

**English transcript:
Introduction and Helga Zepp-
LaRouche's keynote speech
at the Schiller Institute's
Danish-Swedish seminar
We Need a New Security And
Development Architecture for
All Nations,
Not a Strengthening of
Geopolitical Blocs,
May 25, 2022**

May 25, 2022 (EIRNS)—Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, opened the online seminar this afternoon:

Your Excellencies and diplomats from many countries on four continents, guest speakers, members and friends of the Schiller Institute, ladies and gentlemen,

Welcome to this seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institutes in Denmark and Sweden, which is also being live streamed on YouTube. The title is, "We Need a New International Security and Development Architecture, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs. NO in the Danish June 1 referendum about abolishing the EU Defense opt-out, and NO to Sweden and Finland joining NATO." I am Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, and I will be the

moderator today.

After the start of the war in Ukraine, a dramatic shift in defense policy has been proposed in three of the Nordic countries. Denmark is having a referendum on June 1 about joining the EU's military activities, and Sweden's and Finland's governments want to join NATO. We think that it is necessary to discuss these issues from a higher standpoint.

Our keynote speaker, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and international chairwoman of the Schiller Institute stated on May 19, that this is the most dangerous moment in world history. There is war in Europe, and many experts are warning that if the war were not ended soon, and a diplomatic solution crafted, and if those advocating increasing the geopolitical confrontation were not politically defeated, the war could escalate to, even, nuclear war. At the same time, the world economy is in crisis.

While the dangers are great, there is hope, because there are solutions in the form of a new security and development architecture, including proposals by the late Lyndon LaRouche, the founder of our political movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the Schiller Institute, for a security agreement modeled on the Peace of Westphalia, combined with increased economic development cooperation between countries.

We have called this meeting to discuss:

- What caused the current extremely dangerous military, and economic crisis.
- Why strengthening the EU military arm with Danish participation, and Sweden and Finland joining NATO would only exacerbate geopolitical conflict, and
- What are the principles upon which we can create a new security and development architecture, for the benefit of all nations and people.

We want to ensure that both the dangers and solutions are known, and that an effective movement is built to stop a further escalation of this war and its economic effects, and prevent future wars and economic destruction. Somehow, humanity must create the conditions where war is not an option, in this era of nuclear weapons.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote

May 25, 2022 (EIRNS)—Here is the Keynote of Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche: We Need a New Security And Development Architecture for All Nations, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs: Why Sweden and Finland Should *Not* Join NATO, and ‘No’ in the Referendum in Denmark to Join EU’s Military,” the online seminar in Denmark and Sweden today. She was introduced by Schiller Institute in Denmark Vice President Michelle Rasmussen, who moderated the seminar.

The video is available here:

On the international Schiller Institute YouTube channel:
https://youtu.be/8Dt9D_D_U4U

On the Danish YouTube channel: <https://youtu.be/1Pji0vjD9Kg>

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hello, good day, Ladies and Gentlemen: As Michelle just said, I have stated that we are facing the most dangerous crisis in the history of mankind. Now, why am I am saying that? Obviously, that includes two world wars in the 20th century, the Cuban Missile Crisis, so it’s a big order. Well, the first reason is the most obvious, for the very first time, we are facing the real danger of a global nuclear war, and if it would ever come to that, it for sure would mean the annihilation of the human species.

In the recent period, the illusion has developed that a limited nuclear war can be fought, and won, or that protracted, hybrid nuclear/conventional war can take place.

This was the subject of a maneuver in January of this year, called "Global Lightning," which had the idea that you have some nuclear bombs, neutron bombs, space war, cyberwar, and this would go on for weeks. Now, the famous nuclear arms specialist, former MIT Prof. Ted Postol has developed all the arguments why this is completely ludicrous, that why, if one uses only one single nuclear weapon, it is the logic of nuclear war, that all will be used.

In the recent months, since the war in Ukraine started, you hear from all kinds of politicians and journalists and who knows who else making reckless talk, saying things like "even if there is the risk of nuclear war, we have to send heavy weapons to Ukraine. We can't be blackmailed." Or, "it won't happen, because nobody would be so foolish to do this." Well, I don't think that that is a convincing argument.

The second reason why I am saying we are in the worst crisis ever, is that we experience a civilizational breakdown, the end of an entire system. Now, this has many elements. We have an immediate danger of an escalation of the war, as a result of the present chicken-game policies conducted by NATO against Russia. We are facing a hyperinflationary blowout of the Western neoliberal financial system, which was long in process, even before the war in Ukraine started. We are looking at a world famine, which according to the United Nations is threatening 1.7 billion people with starvation. That is 20% of the entire human species. The pandemic is not over, and all of this is threatening social chaos as a result, and that chaos, all by itself, could threaten to plunge the world into a war.

If one listens to the Western media, and all kinds of politicians, it is naturally all to be blamed on Putin. He is being given all possible names right now, that he has caused an "unprovoked war of aggression"; that he responsible for world famine; that he is the cause of inflation; and so forth and so on. If you say any argument for the real causes of the

present situation, you are immediately accused of fake news, you are called a "Putin agent," it is denounced as Russia propaganda.

Well, it has very little to do with Ukraine. In reality, this present confrontation is about the world order. It is a fight between an unipolar world, which is really a world empire based on the "U.S.-British special relationship," whereby the Anglo-American hegemon insists that only the so-called "rules-based order" which they have defined is valid; versus a world in which the rise of China and countries associated with Russia and China insist on their own right for economic development.

We are right now at the most precarious moment: The neoliberal system is collapsing. It is not strong enough any more to enforce its will, but the new order is not yet clearly defined. Naturally, in the officially allowed discussion, it is being said that this is a fight between the "democracies" and the "autocratic regimes." Well, right now, if you listen to what certain politicians and people like Stoltenberg are saying, we are heading toward a potential total decoupling between the West, plus the Five Eyes, plus Japan, Australia, and South Korea, versus a part of the world which includes Russia, China, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS, plus many countries that are now trying to become part of the BRICS, which is most of the Global South.

In frantic trips, Blinken is running around the world, trying to convince people to join the faction of the "democracies." President Biden right now is in Asia, doing the same thing. Chancellor Scholz just went to Africa, von der Leyen to India, all in an effort to isolate Russia and China, but it's not working: Because India, Indonesia, Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, and many others do not want to be pulled into a geopolitical confrontation between the two sides. And what we are actually experiencing is a real renaissance of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Well, we should not overlook, given the American policies, the role of the British, which is "Global Britain," which is really a new word for the British Empire, which contrary to the views of many, has only changed its shape, but not its essence. Take, for example, an article by Malcolm Chalmers, Deputy Director General of the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), which happens to be the oldest official think tank associated with the Royal household, and the British military. They describe themselves as the "world's oldest and leading U.K. defense and security think tank." They're proposing a "Cuban Missile Crisis on steroids," which could result over the Ukrainian attempt to retake Crimea, which would make it easier, in their view, to settle the Ukraine-Russia war. And this is the stunning proposition in this article, which has the headline, "This War Still Presents Nuclear Risks—Especially in Relation to Crimea," which was published on May 20 by the RUSI think tank. [<https://rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/war-still-presents-nuclear-risks-especially-relation-crimea>]

Chalmers discusses how Russia could be forced into a nuclear confrontation, by sending evermore sophisticated weapons to Ukraine, from which it would ultimately back down. Chalmers describes NATO's strategy over the last three months as that of "boiling the Russian frog." You all remember the picture—according to the story, I don't think it's actually true—but according to the story, if you throw a frog into boiling water, the frog it will jump out; but if you put the frog into the water pot, when the water is cold, and then you slowly increase the temperature, the frog ends up being boiled without noticing. So he talks about "boiling the Russian frog" by progressively increasing "size and sophistication of the weapons they have been prepared to supply to Ukraine." Because of those weapons, "the next period will see Ukraine reversing most of Russia's recent territorial gains, including Kherson and even Mariupol." That, however, would not occasion a nuclear threat, nor would Ukraine, using those weapons and

territorial gains to destroy bridges, railheads, storage sites, and airbases inside Russia. But should Ukraine move to retake Crimea, strike a "tempting target," of the Kerch Bridge for example, now, that could lead to a "Crimea Missile Crisis," Chalmers argues. "A specific threat to use nuclear weapons in relation to Crimea ... might be viewed by Putin as a way to restore some of his coercive power, even if he (and the U.S.) doubted whether he would deliver on such a threat... If a red line were not accepted by Ukraine, Russia might then feel that it had to consider a series of further escalatory options, such as putting its nuclear forces on higher alert." They are already on alert. "Faced with the alternative of the likely loss of Crimea, Putin might believe that Ukraine (with U.S. encouragement) would be likely to blink first. It would be a moment of extreme peril, with all the parties seeking to understand the intent of each other even as they looked to pursue their national interests.

"Precisely because of the peril inherent in such a situation, a nuclear crisis of this sort could make it easier for leaders to make difficult compromises. Provided that the war was ended and the blockade of Odesa lifted, Ukraine's leaders might be willing to postpone a settlement of the Crimea question. For Putin, the failure of the invasion, and the subsequent success of the Ukrainian counteroffensive, would have been a massive humiliation. But he would at least be able to argue that the might of the Russian strategic arsenal had, at a moment of great national weakness, successfully deterred NATO's designs for dismembering Russia. This could be enough for both sides to avoid the worst outcome of all."

I mean, this is complete insanity, you know! Saying that one has to threaten to retake Crimea, and then get all the nuclear weapons on the highest alert, and then we can sit down and settle. So he calls that a Crimea Cuban Missile Crisis on steroids.

Now, that policy of "boiling the Russian frog," that has not

started three months ago, but that has been the method since 1990, when on Feb. 9, 1990, James Baker III promise to Gorbachev, that NATO would not move one inch eastward. In the entire Yeltsin period, there was a policy to reduce the former superpower into a raw materials exporting nation, with the "shock therapy" of Jeffrey Sachs, and between 1991-1994, the industrial potential of Russia was reduced to only 30%. There is a very important book by Sergei Glazyev, which describes the 1990s, with the title *Genocide: Russia and the New World Order*, because that is what was imposed on Russia at that time.

Now, the crime of Putin is that he tried to reverse that, and had some success with it. The answer was color revolutions, regime change, humanitarian wars, like the 20 years in Afghanistan, where as a result of the hasty retreat of NATO and the U.S. in August, now, there are 24 million people at starvation levels in Afghanistan, exposed to COVID, measles, polio, without adequate medicine. So, if one would have equally detailed TV coverage of Afghanistan for 20 years, like we see it now with Ukraine every day, maybe the world would have been equally upset—or, maybe not, because the Afghanis are not white.

Then you had the Iraq War in 2003, about which Nancy Pelosi admitted publicly that all responsible people knew ahead of time that there were no weapons of mass destruction. You had Libya. Hillary Clinton, during the Durham investigation in the United States, had to admit that the entire basis of Russiagate were all lies. Did one see anything about that in the mainstream media? Absolutely not! At least not in Europe. Then there was Syria. Then you had the 2014 Maidan coup, about which Victoria Nuland bragged, \$5 billion were spent by the State Department on NGOs, and, let's not forget, the Azov Battalion, which media in the West are now saying, there are no Nazis in Ukraine—but it is a documented fact that there are.

Now, Putin, as a result of this “boiling the Russian frog,” over almost 30 years, on Dec. 15 demanded legally binding security guarantees from the United States and NATO. He has not received an answer from the U.S. or NATO on the core demands, only on arms control, but that was not the essence of what he was demanding. The head of the Russian Security Council, Nikolay Patrushev, said that Russia had no other way, because they were threatened in the existence of the statehood of Russia, when they made what they call the “special military operation” in Ukraine. And one can absolutely argue that Russia was in a situation, according to UN Charter Article 51, which is a question of self-defense and not of aggression.

Now, we are facing with Finland and Sweden, the sixth expansion of NATO. That is the answer, which Stoltenberg even brags about. He says, “Putin wanted less NATO, now he gets more NATO.” So the boiling temperature is just being increased.

One has to take this insane policy of causing a Crimea Cuban Missile Crisis, together with another British policy, which was exposed in a paper by the Henry Jackson Society in 2020, which they put again on the front page of the Henry Jackson Society website, which means it’s ongoing policy of that think tank. It is a report outlining a strategy to use the infamous “Five Eyes” alliance—U.K., U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand—as the instrument to force through the decoupling of the West from China. This rabidly anti-Russia, anti-China neocon think tank is run by British intelligence, through among others, the former MI6 Chief Sir Richard Dearlove, who is the main brain of Russiagate, which was completely discredited as a lie; and he was one of the founders of the Henry Jackson Society and is one of its principals today.

So, even the attempt to decouple China from the international system, before consummated, could detonate an economic nuclear bomb upon the entire world economy. China is not just the world’s largest trading power: It’s currently generating the

highest rate of scientific and technological development on the planet, a productive power which the developing sector nations and the collapsing Western nations urgently require if they want to survive. But actual nuclear warfare could also be the result, because part of the Henry Jackson Society strategy is to build up ties with Taiwan leading to its separation from China. China has made abundantly clear that it will respond with overwhelming military force to any attempt to split Taiwan off from the rest of the nation of China. This is as dangerous a proposition as a NATO-backed Ukraine moving to retake Crimea. So, when President Biden made a gaffe in answer to a reporter on his recent trip to Japan, "Would the United States defend Taiwan militarily?" Biden said, again, "Yes." And he had to be correct, again, by the White House.

Now, the Chinese already had editorials where they said, this is not a "gaffe," this is a signal of what is the real intention of the United States. And Chas Freeman, who was Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and he was the official translator for President Nixon in his 1972 trip to China, and a career diplomat, he warned, and called it a colossal mistake for Biden to have made such a stupid statement.

President Biden is currently championing these precisely British strategies on his current trip to Asia. Fresh from celebrating the expansion of NATO, Biden is to unveil a grandiose Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) during his stop in Japan as the highlight of the trip. National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan stated bluntly on Wednesday, May 18, that the message of the IPEF is that "democracies and open societies of the world stand together to shape the rules of the road. We think that message will be heard everywhere. We think it will be heard in Beijing."

Fifty-two U.S. Senators sent Biden off on his trip with instructions that Taiwan be incorporated as one of the "countries" participating in the IPEF, which is clearly not

acceptable from the standpoint of China, because it is a violation of the One China policy.

Now, just today, if you open the media, if you look at the TV, if you look at TV or newspapers, a huge scandal story about pictures from the supposed labor camps in Xinjiang, were “investigated” by a group of international media, that 1 million Uighurs would have been tortured, beaten in labor camps, forced labor, and so forth. Naturally, our so-called Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock immediately had an outcry demanding a transparent clearing up of the accusations. Calls that all relations with China should be cut—after cutting relations with Russia—and that all trade with China should be stopped, now, let’s look at it realistically: China in 2021 was the third largest partner for the EU export of goods, 10.2%, and the largest partner for the EU import of goods, 22.4%; for Germany, it was the largest trading partner for goods in 2021, with a volume of trade of over €245 billion. To cut that would mean total economic suicide, which is already happening with the relations with Russia.

What is the source of this incredible story? The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, one of the leading newspapers in Germany, says, all the photos and data have been made available through Adrian Zenz, a German anthropologist, and longtime Xinjiang observer. Now, this Mr. Adrian Zenz claims that he got all of that from an “unnamed source” who had access to cyber, cyberwar spying and whatnot. Well, that’s a very dubious observation. But Adrian Zenz is not an unknown entity: The blog, The Grayzone, and the very respected investigative journalist Ajit Singh and Max Blumenthal already wrote articles in 2019, after he had come up with a similar story about genocide in Xinjiang, that Mr. Zenz is a “far-right fundamentalist Christian who opposes homosexuality and gender equality, supports ‘scriptural spanking’ of children, and believes he is ‘led by God’ on a ‘mission’ against China.,” because the end-times are near and the rise of the anti-Christ

is also coming. He is on a complete rampage, saying that [there is genocide in] Xinjiang because of a collapse of the demographic curve of the Uighurs, and Lyle Goldstein, who is professor at the Naval War College in the United States, says that such a statement is “ridiculous to the point of being inciting to those who lost relatives in the Holocaust.”

There is ample evidence that there is no “demographic collapse” of the Uighurs in Xinjiang: Just the opposite. There is a 2019 study in the British medical journal *Lancet*, which talks about a massive improvement of life expectancy among the Uighurs, a demographic growth rate which is much higher than that of the Han Chinese, an improvement in maternal health, in infant mortality, and all of this represents “a remarkable success story.”

Zenz’s so-called testimony comes from Uighur exiles who are cultivated by the U.S. State Department. Zenz served as a fellow at the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation in Washington, D.C., which is a right-wing lobbying group born out of the National Captive Nations Committee. Now, that is a very, very interesting connection, because that was founded by Ukrainian nationalist Lev Dobriansky, who is heading this institution whose co-chairman was Yaroslav Stetsko, who was a leader of the OUN-B militia, which is the Nazi group that fought along with German Nazis during the occupation of Ukraine in World War II. Stetsko and his wife had a residence in Munich during the entire postwar period, and led from there the “Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.” After he died, Mrs. Stetsko went to Ukraine and rebuilt the OUN-B, the Bandera organization, in the tradition of the ideas of Stepan Bandera. Now, that is a direct connection to that apparatus, which was heavily led by the Western secret services—Bandera himself joined the MI6 in 1947, and the BND in Munich had a close, at least “knowledge” about these people (to say the least).

Zenz was also deployed by the Jamestown Foundation, a neocon

think tank in D.C., which was founded by CIA director William Casey as an extra-governmental channel to pay Soviet dissidents.

If Germany or other European nations fall for this intelligence operation, which is exactly what the Henry Jackson Society talked about, namely the "Five Eyes" at work, if they follow this, it would be complete economic suicide. Now, even Henry Kissinger, at the age of 99 years, is more reasonable, and at Davos, he said the world has at maximum a window of two months to end the Ukraine war through negotiations, and he appealed to Ukraine that they should agree to a territorial compromise to get peace.

At the Schiller conference on April 9, we presented a completely different approach: There is an alternative to the complete decoupling between the so-called "democracies" and the Global South on the other side. The new system is already emerging rapidly. There are many countries which at the recent foreign ministers' meeting of the BRICS, want to be part of: Argentina, Indonesia, Egypt, Nigeria and many others. You have the BRICS enlarged, you have the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, almost all organizations of the Global South that want to be part of a new international security and development architecture, which basically is the combination of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, together with two other proposals by President Xi Jinping: The Global Development Initiative and the Global Security Initiative, which is actively being implemented.

Now, what we need is such a conference, for a new international security and development architecture, in the tradition of the Peace of Westphalia. Now, the Peace of Westphalia was the recognition of all war parties that if they would continue the war, no one would be left to enjoy the victory, because they would all be dead. And that is why they developed the principle that any peace must be based on the interest of the other. The security interest of every country

on the planet, which today would mean a security architecture emphatically involving Russia and China. And such a conference, must address the causes for such a war danger: Because it is not enough at this point to be against the war. You have to solve the problem that the collapse of the neoliberal financial system is in progress.

Lyndon LaRouche has a unique record that he foresaw what is happening today, the present crisis, already in August 1971, when Nixon ended the old Bretton Woods system, by replacing the fixed-exchange-rate system, with a floating exchange-rate system, and LaRouche predicted at that time, that if you would continue on that road, it would lead to a new depression, the danger of a new war, and fascism. And that is exactly where we are today.

LaRouche proposed Four Laws to solve the crisis. The first step, a global Glass-Steagall banking separation system, must end the casino economy. There must be capital and exchange controls to prevent the speculative manipulation of currencies, which we see right now in much of the world.

Every country must have a National Bank to make credit generation again the question of the sovereign government, and not that of private bankers, in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton. Then, these National Banks must be connected through a credit system which provides long-term, low-interest credit for real investment in the physical economy.

Also, the Fourth Law is that we must have a crash program for fusion technology, which in the recent period has made tremendous progress, and the commercial use of it is visibly on the horizon. Because we need a massive increase in the productivity of the world economy because just the fact that 1.7 billion people are threatened with starvation, that 2 billion have no clean water, is the proof that the present level of productivity has fallen way below the level of maintaining the present world population of 8 billion people.

And there must be international cooperation, not only for fusion technology, but also for space technology and space travel, because that is the vanguard of scientific and technological realm today.

So we are right now confronted with a situation where the leading governments and institutions are challenged: Are we able to solve the problems of the world, are we able to address the problems which threaten the very existence of mankind, or not? Now, the Schiller Institute has proposed for more than 30 years, first, the Eurasian Land-Bridge; the New Silk Road, and in 2013, we proposed the "New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." Please show the slide: Now, this is a blueprint how we can overcome world poverty, how we can eradicate underdevelopment forever, and how can we create a new, modern world health system for every country in the world, which is the only way how we can overcome old and new diseases, this pandemic and threatening new pandemics.

This is absolutely possible, and this is the vision of how the world will look in a few years, anyway, if we avoid the present danger of nuclear war. The development of infrastructure connecting all continents is the natural way how infrastructure development will continue, provided there is peace. So I think that is something we need to put on the agenda for discussion, and the reason why, despite the incredible danger, one can be optimistic, is because we are the human species, we are capable of reason, and we are not barbarians.

Thank you.

Rasmussen: OK, we have 10 minutes now questions to Helga. ... We have a question from Elena. While we're waiting for Elena, we have a question from Jens Jørgen Nielsen, one of our speakers.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Thank you for a very good presentation. I essentially agree with you. I have one question. As you may

know, I live in Denmark, where we will have a referendum in a week's time, about the European Union: We are discussing in our country for the time being, the role of the European Union and whether it should have an army, how should we have security. I would like a few words: How do you think about the European Union in this context? Because I am somehow skeptical, but I would like to hear your opinion on the European Union and the development right now of the European Union in this context? And also specifically the question of the European military arm, which is the subject of referendum? And the policy toward Ukraine and Russia?

Zepp-LaRouche: When there was a referendum about the EU Constitution in France and Holland 2005, which was defeated, because the majority voted against it. And then they shifted it to the Lisbon Treaty, because by not calling it a "constitution" but by calling it a "treaty," it did not require a vote. So this was decided in great secrecy, but we were extremely closely watching it at the time. And if you look at the Charter of the EU as it was agreed upon in Lisbon in December 2007, it is practically interwoven with NATO, in such a degree that the Article 5 of NATO practically also involves the EU. In other words, when you join the EU, you are practically also part of whatever NATO does. And the character of NATO has also dramatically changed, in the last 30 years, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In the time of the Soviet Union, it was a defensive apparatus against the Warsaw Pact. But in the recent period, it has turned into a completely anti-Russian Russophobic alliance, and therefore, when, in November 2013, when the Ukraine government under Viktor Yanukovich refused to join the EU Association Agreement, it was clear that if Ukraine would join the EU, it would give NATO access to the Black Sea, and that is why he opted out in the last moment.

So, I think that that is an important thing to keep in mind. And the fact that Ursula von der Leyen is at the forefront of

all of the policies which I described as British, in my various examples, such as the fight of so-called democracies and so-called autocratic regimes, when she is talking about that every day: She went to India talking like that.

I think the present EU has completely lost touch with the interest of its member-states. I think they have become a gigantic waterhead of a bureaucracy in Brussels which makes for the most part completely ridiculous decisions and orders and rules which are absolutely contrary to the interest of the member countries. And I actually have called for Germany to move out of the EU, because we don't need a bureaucracy to have a unified Europe! We could have a Europe of the Fatherlands, in the spirit of Charles de Gaulle! We could work together for a joint mission to contribute to shaping a new world order in a positive way: We could do that by having national sovereign governments just working together. You don't need this bureaucracy. That is my view, and I would just advise anybody who has an interest in their own sovereignty to not join this colossus.

Rasmussen: Elena, why don't you ask your question now?

Elena: Thank you so much. I find everything that Madam Helga said very, very interesting. And of course, at the moment, as I am very interested in the situation between Ukraine and Russia, my optimistic feeling is that Russia is going to come to a solution with Ukraine. Because as I have heard today, Putin has been somehow winning in the territories. So most likely something good will happen.

However, I think what Madam said is so beautiful, I would like to have something to read if possible. Because my connection was not very good, and I was not able to hear well. However, I would be very grateful if Madam could let me have what she said in a written form, that I can read and study. And I can write an article about what she has said, what are the goals of this new architecture and let other people to know about

it.

Rasmussen: Elena we will have a transcript of Helga's comments, and we can send those to you and all the participants. And also the video of this conference will be available to send around.

We have one more questioner, Kwame. We can take a short question.

Kwame: I'm a Swede. Thank you for a nice presentation. My question, because I don't know: Would you say that China is united and in full control of the Chinese Communist Party? Or, are there some Chinese oligarchs that have good connections with their American counterparts? As for they send some money into the [inaud 51:09] laboratory, maybe to somehow get them connected to the globalists in the Western hemisphere. So, my question is, does the Chinese Communist Party have full control of the country?

Zepp-LaRouche: I would say, absolutely yes. And I just should say something, because right now, when you say "Communist," some people fall completely into a coma and have hysterical outbursts. I mean, the Communist Party of China is, in my view—and I don't even think that they would agree with that—but I think they're 90% Confucian, in the tradition of the ancient Chinese traditions and philosophy, which influenced Chinese policy for more than two millennia. And naturally, there is an element of Marxism and communism, but it's a meritocracy.

The way people look at the CPC in the West is completely uninformed, and I can only—my best way of answering is that I was in China for the first time, in 1971, in the middle of the Cultural Revolution, and I could travel around in Shanghai, Tientsin, Qingdao, Beijing, I could visit the countryside: And I saw a country which was really distraught! People were poor, the conditions were very terrible. The beautiful garden of the

Summer Palace had been painted all red by the Revolutionary Guards. In any case, this was 51 years ago, and when you go to China now, it is so developed! They have 40,000 km of fast train system, of which nobody in the United States or Europe can even dream, because we have nothing like that! China has made an incredible development: 850 million people have been lifted out of poverty. And I could say many, many more things.

Deng Xiaoping coined the term “judging truth from facts.” And if you look at the facts of the gigantic development of China in the last 40 years, in particular, then this Communist Party has done something right. And if you travel to China, and study Chinese history, and meet people in all ranks of life, professors, students, people living in the countryside, other professions, you go to restaurants, and you see how people live, you find a population which is primarily content. They’re optimistic: They’re not like the Europeans and they’re for sure not like the Germans, who are completely pessimistic, and think nothing can function and you can’t do anything anyway. No. That is not the view in China. They are optimistic; they have, to a very large extent, trust in the government. And I think that the Chinese model, which the West is now regarding as a big competitor and threat, the Chinese model is doing something right, which the West is not doing right! And rather than opposing it, we should go to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and say: We should respect each other, even if the other one has a different social system, and even if the other one has a different way of doing things, according to their history, and their tradition. And I think then, we can absolutely peacefully live together. And that is my stated view, and I think all the slanders about China are really absolutely unfounded, and in particular, this present campaign by this very dubious Adrian Zenz, we should squash before it really takes hold.

Rasmussen: All right, thank you very much Helga! We really appreciate your very in-depth discussion.