andre netværk. Hun opfordrer til et hastemøde mellem præsidenterne Donald Trump, Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin på grund af den øjeblikkelige fare for konfrontation mellem Iran og USA, og desuden for "at etablere samarbejde på et højere niveau" for at kunne håndtere alle kriser ordentligt.

Selvom de to forslag er forskellige hvad deltagende nationer angår, er konceptet om et topmøde det samme, og en sådan aktion er afgørende på dette tidspunkt i historien. Nu er tiden inde til at alle nationer og borgere organiserer for, hvad der skal være indholdet på et sådant topmøde. Hvad skal der være på dagsordenen? Dette er stedet og tiden for LaRouches politik og principper i forbindelse med hans syn på, at "udvikling er forudsætningen for fred": Et nyt Bretton Woods-system, der gennemfører hans "Fire love" fra 2014 gennem så konkrete tiltag som samarbejde med Bælte- og Vejinitiativet.

Efter alt at dømme er Putin gået ud over propagandafasen med blot forslag om et topmøde, og ind i den aktive organiseringsfase. Potentielle tidspunkter for et sådant topmøde blev påpeget den 24. januar af den russiske ambassadør i USA, Anatoly Antonov. TASS rapporterer i dag, at Antonov sagde, "et sådant møde kunne arrangeres, enten før genforhandlingen af NPT-konventionen (atomar ikke-spredningstraktat) i maj måned, eller før eller under fejringen af FN's 75-års jubilæum (i september under FN's generalforsamling). "Jeg tror, at gennemførelsen af dette initiativ ville være meget nyttigt for international fred og sikkerhed." Da Putin gentog sit forslag den 23. januar i Israel, sagde han, at Rusland vil sende meddelelser til lederne uden forsinkelse.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede under drøftelsen af situationen i dag, at et sådant topmøde er presserende, og at selv om folk kan have kritik mod den ene eller anden af de "Fem" [faste medlemmer af] FN's Sikkerhedsråd, er det dynamikken der tæller. For eksempel har den franske præsident Emmanuel Macron gentagne gange understreget, at det er vigtigt at involvere Rusland i overvejelserne for at løse store kriser. Kansler Angela Merkel tog for nylig initiativ til samarbejde med Rusland og andre magter ved at afholde Berlin-konferencen den 19. januar samt andre foranstaltninger for at søge løsninger på

Libyen-krisen.

Vores opgave er at ophøje folk til at forstå, at vi kun gennem internationalt samarbejde kan løse de problemer, vi nu står overfor, og at det må ske med udgangspunkt i den politik, der på enestående vis er foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche. Mange mennesker holder sig tilbage, fordi de bogstaveligt talt "ikke ved hverken ud eller ind", eller fordi de har opgivet at forandre verden. Men nu er øjeblikket inde til at tage fat på alle relevante "spørgsmål", i bredeste forstand, som mennesker måtte have, og indgyde optimisme. Præsident Trumps tale i Davos den 21. januar hjælper med til at åbne døren for netop en sådan tilgang.

[Frankrig og Kina bakker op om Putins opfordring til topmøde mellem 5 stormagter](#)

[Amerikansk præsidentkandidat opfordrer til 3-parts topmøde](#)

Den 24. januar (EIRNS) – Kina og Frankrig hilser præsident Vladimir Putins forslag om et topmøde med stats- og regeringscheferne i Rusland, Kina, USA, Frankrig og Storbritannien velkommen – de fem faste medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd – med henblik på at diskutere, hvordan man sikrer global fred.

Præsident Emmanuel Macron sagde i går på 'World Holocaust Forum' i Jerusalem: "De fem faste medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd bærer i dag et historisk ansvar. Kære Vladimir, jeg støtter dit forslag om at samle os alle sammen. Jeg vil gerne have, at vi når dertil, da det er os, der er garanterne for verdensfreden."

Talsmand for det kinesiske udenrigsministerium, Hua Chunying, sagde ligeledes i dag, at "global ustabilitet og usikkerhed øges, mens multilateralisme og FN's rolle står over for klare udfordringer. Kina støtter Ruslands initiativ til at afholde et topmøde med FN's Sikkerhedsråds faste medlemmer", og tilbyder at

koordinere aktiviteterne i forbindelse dermed.

Og i USA tweetede den demokratiske præsidentkandidat Tulsi Gabbard den 23. januar: "Min personlige forpligtelse over for jer er, at jeg på den første dag af mit præsidentskab vil kontakte lederne af Kina og Rusland for at sætte et topmøde op med henblik på at afslutte den nye kolde krig og atomvåbenkapløb, som uundgåeligt vil resultere i et atomart holocaust". Dette er et ekko af Helga Zepp-LaRouches opfordring den 3. januar til et sådant trepartsmøde for at undgå krig og iværksætte massiv økonomisk udvikling.

Britiske paralleller til det amerikanske oprør

Den 19. december (EIRNS) – Vanviddet fortsætter i den amerikanske rigsretsproces og demonstrerer endnu en gang, at det ikke er andet end et orkestreret kupforsøg af ophavsmændene til "Russiagate" i de britiske efterretningscirkler og deres aktiver i det Demokratiske Parti. Nancy Pelosi, der selvfølgelig er klar over, at de latterlige rigsretssagspunkter er usande, og ikke engang ville være forbrydelser selv om de var sande, venter nu med at overføre sagen til retsbehandling i Senatet indtil det nye år, i håb om at der skal opstå et mirakel, der kan retfærdiggøre deres faktiske kriminelle hensigt.

Justitsminister William Barr gjorde det her til aften klart på Fox News, at der er begået alvorlige kriminelle handlinger af kupmagerne, og at den særlige anklager John Durhams efterforskning agter at gribe fat om nældens rod, ikke kun i FBI og justitsministeriet, men også i CIA og andre agenturer. Durham har nu udbedt sig mange af de relevante dokumenter vedrørende tidligere CIA-direktør John Brennan, der kørte en stor del af Russiagate-svindlen.

Hensigten – at forhindre Trumps bestræbelser på at etablere venskabelige forbindelser mellem USA og Rusland og Kina og således opbryde den britiske imperialistiske opdeling af verden i uforsonlige blokke – er den samme som i "Ukraine", udvidelsen af kuppet, eftersom de britiske samt Obamas efterretningsfolk er hektiske for at dække over deres direkte rolle i det kriminelle kup mod den valgte Ukrainske regering i forbund med åbenlyse nazi-bander, med det formål at starte en krig med Rusland. Da det ukrainske folk overvældende stemte imod det nynazistiske regime til fordel for præsident

Volodymyr Zelenskys intention om at genoprette forbindelserne med Rusland, arbejder Trump nu sammen med Zelensky i dette øjemed. Den falske rigsretsanklage om "magtmisbrug" for Trumps bestræbelser på at afsløre denne massive forbrydelse er latterlig, men alligevel ekstremt farlig.

Situationen i Storbritannien har mange ligheder – selvom man skal være varsom her, da det er det britiske imperium, der står på spil. Boris Johnson og hans toprådgiver, Dominic Cummings, har appelleret til arbejderklassen i Storbritannien, der traditionelt er på linje med Labour-partiet, for at genoprette Storbritanniens historiske industrielle kapacitet og dens styrke inden for videnskabelig forskning og infrastruktur, med et resultat svarende til Trumps 'jordskredssejr' i traditionelle 'Demokratiske' stater ved valget i 2016. De lag indenfor både arbejderpartiet og det konservative parti, der kæmpede imod Brexit-afstemningen i 2016, som var stærkt støttet af Johnson, blev stort set fejlet ud af embederne ved det nationale valg, som gav Johnson hans historiske flertal.

I både Storbritannien og USA ignoreres det hastigt fremstormende økonomiske sammenbrud. Det er aldeles muligt, at præsident Trump, når boblen brister, vil ty til LaRouche-løsningen, det amerikanske systems politik efter Alexander Hamiltons principper, snarere end til Wall Street-slanget omkring ham. Det er mindre sandsynligt, at Johnson vil gøre det samme, men hvis USA går sammen med Rusland og Kina, hvilket Trump forsøger at gøre, kan denne kombination, med Indien og andre der måtte tilslutte sig, indføre et nyt paradigme for verden, og trække selv briterne med. Dette har været LaRouche-bevægelsens hensigt igennem adskillige årtier – det ligger nu direkte på bordet, hvilket kræver fuld mobilisering af denne nations patrioter og verdens borgere.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19. december
2019:
Rigsretssag imod Trump kan ikke få

det gamle paradigme tilbage i kontrol//

Brexit + COP25-fiasko. Se også 2. og 3. del.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Video:

2. del:

3. del:

Lyd:

Pelosis løgne udstiller den kriminelle hensigt bag kup-komplottet imod Trump

Den 15. december (EIRNS) – Rigsretskuppet – og Trump har kaldt det et kup, og det ér et kup – kan faktisk give betydeligt bagslag. Oligarkiet – i USA, Storbritannien og internationalt – er i panik, da Horowitz-rapporten har afsløret USA's og de britiske efterretningsagenters kriminelle sammensværgelse for at gennemføre et kup mod præsident Donald Trump. Selv Der Spiegel i Tyskland udkom med en forsidehistorie, der udtrykte deres rædsel for, at Trump, trods 'Russiagate' og svindlen med rigsretssagen, ser ud til at ville vinde det næste valg.

Bill Binney – den tidligere leder af den tekniske afdeling hos National Security Agency (NSA), der udformede programmerne til at finde terrorister, men trak sig

tilbage da programmet i stedet blev brugt til at spionere på stort set alle i verden – har vist, at der ikke var noget russisk hack af [email-]serveren hos det Demokratiske Partis Nationalkomité (DNC), kernen i 'Russiagate'-svindlen. Han gennemgik beviset herfor på LaRouchePAC's nationale webcast, "Fireside Chat", den 12. december, og er villig til, og ivrig efter, at få denne historie ud i hele USA og internationalt.

Binney og den tidligere CIA-operatør Larry Johnson, der optrådte sammen med ham på LaRouchePAC's telefonkonference, pegede på det faktum, at general Michael Flynn, den tidligere chef for 'Defense Intelligence Agency' (DIA) i Obama-administrationen og Trumps første nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, var udpeget som et mål i 'Russiagate'-heksejagten, netop fordi han havde afsløret, at Obama-administrationens bevæbning af såkaldte "moderate oprørere" i regimeskiftekrigen mod Bashar Assads regering i Syrien faktisk gik til al-Qaida-terroristnetværket – og værre endnu, at Obama-administrationen gjorde dette med fuldt overlæg. Set i optikken af Obamas og det britiske efterretningsnetværk var Flynns forbrydelse, at han ønskede at etablere venlige bånd med Rusland, ligesom præsident Trump.

Alt dette slår nu tilbage imod kupmagerne, både dem i USA og dem i Storbritannien, Ukraine og andre steder. Som præsident Trump tweetede i dag, står den tidligere FBI-direktør Comey, der ledede 'Russiagate'-svindlen, nu til seriøs fængselstid.

I hendes ugentlige strategiske internationale webcast advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag om, at den igangværende "våbenklirren" i rigsretsprocessen af lederskabet i det Demokratiske Parti, er tegn på desperation; tegn på at de med rette frygter, at de ved valget i 2020 ikke kan vinde en ærlig valgkamp. Ekspert i forfatningsspørgsmål Alan Dershowitz gør opmærksom på, at der skabes en meget farlig præcedens ved at ødelægge den republikanske opfattelse af præsidentsystemet og erstatte det med et britisk parlamentarisk system, hvor man kan slippe af med en premierminister blot på grund af et flertal i parlamentet.

Den britiske imperialistiske opdeling af verden med NATO mod Warszawa-pagten er død. Macron kaldte NATO "hjernerød", mens Trump kaldte det "forældet." Da Sovjetunionen blev opløst i 1991, mistede NATO sin raison d'être, eksistensberettigelse, og konfrontationen med Rusland og Kina opbygges bare for at retfærdiggøre store lønninger til bureaukraterne i NATO-apparatet og i det militærindustrielle kompleks. Det er ikke for sent at sige, at NATO bør erstattes med et helt andet system, en sikkerhedsarkitektur, der inkluderer Rusland, og som inkluderer Kina, fordi den nuværende konfrontationspolitik fører til krig. Det er klart, at Trump forsøger at have et anstændigt forhold til

Rusland og Kina, mens hvis Hillary Clinton var blevet præsident, kunne vi have haft 3. verdenskrig allerede nu. Det er på tide, at NATO pakker sammen. Vi har brug for en ny tilgang, en tilgang der garanterer planeten og menneskehedens en langsigtet overlevelsessevne.

Et skridt i den retning blev opnået i Spanien i denne uge, da COP25-konferencen den 2.-13. december for malthusiansk folkemord under dække af den forfalskede skrøne om "klimaforandringer" faldt pladask omkuld og ikke var i stand til at fremlægge nye diktater om at stoppe den industrielle udvikling under løggen om, at global opvarmning truer den menneskelige race. Mens mange beskyldte præsident Trump for at underminere den malthusianske plan – og denne ros har han fortjent – skyldes det først og fremmest den vedvarende indsats fra LaRouche-bevægelsen igennem de sidste 50 år for at afsløre de britiske malthusianere som stormtropperne i den nye fascistiske bevægelse til retfærdiggørelse af befolkningsreduktion i verden. Med dette nederlag til malthusianerne bør kræfterne for menneskelig fremgang gå i offensiven for fremskridt – for et nyt Bretton Woods, for globalt samarbejde i regi af den Nye Silkevej og for samarbejde mellem de store civilisationskulturer i et nyt paradigme for den menneskelige race.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21. november 2019:

Regimeskifte og modkup verden rundt.

Schiller Instituttets konference sætter LaRouche på dagsordenen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

[Tilegnelsen af LaRouches metode er påkrævet for at organisere kræfterne for sejr.](#)

Den 7. november (EIRNS) – I en tale, der var forberedt den 26. maj 2000, af statsmand Lyndon LaRouche med titlen "Vedrørende emnet strategisk metode" (EIR, 2. juni 2000), beskrives en tankegang, hvis tilegnelse er afgørende, hvis vi skal komme sejrrigt ud af det nuværende politiske og økonomiske rod i USA, hvor sejr også er kritisk for [resten af] verden. Tankegangen bygger på metoden for videnskabelig hypotese kombineret med en analyse af den kulturelle og økonomiske dynamik, der faktisk bestemmer væsentlige ændringer.

LaRouche siger, at "den afgørende faktor ... er den menneskelige vilje, der vælger eller fravælger passende former for frivillige, kritiske ændringer i politik, som former nationer og menneskehedens fremtid som helhed. Disse er de beslutninger, som har forholdsvis afgørende indflydelse på begivenhedernes forløb, især under kriseramte forhold, der ligner dem som er fremherskende verden over i dag. "Han pegede på et sæt af sådanne beslutninger, som virkelig var onde, for at demonstrere hvad han mente med kritiske beslutninger, der har dyb indvirkning selv over generationer. Disse beslutninger stammer fra 1975-76 [og blev truffet] af New York Council on Foreign Relations og Den Trilaterale Kommission, og er kendt som "1980'erne-projektet", hvilket lagde grundlaget for ødelæggelsen af USA's fysiske økonomi, omdannelsen til et forbrugerdrevet post-industrielt samfund, og i den endelige manifestation af denne politik, noget vi stadig oplever i dag, den tilstræbte triumf for globalisering og opgivelse af suveræne nationale regeringer til fordel for den type af bankdiktatur, der blev foreslået den 23. august, 2019 af Bank of Englands bankdirektør, Mark Carney, i Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Og denne plan for et bankdiktatur har taget et væsentligt skridt fremad med meddelelsen om, at milliardæren Michael Bloomberg går ind i demokraternes primærvalg i Alabama, uden endnu at "have besluttet" om han stiller op som præsidentkandidat.

Præsident Donald Trump afbrød den langsigtede udvikling, som disse fyre dengang satte i værk, en udvikling hen imod fuldstændig opgivelse af vores grundlæggeres store eksperiment med den suveræne republik kendt som De forenede Stater. LaRouche siger: "Metoden for det sædvanlige slæng af bankfolk og advokatfirmaer fra Wall Street var forkert, endda ond, men disse fyre havde i det mindste en vision om en række kulturelt motiverede ændringer i USA og verdenssamfundet, som

de havde til hensigt at fremkalde de kommende årtier. "Det lykkede de med, fordi borgerne var optaget af øjeblikkelige begivenheder, på en selvbegrænsende måde, og nægtede at strække deres sind og vision til hvilken fremtid de søgte at skabe de kommende 50 år. Denne smålighed tillod ondskaben at triumfere.

LaRouche spørger derefter, hvordan vi kan imødesee og arbejde for at påvirke de kulturelle paradigmer, som igen vil afgøre den måde hvorpå befolkninger og andre beslutningstagere vil reagere på det globale finansielle og politisk-økonomiske chok, af den slags der nu hastigt nærmer sig? Og, siger han, der er virkelig kun et tidspunkt, hvor man dramatisk kan ændre ting, og det er når begivenhedernes chok får folk til at undersøge deres eget tankesæt, de underliggende aksiomer og postulater, på hvilke de baserer deres meninger.

Det er netop situationen i dag, hvor en udfordret og modtagelig befolkning søger efter løsninger på, hvad de ser der sker omkring dem. Som LaRouche uddybede, er den eneste rigtige måde at fjerne kræfterne bag kuppet mod denne præsident – ud fra en strategisk betragtning – at vælte hele skakbrættet, ved at slutte sig til Rusland, Kina og Indien for at skabe traktater, der er centreret om et nyt monetært system med faste valutakurser, der kun udsteder kredit til økonomisk udvikling og avancerede videnskabelige udforskninger, der fremmer hele menneskeheds produktive kapacitet.

LaRouche peger på adskillige bestemmende kulturelle chok, der førte til USA's tilbagegang under Barack Obama, og som demokraterne nu beskriver som "normale tilstande." Blandt dem er brugen af nuklear terror til at skabe et krav om en verdensregering, som forestillet af Bertrand Russell og andre talsmænd for det britiske oligarki, og stillet til skue under betegnelserne "globalisering" og "lov og orden". Der var fremkomsten af 'rock/stoffer/sex-modkulturen' i kølvandet på drabet på præsident John Kennedy; bestræbelserne på at standse den teknologiske udvikling gennem miljøbevægelsen og afviklingen af centrale initiativer for NASA; udryddelsen af klassisk uddannelse i skolerne; fremme af fri handel og traktater som NAFTA, der decimerede den amerikanske arbejdsstyrke og opgav enhver beskyttelse af amerikanske industrier.

Denne dekadence blev af LaRouche beskrevet som en "grundlæggende konflikt" i geometrien af aksiomer og postulater om menneskets natur. Hvad han betegnede som 'det romantiske syn', ser mænd og kvinder som grundlæggende onde, som dyr, med dyriske sanselige impulser, ude af stand til at ræsonnere ud over øjeblikkets sanseopfattelser. Denne opfattelse er grundlæggende for tolerancen over for imperier i histories løb, og er i stigende grad dominerende i USA i dag. Det modsatte, klassiske tankesæt, især i dets kristne manifestation, definerer mennesker som grundlæggende gode, som hævet over dyrene, som værende skabt i

billedet af universets skaber og i stand til kreativ forandring og opdagelse af universets grundlæggende love. Det var tankesættet hos grundlæggerne [af republikken], der måtte fordrives og ødelægges af de fundamentale ændringer, der er nævnt ovenfor.

Præsident Trump har taget skridt til at vende alt dette, nogle skridt er stærke, andre mere tøvende, men han hæmmes af det kulturelle forfald, selv blandt hans mest glødende tilhængere. Hvad der mangler her er dybden af intelligens og analyse, som LaRouche drøftede [i talen], hvor han bemærkede, at det største problem er opgivelsen af de former for klassisk uddannelse og klassisk drama og musik, som bevidst er udformet til at nære og styrke det menneskelige sind, menneskelig kreativitet, og får os til at gå uden for vores umiddelbare omgivelser, og beherske hvordan vi ændrer dem. Store forsamlinger råber taktfast "U.S.A.!" igen og igen, men er blevet nægtet dette middel, hvilket viser, at vi ikke indgående uddanner de generaler, der faktisk er i stand til at vinde denne krig for USA, og i sidste ende verden. I mangel på LaRouches metode kan og vil disse menneskemængder blive manipuleret og dræbt af vor fjendes evne til at manipulere dem gennem populærkultur og den offentlige mening.

[Udtalelse om forsøget på at dræbe Julian Assange](#)

At dræbe vidnet til en forbrydelse er den ultimative 'forhindring af retfærdigheden', og nu begås netop dette på britisk jord i samarbejde med amerikanske embedsmænd. Der er en person i live, der er i besiddelse af midlerne til hurtigt at gøre en ende på hele løgneren om 'Russiagate', et fupnummer, der først og fremmest forøves af britiske efterretningsfolk og de britiske infiltrerede og kontrollerede elementer i det amerikanske efterretningssamfund. Denne er Julian Assange. Assange modtog de lækkede DNC- og John Podesta-filer, som John Brennan og venner hævder blev hacket af russerne og overleveret til WikiLeaks i et forsøg på at blande sig i valget i USA til fordel for Donald Trump. 'Veterans Intelligence Professionals for Sanity' påviste kriminalteknisk, at filerne fra DNC blev lækket – og ikke hacket over internettet af russerne – som Robert Mueller hævdede.

Julian Assange har gentagne gange sagt, at han modtog lækkede filer, og at disse

filer ikke involverede russiske statsaktører. Han tilbød at fremlægge sine beviser for kongresmedlem Dana Rohrabacher, og Rohrabacher delte dette tilbud med præsident Trump, tillige med Assanges benægtelse af at dokumenterne kom fra en russisk kilde. Dokumenterne beskrev i detaljer Hillary Clintons underdanighed over for Wall Street, alle former for dårlige gerninger begået af Clinton-fonden samt den Demokratiske Nationalkomité's valgsvindel imod Bernie Sanders i de demokratiske primærvalg i 2016. Deres rigtighed er aldrig blevet bestridt. Assange tilbød også at fremlægge sine beviser for det amerikanske justitsministerium, og forhandlinger var aktivt i gang, da Senatets efterretningskomité's "fodsoldat", Mark Warner, afbrød dem. Assange holdes for tiden indespærret i Londons Belmarsh-fængsel, Hendes Majestæts fangehul for de farligste kriminelle i Storbritannien. Han tilbageholdes på en amerikansk anklage om sammensværgelse med Chelsea Manning vedrørende hendes afsløring af pinlige amerikanske militærdokumenter helt tilbage i 2010. Anklagen har været under udarbejdelse siden 2017, lige efter samtalerne mellem Assange og Rohrabacher, og blev forelagt en amerikansk storjury umiddelbart efter at den juridiske lejemorder Robert Mueller afsluttede sin fabrikerede kampagne mod den amerikanske præsident i april 2019. Da tiltalen blev rejst blev Assange trukket ud af den ecuadorianske ambassade, hvor han var blevet tildelt asyl og ført til Belmarsh for at afvente udlevering til USA. Nils Melzer, FN's 'ordfører for tortur og anden grusom og umenneskelig eller nedværdigende behandling eller straf', advarede den 1. november i en erklæring om Assanges tilstand:

"Medmindre Storbritannien hurtigst muligt ændrer kurs og lindrer hans umenneskelige situation, kan Assanges fortsatte udsættelse for vilkårlighed og misbrug snart ende med at koste hans liv."

Melzer mødtes med Assange den 9. maj, hvorefter han krævede øjeblikkelige foranstaltninger til at beskytte Assanges helbred og værdighed.

"På trods af den presserende medicinske hast af min appel og alvorligheden af de rapporterede krænkelse har Storbritannien ikke iværksat nogen foranstaltninger til efterforskning, forebyggelse og klage, hvilket kræves i henhold til international lov," anklagede Melzer.

Assange "tilbageholdes fortsat under undertrykkende omstændigheder med isolation og overvågning, hvilket er uberettiget i betragtning af hans tilbageholdelsesstatus," sagde han. Melzer angreb også den amerikanske rolle: "Alt imens den amerikanske regering anklager hr. Assange for at offentliggøre oplysninger om alvorlige menneskerettighedskrænkelser, herunder tortur og drab, fortsætter de [samme] embedsmænd, der er ansvarlige for disse forbrydelser, med at nyde straffrihed." Og "til trods for kompleksiteten i sagen mod ham, ledet af

verdens mest magtfulde regering, er hr. Assanges adgang til juridisk bistand og dokumenter alvorligt hindret." Dette, sagde han, havde effektivt undermineret "hans mest grundlæggende ret til at forberede sit forsvar."

Dette opråb fra FN-ordføreren pålægger alle FN-nationer ansvaret for at gribe ind for at stoppe dette politiske overgreb. De mennesker der har sat dette i gang må fyres eller retsforfølges som led i John Durhams efterforskning. Dette er en reel test for, om det amerikanske justitsministerium [overhovedet] kan tillægge sig nogen grad af ære.

Den tidligere britiske ambassadør Craig Murray deltog ved Assanges retsmøde den 21. oktober om udlevering. Murray skrev i sin blog:

"Before I get on to the blatant lack of fair process, the first thing I must note was Julian's condition. I was badly shocked by just how much weight my friend has lost, by the speed his hair has receded and by the appearance of premature and vastly accelerated ageing. He has a pronounced limp I have never seen before. Since his arrest he has lost over 15 kg in weight. But his physical appearance was not as shocking as his mental deterioration. When asked to give his name and date of birth, he struggled visibly over several seconds to recall both."

Høringen, sagde Murray, havde overbevist ham om FN's ordfører Melzers tidligere varsel om, at Assange blev tortureret. (se Murrays beretning om høringen)

Vi opfordrer alle borgere i alle nationer til at deltage i den internationale kampagne, der gennemføres af mange organisationer for at bringe sandheden om denne forfærdelige forbrydelse (begået af efterretningstjenester) frem i lyset, og for at redde Assanges liv.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 31. oktober
2019:

Massestrejke i gang: Chile, Libanon, Tyskland, Argentina og Storbritannien. Og USA?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

For en økonomisk renæssance for menneskeheden og renselse af Lyndon LaRouches navn.

Erklæring fra Schiller Instituttet formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, vedrørende de internationale aktionsdage 10.-15. oktober 2019

Forestil jer: Verdens ende indtræffer, men der møder ingen op! Forestil jer at teenager-klimaidolet Greta Thunberg, og alle central- og investeringsbankfolkene, hedgefonde og spekulanter, der er euforiske over den angivelige vished for at planeten vil koge over inden for 18 måneder (ifølge Prince Charles) – mens sidstnævnte er ekstatiske over astronomiske profitter, som de tror kan opnås ved "grønne finanser". Men så, ikke desto mindre, fortsætter verden – trods forskellige udsving i klimaet – simpelthen med at eksistere!

Denne variation af fredsbevægelsens gamle slogan: "Antag at der er krig, men at der ikke kommer nogen", er nyttig for at understrege den pointe, at en ideologi kun indvirker på virkeligheden, hvis størstedelen af befolkningen tror på den.

Der er ingen klimakrise. Klimadata for de sidste 500 millioner år viser, at Jordens klima har varieret kontinuerligt med en konstant vekslende mellem varme og kolde perioder. (Den sidste af disse kolde perioder sluttede først i 1850 med den 'Lille Istid'.) Dagens klimaalarmister kan ikke basere sig på videnskabeligt

beviselige fakta, men bruger klimamodeller, hvis forudsigelser allerede har vist sig at være overdrevne. Fejlen i disse modeller understreger det faktum, at klimaet er en meget kompleks størrelse, som straks må bringes tilbage på et videnskabeligt grundlag. Mens menneskeskabte aktiviteter har en begrænset effekt på klimaet, er det som IPCC gør – nemlig at ignorere den dybe indvirkning af processer i solen og i vores galakse – højdepunktet af videnskabelig inkompetence!

Dæmoniseringen af CO₂ og det resulterende mål om af-karbonisering af verdensøkonomien er lige så rationelt som at brænde hekse på bålet som et middel mod sygdom. CO₂ er ikke et forurenende stof, men er en uundværlig betingelse for livet på jorden, og især for trivslen af planter og landbrug som grundlag for menneskets eksistens. Den virkelige krisesituation er af-karboniseringen af den globale økonomi, hvilket den finansielle sektor presser på med, og som vil føre til et sammenbrud af de industrialiserede lande, ødelæggelse af udviklingslandene og massiv, global befolkningsreduktion – dvs. folkedrab.

Klimahysteriet, der er iscenesat af den finansielle sektor og de etablerede medier, er den største propagandistiske manipulation af befolkningen nogensinde; en manipulation der har fungeret så effektivt, at den nazistiske propagandamester Josef Goebbels ville have opgivet sit job på grund af sin relative fiasko i forhold hertil. Det egentlige spørgsmål der står på spil er ganske anderledes: Det neoliberale finanssystem er absolut færdigt. Årsagerne til nedbruddet i 2008 er langt fra blevet løst, men er i stedet blevet forstørret gennem elleve år med kvantitative lempelser, og renter der er sat til nul eller endda under. Hvilke planer har det finansielle oligarki? Ifølge et papir, der for nylig blev fremlagt af BlackRock på Jackson Holes årlige bankmøde, skulle centralbankerne gennemføre et "regimeskifte", hvor centralbanker, der forbliver "uafhængige", udsteder store mængder penge og giver dem direkte til regeringer, som kun vil bruge dem i henhold til centralbankernes direktiver. Det er samme princip, som Hitlers finansminister Hjalmar Schacht brugte til at finansiere den militære opbygning på det tidspunkt – men denne gang skal alle de penge der er skabt bruges til at gøre verdensøkonomien "grøn".

For de fleste mennesker der er indfanget af den neoliberale ideologi, iscenesat af de etablerede medier, er det meget svært at forestille sig, at hele grundlaget for dette system er forkert. Men denne ideologi involverer ikke kun det "regimeskifte", der er planlagt af centralbankfolkene, men også et "regimeskifte" mod den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump, såvel som imod Rusland og Kina, som det ses i "farverevolutionen", der nu bliver anstiftet i Hongkong. Og det inkluderer også ideen om, at det er helt normalt, at et lille lag af rige mennesker bliver stadig rigere, mens flertallet bliver stadig

fattigere; at Afrika skal forblive underudviklet for evigt; at hvert menneske under alle omstændigheder er en parasit, der forurener miljøet; og at grænserne for vækst er nået. Og lad os ikke glemme de liberale ideer om, at "alting går an," og at enhver mening er lige så god som enhver anden.

Men set ud fra universets love og menneskehedens evolution, som de er bestemmende for, er disse aksiomer lige så forkerte som de fleste af antagelserne fra middelalderen, såsom skolastik, hekseri eller flagellantisme.

Hvis vi skal slippe ud af den nuværende voksende krise, hvor alt ser ud til at løbe ud af kontrol, er vi nødt til at ændre hele vores tankegang. Vi er nødt til at finde et referencepunkt, hvorfra vi kan vurdere alle vores antagelser om menneskeheden og universet vi bebor, og undersøge deres gyldighed. Dette referencepunkt er rumforskning og rumfart.

Bemandet rumfart er det sejrende bevis for, at Leibniz havde ret i at hævde, at vi lever i den bedste af alle verdener. Naturligvis ikke i den forstand, som den kyniske Voltaire – på sin vis den tids Sir David Attenborough – angreb Leibniz' optimistiske billede af mennesket, men i den forstand at det viser, at menneskeheden er den eneste (hidtil kendte) kreative art, der gennem opdagelsen af stadigt nye principper for det fysiske univers kan skabe grundlaget for at overvinde alle grænser.

Som Lyndon LaRouche demonstrerede i sin banebrydende bog 'Der er ingen grænser for vækst', (PDF) og i hele sit livs arbejde, er det de originale opdagelser af stadigt mere komplekse eksperimentelt beviselige principper for universet, der giver grundlaget for helt nye økonomiske platforme, som kan skabe midlerne til at opretholde bedre brødfødte, længere levende og bedre uddannede mennesker. På den måde er vækstbegrebet ikke så simpelt som nogle fjolser, såsom Malthus, forestiller sig; fjolser, der tænker i baner af en kausal verden indskrænket af en euklidisk aritmetik eller geometrisk multiplikation; men snarere svarende til en mangfoldigt forbundet riemannsk manifold, der udfolder sig til højere ordener, der ikke kan forstås med udgangspunkt i de lavere. Kreativ fornuft kan, som det mest udviklede element i universet, skabe nye singulariteter, der igen kan øge graden af menneskelig effektivitet i universet ud over alle grænser.

De bedste eksempler på dette er den forventede beherskelse af termionuklear fusion – hvor mennesket efterligner fusionsprocessen i Solen og derved producerer ubegrænsede mængder af energi og reserver af råmaterialer – og bekræftelsen af Albert Einsteins generelle relativitetsteori, som det for nyligt blev gjort med bekræftelsen af gravitationsbølger og billedoptagelser af sorte huller; sorte huller, som befinder sig i centrum af hver af de to billioner

galakser, som Hubble-teleskopet indtil videre har været i stand til at opdage.

Den nye måde at tænke på må afvise bankfolks pseudo-religioner, etablerede medier og klima-apostle, og erstatte dem med en videnskabelig debat om eksperimentelt beviselige fakta. Artemis-programmet, der er vedtaget af præsident Trump, og som vil bringe folk tilbage til Månen i 2024 og etablere en permanent station i 2028, er lovende i så henseende, og ligeledes rumprogrammerne i Kina, Indien, Rusland og Det Europæiske Rumfartsagentur. I øvrigt viser Kinas enestående økonomiske succes og dynamikken i 'Den Nye Silkevej', at fokuseringen på videnskabelig innovation er mere gavnligt for de involverede lande end det neoliberale systems fokusering på profit.

Hvis det er muligt at bringe Europa og USA ind i et samarbejde med det kinesiske Bælte- og Vejinitiativ og, for USA's vedkommende, i et samarbejde med Kina om rumfart, vil menneskeheden ikke befinde sig på randen af en klima-apokalypse, men snarere i begyndelsen af en ny æra, hvor menneskets iboende evne til fornuft frit kan udvikle sig, og vi i en vis forstand kan overgå til voksenlivet for vores art. Vi vil udforme en mere menneskelig tidsalder, og demonstrere at denne verden faktisk er den bedste af alle mulige verdener, fordi der potentielt findes et geni i ethvert menneske, og graderne af frihed i udviklingen af vores art vil stige uden begrænsning til i et omfang, hvor flere [og flere] mennesker kan realisere dette potentiale i sig selv.

Det uomgængelige skridt for at opnå denne nye tankegang er den fuldstændige renselse af Lyndon LaRouche, der blev forfulgt og fængslet i 1980'erne og 1990'erne af det Britiske Imperiums onde og desperate storinkvisitorer i deres forsøg på at blokere adgangen til hans ideer.

Vi har brug for de dristige og optimistiske visioner af tænkere som Leibniz, Schiller, Einstein, Krafft Ehrlicke og Lyndon LaRouche, fordi den kulturelle pessimisme fra Malthus, Nietzsche og Spengler fører til fascisme og krig, mens positive ideer om menneskeheden fører til nye renæssancer og blomstrende perioder i historien. Det er op til os alle, hvilken retning vi tager!

Hvad der foregår er ikke en

rigsretssag, det er et kup.

Den 2. okt (EIRNS)–Præsident Donald Trump tweetede tirsdag aften: “I takt med at jeg lærer mere og mere hver dag er jeg kommet til den konklusion, at det der foregår ikke er en rigsretssag, det er et KUP.”

Dette er præcist tilfældet, hvilket LaRouche-bevægelsen har påpeget – og dokumenteret – i årevis. Og det er også tilfældet, at kuppet køres af det Britiske Imperium og deres amerikanske allierede, hvilket præsidentens advokat, Rudy Giuliani, for nylig tilkendegav ved at pege på den rolle, som MI6-agent Christopher Steele’s løgnagtige rapport udgjorde i forhold til få hele operationen til at løbe af stablen. Justitsminister William Barr og statsadvokat John Durham er nu i Italien for at følge op på spor, som også kan afsløre hele kupoperationen. ‘Ethvert af skovens træer står for at kunne falde’.

LaRouche PAC (Political Action Komité) offentliggør i al hast, en kort rapport, der afslører den mest sårbare flanke i den britiske operation mod præsident Trump: deres eget engagement i “Maidan” statskuppet i Ukraine; som resultat af hvilket kup der blev indført et nynazistisk regime i dette land, lige på grænsen til Rusland.

Briterne er opmærksomme på den fare, som de står overfor, og har kastet al fornuft over bord, herunder, at de gennemtvinger, at Demokraterne i Kongressen tager konsekvenserne forbundet med at bakke op om en rigsretssag, selvom de ved, at dette i mange tilfælde betyder politisk selvmord.

Graden af desperation hos briterne er åbenlys, og dette er direkte relateret til det hastigt fremkommende sammenbrud af deres transatlantiske finansielle system. Fastfrysningen af det amerikanske interbank-lånemarked sluttede ikke med udgangen af 3. kvartal, men fortsætter med uformindsket effekt i denne uge. Og den fysiske økonomi i USA og Europa fortsætter med at styrtdykke; indekset for amerikanske indkøbsledere faldt i september til 47,8 (‘Institute for Supply Management’, alt under 50 indikerer en absolut nedgang) – det laveste punkt i over et årti. Lignende sammenbrud hos produktionsvirksomhederne forekommer i Europa, Japan og Storbritannien.

Sammenlign dette med Kina, hvor fattigdom i det sidste halve århundrede praktisk talt er udryddet; spædbarnsdødeligheden er faldet; den forventede levealder er steget kraftigt; og analfabetisme er næsten forsvundet, da det samlede uddannelsesmæssige og teknologiske niveau er steget markant. Sigende for landets satsning på infrastruktur er, at ‘China Railway Rolling Stock Corporation’, har

bygget et anlæg til at producere magnettog, der er i stand til at nå hastigheder på 600 km/t, samt arbejder på en model, der kan nå maksimale hastigheder på 1.000 km/t!

Link (skrevet på engelsk).

<https://www.larouchepac.com/20191002/joe-biden-and-ukraine-corrupt-dim-witting-agent-british-intelligence>

[Et faseskifte ryster Verden – nu er det LaRouche-tid](#)

Den 1. oktober (EIRNS) –Den 1. oktober markerer 70-årsdagen for oprettelsen af Folkerepublikken Kina. Beijing var scenen for en ekstraordinær festligholdelse med over en million mennesker til stede for at ære den mest spektakulære transformation af en nation i historien. Enkle statistikker viser transformationen – mellem 1949 og i dag er den forventede levealder steget fra 35 til 77 år, spædbørnsdødeligheden faldet fra næsten 250 pr. 1000 – en fjerdedel af alle fødte – til mindre end 10, og analfabetismen er faldet fra 80% til under 1% , hos alle undtagen de ældre.

Og alligevel ignorerer det vestlige etablissement denne forbløffende præstation for i stedet vidt og bredt at 'broadcaste' den voldelige farverevolution, som de selv har finansieret og sat i gang i Hong Kong. I dag satte pøbelen ild til, lukkede ned for og skamferede flere undergrundsstationer og regeringsbygninger, kastede Molotov-cocktails mod politiet og "lykkedes" til sidst med at få "blod på skjorten", som de ønskede, da en maskeret ung, der svingede et jernrør mod en politimand, blev skudt, og befinder sig i kritisk stand i skrivende stund. Hensigten er et regimeskifte i Beijing, idet man prøver at sælge løggen om et umenneskeligt diktatur, der undertrykker sit folk.

Amerikanere, der falder for denne linje i pressen, må reflektere over det faktum, at de samme mennesker, fra både det neokonservative-"højre" og neoliberale "venstre", der driver denne regimeskifte-operation mod Kina under det falske råb om "demokrati", er nøjagtigt de samme mennesker, der kører regimeskifte-operationen mod De Forenede Stater, og hektisk forsøger at få præsident Donald Trump fjernet fra embedet, før det forestående økonomiske sammenbrud rammer det vestlige finansielle system. Begge operationer drives fra

London. De liberale medier, der falbyder løgnene bag rigsretssagen mod præsident Trump, priste i dag åbent den krigsførende John Bolton for hans angreb på Trump for ikke at starte en krig mod Nordkorea, snarere end at forhandle om en fredelig afvikling af atomvåbnene. Sandelig nogle underlige sengekammerater, men ingen overraskelse for dem, der forstår det britiske imperiums 'gang-coungang'-metodik, som længe har været udstillet på EIR's sider.

Det amerikanske folk lugter denne lunte. En faseændring fejer gennem den amerikanske psyke, en forandring, som LaRouche-organisatorerne genkender og mobiliserer over hele landet. Processen med rigsretssag er en panikindsats for at forhindre Trump og hans justitsminister William Barr i at afsløre det forræderiske kupforsøg, der ledes af Obama-administrationen og dets korrupte efterretningsteam, dirigeret af Christopher Steele og hans overordnede i Storbritanniens MI6 og GCHQ (General Communication Head Quarter er den britiske pendant til NSA i USA, red.). Mandag aften identificerede senator Lindsey Graham denne britiske fjende – "Hvis man er bekymret over, at udenlandske mennesker er involveret i vores valg," sagde Graham, "burde man bekymre sig om, at Christopher Steele er ansat af det Demokratiske Parti."

Det amerikanske folk vil heller ikke købe den idé, der tilbydes af den patetiske Greta Thunberg og hendes økofascistiske sponsorer. Hvad de muligvis ikke forstår helt så godt, er, at dette klimahysteri drives af City of London og deres agenter på Wall Street. I dag oprettede Bank for International Settlements (BIS), centralbankernes centralbank', et 'initiativ for grønne obligationer' for at facilitere "forgrønnelsen af finanssystemet", der er sat i gang under ledelse af chefen for Bank of England Mark Carney. Basis for "risikostyring" under denne monstrøse ordning er ikke levedygtigheden af et industri- eller landbrugsprojekt, men hvor meget CO2 der genereres af investeringen. Med andre ord skal investeringer i stort set ethvert moderne industri eller landbrugsprojekt således straffes, – at de helt skæres væk.

Trump har forpligtet sig til internationalt samarbejde i regi af Månen-Mars missionen. Ligesom Kina, Rusland, Indien og de fleste af udviklingslandene har han ikke til hensigt at begå økonomisk selvmord ved at bremse udvikling af fossilt brændstof. I denne uge sendte han chefen for Det Hvide Hus' Kontor for 'National Drug Control Policy' til Kina, hvor de to nationer blev enige om at et tæt samarbejde om at bekæmpe fentanyl-krisen og anden narkotikahandel. Denne form for internationalt samarbejde, der er baseret på ægte videnskab, reelle fremskridt og befolkningens reelle fysiske og mentale sundhed, er faktisk midlerne til at besejre det britiske imperiums planer om folkedrab. Imperiet er bange for at Trump – når boblen brister, hvilket er nært forestående – vil vedtage det fulde LaRouche-program for at gendanne et system efter Hamiltons

principper og forene verden i ånden af 'Den Nye Silkevej'. Vi må sikre os, at deres frygt går i opfyldelse.

'Et utroligt historisk øjeblik: Vi må ændre dagsordenen fuldstændig!' Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-Larouche den 25. september 2019

Den 25. september (EIRNS) – Ovenstående ord blev udtalt af Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag i hendes strategiske webcast for Schiller Instituttet. Overvej de historisk virkelig skelsættende begivenheder fra de sidste 48 timer.

I den anden uge med den amerikanske centralbanks tiltag for at afværge et sammenbrud i banksystemet, blev yderligere 180 milliarder dollars pumpet ind i systemet, hvilket bragte det samlede beløb op på over 500 milliarder dollars med fortsatte opfordringer til at frigive nye kvantitative lempelser (QE), inden hele det vestlige banksystem kollapser. Konkurser brød ud over hele Europa, delvis på grund af kreditstramningen af realøkonomien, hvilket efterlod over 22.000 nye arbejdsløse.

På klimatopmødet i New York, scenen for det mishandlede og forvirrede barn, Greta Thunberg, der af hendes kontrollører blev drevet til et næsten psykiatrisk sammenbrud, mens hun skvaldrede op om dommedag, holdt den faktiske kontrollør af den massive klimasvindel, Mark Carney, chef for Bank of England, hovedtalen ved klimabegivenheden. Alt imens dette arrangement er beregnet på at skabe en ny "grøn" boble til at oppebære den massive derivatboble, er den også beregnet på at skabe en begrundelse, og måske endda love for at forhindre udlån til alt hvad der producerer kulstof – dvs. stort set al industri, transport, byggeri og landbrug i verden. Som det fremgår af den netop offentliggjorte EIR-rapports overskrift: "'CO2-reduktion' er en masseorderisk politik udtænkt af Wall Street og City of London."

I USA står det forrykte Demokratiske Parti over for den snarlige afsløring af Obama-regeringens kriminelle samarbejde med britiske og ukrainske efterretningsnetværk i deres bestræbelser på at vælte USA's præsident, samt fiaskoen i deres "Russiagate"-svindelnummer og deres "racistiske" beskyldninger for at afsætte Trump. Demokraterne bekendtgjorde en offentlig undersøgelse for at indlede en rigsretssag, baseret på Trumps helt normale samarbejde med præsident Volodymyr Zelenskij's nye ukrainske regering. Zelenskij kom til magten på et løfte om at udrydde korrruptionen i det nynazistisk tilpassede Poroshenko-regime, som var kommet til magten gennem et kup i 2014, der blev styret af de samme kredse i Obamas regering, der nu er ivrige for at stoppe Trump.

I Storbritannien, hvor en krise nu sammenlignes med den engelske borgerkrig i

det 17. århundrede, tilranede den nyligt indrettede Højesteret (oprettet af Tony Blair) sig magten fra premierministeren, for at omgøre hans ophævelse af Parlamentet, mens Parlamentet for nylig også bemægtigede sig premierministerens magt ved at presse et lovforslag igennem for at forhindre Brexit. Nu ønsker Boris Johnson et parlamentsvalg, for at "give vælgerne mulighed for at bestemme", men oppositionen blokerer for et valg i den overbevisning (næsten helt sikkert rigtigt), at de ville lide et alvorligt nederlag.

Sagen er, som fru Zepp-LaRouche påpeger, at ingen af disse kriser eller den ekstreme fare for krig mellem atomvåbenmagterne, som menneskeheden nu står overfor, kan løses hvor for sig. Det er et sandhedens øjeblik for menneskeheden, hvor Lyndon LaRouches levned må anerkendes gennem hans renselse af præsident Donald Trump, og hans politik må gennemføres, som de virkelig revolutionerende ændringer de udgør. Systemet kan ikke repareres, det kan kun udskiftes. Donald Trumps fjender er de samme fjender, der fængslede Lyndon LaRouche, men som nu står afslørede med deres forræderiske hensigter. William Weld, den amerikanske advokat der overvågede retsforfølgningen af LaRouche og hans medarbejdere, forsøger nu at indlede en kampagne mod Trump i de republikanske primærvalg – og i denne uge erklærede han Trump skyldig i forræderi og opfordrede til hans henrettelse.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i sit webcast i dag: "Dette er bare helt ude på overdrevet, og folk bør forstå nøjagtig hvem William Weld er. Han var den amerikanske statsanklager i Boston, der var anstifteren i hele sagen mod min afdøde mand, Lyndon LaRouche. Han var gerningsmanden for, hvad Ramsey Clark korrekt kaldte den største uretfærdighed i amerikansk historie. Og han er nu den samme person bag forsøget på at fjerne Trump fra embedet, på den ene eller anden måde".

Jeg tror, at alt dette kan give bagslag," fortsatte hun, "og det fremhæver nødvendigheden af virkelig at gå efter Lyndon LaRouche renselse, fordi denne sag vil give bagslag. Dette kan potentielt bringe hele sandheden frem om, hvad der er foregået i amerikansk politik i de seneste mange årtier. Og jeg kan kun fortælle folk, at dette kommer til at bringe sandheden frem om, hvad der skete, og du burde være indstillet på det og hjælpe os med at få denne sandhed ud."