

Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler ved kinesisk-europæisk online-seminar, tilskynder til fire-magts topmøde.

Den 14. juni (EIRNS) – Tre dage før Donald Trump indtrådte som præsident for USA, den 20. januar 2017, fortalte Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin sagligt på en pressekonference i Moskva, at den kommende amerikanske præsident, allerede før han havde aflagt embedsedden, blev udsat for et kupforsøg i stil med regimeskiftet i Ukraine.

"Efter min mening", udtalte Putin, "er der flere mål; nogle er indlysende. Det første er at undergrave legitimiteten af den valgte præsident for USA... Det ser ud til, at de har trænet til dette i Kiev, og nu er klar til at organisere en 'Maidan' i Washington, for ikke at lade Trump indtræde i embedet. Det andet mål er at binde hænderne og fødderne på den nyvalgte præsident i forbindelse med gennemførelsen af hans løfter under valgkampagnen til det amerikanske folk og det internationale samfund".

Putin henviste klart til Trumps løfter om at etablere gode samarbejdsrelationer med blandt andet Rusland og Kina – et prospekt, som det dødsmerkede britiske imperium og deres amerikanske allierede betragtede som en eksistentiel trussel mod deres kontrol over planeten.

I går, i et interview der fandt sted den 14. juni med Rossiya-1 TV, vurderede Putin den aktuelle situation i USA og udtalte sig atter ligefremt: "Det der har fundet sted, er faktisk en manifestation af en slags dyb indre krise. Vi har observeret dette i lang tid, lige fra det øjeblik, hvor den nuværende præsident tiltrådte, da han vandt klart,

demokratisk, men den tabende side udtænkte alle mulige slags eventyr – alt hvad der kunne rejse tvivl om hans legitimitet”.

I takt med at USA og verden hvirvles rundt i en malstrøm af økonomiske, politiske og sociale kriser, er der ikke meget, som briterne frygter mere end udsigten til et firemagts-topmøde mellem lederne af USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – som formuleret af Lyndon LaRouche i lang tid. Det var netop den meddelelse, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og præsident for Schiller Instituttet, præsenterede på podiet ved et kinesisk-europæisk online-seminar den 12. juni mellem byer fra Zhejiang-provinsen (Kina) og Øst- og Centraleuropa: ‘Zhejiang Virtual Expo in Digital Service Trade–IT Telecommunication Technologies Services Session’.

Zepp-LaRouches tale bar titlen ”Bælte- og Vejinitiativet i verden efter COVID-19: Udfordringer og muligheder og en opfordring til et nyt paradigme i internationale forhold”, og blev hørt under panelet: “Diskussion om den nye mekanisme for samarbejde mellem lande”. Uddrag følger:

”Udbruddet af coronavirus-pandemien har ændret verden på måder, som meget få mennesker havde forestillet sig for kun et halvt år siden. Det har blandt andet afsløret sårbarheden af en verden, der i flere årtier er blevet domineret af de finansielle institutioner i det nyliberale monetære system. Meget brutalt er det blevet udstillet, at privatiseringen af sundhedssystemet i de transatlantiske lande har efterladt disse samfund uforberedte med utilstrækkelig forsyninger af beskyttelsesmasker og tøj, ventilatorer, intensivafdelinger, testkapacitet, sporingsanordninger osv.

”I udviklingslandene er virkningerne af pandemien, som stadig vokser der, med fraværet af effektive sundhedssystemer katastrofalt, som vi nu er vidner til i lande som Brasilien og Chile. Ifølge ILO er 60% af den globale arbejdsstyrke beskæftiget i den såkaldte uformelle økonomi, hvilket betyder, at folk lever fra hånden og til munden, og den økonomiske

nedlukning, der blev indført som et resultat af pandemien, truer umiddelbart selve eksistensen af disse mennesker. David Beasley fra 'Verdens Fødevareprogram' har gentagne gange advaret om, at som et resultat af krisen i fødevareproduktionen, der er blevet forværret af pandemien og græshoppeplagen, der nu rammer flere lande i Afrika og Asien, vil verden snart blive ramt af en hungersnød af 'bibelske dimensioner' og dræbe 300.000 mennesker om dagen, hvis der ikke gøres noget ved det på kort sigt.

"Det var ikke coronavirus, der forårsagede pandemien, det var manglen på reel industriel udvikling. Som de effektive foranstaltninger, der blev iværksat af den kinesiske regering i Wuhan og Hubei-provinsen, har vist, blev virusset bragt under kontrol; og hvis enhver nation på denne planet havde haft et lignende sundhedssystem, ville coronavirusset aldrig have forvandlet sig til en pandemi, eller i det mindste kunne det have været inddæmnet i meget stor udstrækning. Allerede i 1973 nedsatte min afdøde mand, økonomen Lyndon LaRouche, en biologisk arbejdsgruppe for at undersøge virkningen af IMF's og Verdensbankens monetaristiske politik på sundheden og den forventede levealder i udviklingslandene. Denne arbejdsgruppe producerede adskillige store omfattende undersøgelser i 70'erne og 80'erne, som påpegede, at nedsættelsen af befolkningernes levestandard gennem generationer, forårsaget af IMF's såkaldte 'betingelser', uundgåeligt ville føre til genoplivning af gamle sygdomme og udbruddet af nye, samt pandemier.

"Nu er 'den store krise' her, og vi har de samtidige kriser med pandemien, en større krise i landbruget, faren for hungersnød, og sidst men ikke mindst, endnu en krise i det finansielle system, der truer med at blive meget større end krisen i 2008. Det burde være klart, at en fortsættelse af den hidtil førte politik, kun kan føre til kaos, potentielt en global katastrofe og et dyk ned i et nyt mørkt århundrede, værre end det 14. århundrede i Europa ...

"Der er et alternativt perspektiv! Krisen i hele det menneskelige samfund er så enorm, at kun en topstyret løsning kan fungere. Jeg har siden begyndelsen af det indeværende år opfordret til et topmøde med lederne af de fire vigtigste lande: Kina, Rusland, Indien og USA. Verden har brug for en løsning, der tager fat på alle de ovennævnte problemer med at etablere et helt nyt paradigme af relationer mellem nationer. Det første skridt bør naturligvis være at tackle den truende fare for et økonomisk sammenbrud ved at etablere et nyt kreditsystem i Bretton Woods-systemets tradition, som det var Franklin D. Roosevelts hensigt, nemlig at give store langfristede kreditter til industrialiseringen af udviklingslandene. For at bekæmpe pandemien må det første skridt være opbygningen af et nationalt sundhedssystem i hver eneste nation på planeten, for medmindre den underliggende årsag til underudvikling er afhjulpet, er der ingen garanti for, at der ikke snart vil komme nye virusudbrud, der fører til nye pandemier, hungersnød og plager. Opførelsen af et sådant sundhedssystem i hvert land kan være det første skridt til at skabe 1,5 milliarder nye produktive job...

"Et topmøde mellem præsident Xi, præsident Trump, præsident Putin og premierminister Modi kunne vedtage en sådan sundhedsnødplan, en 'Sundheds-Silkevej', og dermed reagere på det akutte behov for hele menneskeheden, og indføre en ny æra af samarbejde i menneskehedens historie".

Vent ikke på katastrofen: Skab betingelserne for sejr uden forsinkelse

Den 12. juni (EIRNS) – Løsningen på verdens mest presserende problemer må lokaliseres i menneskets enestående evne til at opdage sandheder om det reelle, fysiske univers, og til at anvende denne viden til at forbedre levestandarden, kulturen, samt i antallet af tilegnelser af nye opdagelser. Lyndon LaRouche, den amerikanske økonom og præsidentkandidat i flere ombæringer, udviklede en retning indenfor økonomi baseret på fundamentale opdagelsers ikke-kvantitative, transcendentale kvalitet, og byggede en bevægelse viet til at skabe et økonomisk system i overensstemmelse med alle menneskers kreativitet og værdighed.

”LaRouche-planen til at genåbne den amerikanske økonomi: Verden behøver 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job” er den bedste vejledning til at skabe en økonomisk fremtid, og dennes indhold fortjener nærmere granskning og refleksion. En bestræbelsesværdig, opnåelig vision for fremtiden – med et internationalt samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – er en desperat fornødenhed. Og der er ingen tid at spille!

Enorme økonomiske forskydninger rammer, eller truer med at ramme, den transatlantiske sektor. I USA står de midlertidige foranstaltninger til at øge arbejdsløshedsunderstøttelsen, forbyde tvangsudsættelser, udsætte betalinger af studielån og fryse betalinger på boliglån, til at blive afsluttet i perioden mellem juli og slutningen af oktober. Ordre på maskinværktøj er en tredjedel lavere end for et år siden – et fald som begyndte *før* coronavirusset skabte storstilede dyk i økonomisk aktivitet.

Kaos bliver bevidst sluppet løs i USA, gennem voldelige protester over de seneste uger, i kølvandet af drabet på George Floyd og etableringen i Seattle af den såkaldte Capital Hill Autonome Zone, der er blevet oprettet som en provokation mod Præsident Trump, for at teste om han tør bruge militæret, om nødvendigt, for at garantere evnen til "at håndhæve USA's love."

Over hele verden fortsætter corona-pandemien med at udbrede sig. I Australien, Kina, Kroatien, Island, Irland, Schweiz og Thailand (for at nævne nogle eksempler) har man virusset under kontrol. Men i Argentina, Bangladesh, Brasilien, Chile, Ægypten, Etiopien, Indien, Indonesien, Mexico, Saudi-Arabien, Ukraine og Venezuela fortsætter antallet af nye, bekræftede smittetilfælde med at sætte rekorder, næsten dagligt. I USA, i de områder som først blev ramt hårdest, såsom New Jersey og New York, har man set antallet af nye smittede styrtdykke, som et resultat af opmærksomheden på farerne fra virusset, samt en god overholdelse af sundhedsforanstaltningerne. Men antallet fortsætter med at stige i stater som Texas, Arizona, og, efter "Memorial Day", i Florida. I de fire uger, efter Arizona den 15. maj ophævede dens ordre om at blive hjemme, er antallet af COVID-19-patienter, som er afhængige af respiratorer, steget med 400%.

De strategiske spændinger fortsætter ligeså: I fredags godkendte Senatets Komité for de Væbnede Styrker i USA 6 milliarder dollars til Forsvarsinitiativet i Stillehavet, der sigter på militært at omringe og isolere Kina; i onsdags fløj russiske bombefly indenfor 8 sømil af USA's territoriale luftrum; og USA's fortsatte insistensen på at inkludere Kina i forhandlingerne om at forlænge den Nye START-traktat for at begrænse atomvåben-arsenaler, muliggør at den kunne udløbe til februar, 2021.

Disse spændinger kan ikke overvindes blot ved at protestere, om det så handler om politivold, om afmonteringen af

patriarkalske, kapitalistiske systemers heteronormative systemiske racisme og undertrykkelse, eller om regler for ansigtsmasker er et angreb på enhvers himmelsendte ret til at indtage ilt.

Glem slagordene! Tag tiden til ærligt at reflektere over den fundamentale forskel mellem den menneskelige race og alle andre kendte livsformer, og over den kreative tankes naturlige proces, som alene finder sted i det individuelle menneskes sind. Arbejd på at gøre disse karaktertræk til den centrale kilde for din identitet og for det økonomiske system, som må lede os ind i fremtiden.

**Videoer af tre paneler,
invitation og afskrift af
Panel I:
Schiller Instituttets
internationale konference
lørdag den 27. juni:
Vil menneskeheden blomstre op
eller gå til grunde?**

Fremtiden kræver et 'Fire-magts topmøde' nu

Et afskrift på engelsk af Panel I findes nedenunder.

Ovenover: Panel I: "Til erstatning for geopolitik: principperne for statsmandskab"

Schiller Instituttets stifter og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche og internationale diplomater, amerikanske valgte politikere, osv.

- Keynote speaker: Helga Zepp-LaRouche: "The Alternative to a Dark Age and a Third World War"
- Dr. Jin Zhongxia, Executive Director for China, IMF; Washington, D.C., United States: "The Fundamentals of East-West Philosophic Relations"
- Boris Meshchanov, Counselor, Russian Federation Mission to the UN, New York City, United States: "Russia's Global Economic Perspective, Post COVID-19"
- Dr. Joycelyn Elders, former Surgeon-General of the United States
- Ding Yifan, Deputy Director, Research Institute of World Development, China Development Research Center, China: "A Chinese Perspective on a Post-COVID Paradigm"
- Daisuke Kotegawa, former Executive Director for Japan at the IMF; Research Director, The Canon Institute, Japan
- Mayor DeWayne Hopkins (fmr); Former Mayor, Muscatine, Iowa; The Mayor's Muscatine-China Initiative Committee, United States: "A View from the Iowa Farm Belt: the Muscatine-China Cultural Connection"
- Question and Answer session

Panel II: "Producenter i Verden, foren jer! Hvorfor et program for skabelse af 1,5 milliarder produktive job kan afslutte

krig, hungersnød, fattigdom og sygdom"

Jacques Cheminade, lederen af LaRouche-bevægelsen i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat, og landbrug, fagforening og politiske ledere fra Afrika, Sydamerika og USA.

- Jacques Cheminade, President Solidarité & Progrès, France: "How Food Production Can Unite the World"
- Diogène Senny, Founder of the Pan-African League: "Thrive or perish: An Introduction to the Geopolitics of Hunger and Poverty"
- Walter Formento, Director, Center for Political and Economic Research, Argentina; "South America on the New Multipolar Road"
- Dr. Kirk Meighoo, political economist, broadcaster, and former Senator, Trinidad & Tobago: "The Caribbean's True Importance in the Making and Re-Making of the Modern Global Economy"
- Mark Sweazy, former UAW trade union leader, United States: "Returning the U.S. Work Force to a Culture of Scientific Progress"
- Robert L. Baker, Schiller Institute, United States
- Mike Callicrate, Board of Directors, Organization for Competitive Markets, Owner Ranch Foods Direct, United States: "Food Unites People Around the Planet"
- Alicia Díaz Brown, Citizens Movement for Water, Sonora, Mexico: "Let Us Return to the Best Moments of the U.S.–Mexico Relationship"
- Question and Answer session

Panel III: Ungdommens opgave

Daniel Burke, senatorkandidat i New Jersey, USA fra LaRouche-bevægelsen, og universitets og andre ungdomsledere fra Frankrig, Yemen, Colombia, Mexico, Tanzania, og USA.

- Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Institute, Germany: Opening Remarks
- Keynote: Daniel Burke, Schiller Institute, United States: "If You Sat Where They Sit, What Would You Do?"
- Carolina Domínguez Cisneros, Mexico; Sebastián Debernardi, Peru; Andrés Carpintero, Colombia; Daniel Dufreine Arévalo, Mexico: "Getting Back the Great Ideas That Were Stolen From Us"
- Franklin Mireri, YouLead Partnerships Coordinator, Tanzania: "The Greatest Want of the World is for True Leaders."
- Sarah Fahim, Student from Morocco Studying in Paris, France
- Chérine Sultan, Institut Schiller, Paris, France
- Lissie Brobjerg, Schiller Institute, United States: "Are You a Large-Scale Geological Force?"
- Areej Atef, Education Committee Vice President of BRICS Youth Parliament, Sana'a, Yemen: "Youth of the World Face Two World Systems: The Old and the New"
- Jose Vega, Bronx, NY: "A New Space CCC"
- Youth Day of Action Invitation Video
- Question and Answer session

Invitationen:

Efter vore vellykkede internetkonferencer den 25.-26. april samt den 9. maj på V-E-dagen, vil vores næste konference være den 27. juni, kl. 16:00. Hjælp venligst med at sprede denne meddelelse bredt blandt venner, sociale medier osv.

Siden januar har Schiller Instituttets formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche insisteret på, at USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien skal mødes. Deres ledere må vise det statsmandskab, der kræves for at overvinde åndsforladt koldkrigerisk propagandataktik og geopolitik, og tage del i en hastemission for at opbygge en fuldt funktionsdygtig sundhedsinfrastruktur for verden, især for Sydamerika, Afrika og dele af Asien, der kræver opførelse af hospitaler, vandværker, vejsystemer og

uddannelsesfaciliteter til unge læger, sygeplejersker og lægeassistenter.

I over 35 år, og især i de sidste syv år, har Schiller Instituttet kæmpet for netop den slags statsmandskunst.

Verden må nu vælge mellem to modstridende syn på menneskehedens næste 50 år:

Et synspunkt kræver at vende den forestående affolkning af jorden på grund af globale pandemier. Disse pandemier er uden undtagelse resultatet af mislykkede finansielle, økonomiske og militære politikker, og især af den fuldstændige deregulering af de finansielle markeder igennem de sidste tre årtier. Det andet, modstridende synspunkt, kræver en 'Green New Deal' - energipolitik, som umiddelbart vil forværre planetens nuværende sundhedskrise og kunne muligvis endda resultere i døden for størstedelen af den menneskelige race.

Vi må tage afstand fra denne affolkningspolitik, organisere den transatlantiske verden for at tilslutte sig det nye kulturelle paradigme, der nu føres an af Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ, og bevæge verden til det som Schiller Instituttet har kaldt 'Verdens Landbroen'.

Netop mens Kina igennem præsident Xi Jinping's Bælte- og Vejinitiativ har engageret 150 nationer i et forsøg på at stoppe fattigdom i hele verden, har malthusianske økonomiske kræfter i USA og Europa, der er imod dette, stigmatiseret Kina som 'virussets udspring' – en slet skjult genoplivning af den racistiske doktrin for 100 år siden kaldet 'den gule fare'.

I 1923 skrev medlem af det britiske Overhus Lord Bertrand Russell:

"De hvide befolkninger i verden vil snart ophøre med at stige i tal. De asiatiske racer vil blive flere, og negrene stadig flere, før deres fødselsrater falder tilstrækkeligt til at stabilisere deres antal uden hjælp af krig og pestilens.

Indtil det sker, kan fordelene som socialismen sigter mod kun delvist realiseres, og mindre reproduktive racer bliver nødt til at forsvare sig mod de mere reproduktive ved metoder, der er oprørende, selvom de er nødvendige”.

Verden, og især vores ungdom, der skal opbygge planeten i de kommende 50 år, må så stærkt som muligt afvise sådanne ideer og politikker for at pålægge systemisk tilbageståenhed globalt, herunder i forklædning af “Green New Deal”. Der kan ikke længere være nogen tvivl om, at verdens mest avancerede teknologier – i rummet, i fremstillingsindustrien, i minedrift, i landbruget – straks, i kraft af hasteprogrammer, må anvendes mod den globale pandemi og den økonomiske krise, som ellers kan føre til snesevis af millioner døde og fordrevne på kort sigt. En sådan massedød forekommer allerede i Brasilien og andre nationer. ‘Verdensfødevareprogrammet’ advarer om, at vi om nogle måneder vil kunne se så mange som 300.000 mennesker dø af sult dagligt, primært i udviklingslandene.

Et nyt dokument, **‘The LaRouche Plan to Reopen the U.S. Economic; The World Needs 1.5 Billion New, Productive Jobs’**, (LaRouche-planen til genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi; Verden har brug for 1.5 milliarder nye produktive job) skitserer, hvordan denne tragedie kan vendes ved at sætte den største økonomiske ekspansion i menneskets historie, herunder 50 millioner produktive job i henholdsvis USA og Europa.

Da den sydafrikanske præsident Ramaphosa lykønskede Elon Musk, der har dobbelt sydafrikansk-amerikansk statsborgerskab, med den vellykkede gennemførelse af den amerikanske mission til Den internationale Rumstation, udtrykte han den form for nationalt lederskab, der kræves for endeligt at bringe globalt tyranni med globalisering og geopolitik til ophør. De seneste gennembrud inden for videnskab, gjort tilgængelig for de mest nødlidende, kan nu indlede en ny æra, der kunne kaldes ‘menneskelig økonomi’. Som Lyndon LaRouche redegjorde: “I

stedet for disse for nærværende fejlslagne ideer, må vi antage en forestilling om økonomi, hvis målestok er funktionelt i overensstemmelse med det afgørende særpræg: princippet om kreativ fornuft”.

Denne stræben efter økonomisk retfærdighed, især for de af verdens børn, der er født ind i livstruende omstændigheder, vil have den yderligere fordelagtige virkning at tage fat på andre problemer med social retfærdighed, der for nylig har fået så megen international opmærksomhed.

Kontakt os for at få tilsendt udgaver med tysk, fransk eller spansk oversættelse. Ring +45 53 57 00 51

Panel I afskrift:

Panel 1: “Instead of Geopolitics: The Principles of Statecraft”

DENNIS SPEED: My name is Dennis Speed, and I want to welcome you to today’s international conference and webcast. We had a technical problem for a moment, and now we think we’ve solved that problem.

Today’s conference is called “Will Humanity Prosper or Perish? The Future Demands a ‘Four-Power’ Summit Now.” We’re going to begin today by the late economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche. He was keynoting a panel of the Schiller Institute – this was in Germany – and the name of the particular panel on that occasion was “Rescuing Civilization from the Brink: The Role of Classical Culture. An Imperative for Mankind.”

LYNDON LAROUCHE video:

This is truly the most important of all strategic questions we have to face today: the fact that the human species is absolutely unique in its capabilities. There’s no other known

species in the universe, ever known to have existed, or could exist – even though we have not fully explored, of course, the Crab Nebula or similar parts of the great galaxy which we're involved in, called the Milky Way. There may be many species with cognitive powers out there. Because the Solar System of which we are immediately a product, although always under the control of the galactic processes – and we know a good deal, today, about those kinds of things: Our organization in the United States has spent a good deal of effort on concentrating, inclusively, on just this question: *How old is life?* How long has life existed in this galaxy, or within some place in it? What is the nature of mankind, who's been on this planet only for a few million years? There was no human being on this planet, to the best of our knowledge, until a few million years ago.

And yet, we're talking about billions of years of this galaxy, during which all living processes known to us have come into existence. And all life is creative, but there's a sad part: that over 95% of all known living species have been rendered extinct, *as failures*, in their time. The question, therefore: *Why, in these times, when we have entered a period in which there will be more great kills of living processes, at this phase of the movement of the Solar System through the galaxy, why should we be so presumptuous as to imagine that human life is not about to disappear as the dinosaurs did in the last great kill?*

What is there about human beings that says they're not just another animal species, ready to get to the chop in the course of their time?

The answer is a very little-known question. Most people don't have an inkling of what the answer is! As a matter of fact, our societies are run on the basis of people who have no inkling what the human species is! All they can come up with is an explanation of some kind of an animal, with animal characteristics of pleasure and pain, and things like that,

that might control the behavior of this animal.

So why should we expect that we have a right to claim that the human species is going to survive the approaching point of a great kill in the course of the movements of the Solar System up and below and around the galaxy we inhabit? How do we know that this 62-million-year cycle is not going to take the human species away, as it's taken so many away before? And then, before that, and then before that?

And here you have all these people talking about *politics*; they're talking about issues of politics; they're talking about "practical opinion," and public opinion, and differentiations in customs, and all those kinds of things! And here we are: We're approaching the time of the great kill, where everything about us may suddenly disappear; so what are we worried about? If we're going to disappear, why do we worry? Why do we fight it? [laughter]

What is there in us, that is not in other living species known to us? That might, somehow, miraculously, pronounce a destiny for our human species which we grant to no other living species? The name for that specific quality, which we know in the human species, which does not exist in any other known living species: There's a quality of creativity, which is absolutely unique to mankind. And if you're not creative, and if you don't understand creativity, you haven't got a ticket to survival yet! Because creativity won't save you, unless you use it. [end video]

SPEED: We're continuing to experience highly unusual technical difficulties. There were some problems in some of our international connections...

As soon as we have this technical problem somewhat under control, we're going to go directly to our keynote speaker, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. We are about now 15 minutes behind schedule, but we'll be able to do certain things to make that

up. We want to apologize again, so that people have an idea, this is a highly unusual circumstance, we're not going to talk a lot about that right now. Let me simply say so that the format is known, we are going to have first our keynote speech, followed by representatives from China and from Russia, and several others. The topic of the panel, as we announced before, is "Instead of Politics, the Principles of Statecraft."

Let me say about the Schiller Institute and what we've been doing with this conference, or this process of conferences, because it actually began back in April of this year. April 25th and 26th, we held the first of what is now the three conferences. These conferences were devoted to the idea of the creation of a Four-Power summit – Russia, China, India, and the United States. There are various processes that have been able to move in that direction already, and we are in a process today. In fact, among many of the things we'll be talking about today is a new proposal that has been put forward by President Vladimir Putin of Russia to that effect. Let me also say that for people in the United States in particular, the crisis that has been on people's minds, as exhibited in the social and political crises in the streets of America, is merely one predicate of a broader international process. And that's what why we're starting today with this first panel, to give that broader overview, and to allow you and others to become part of an international operation to reverse that circumstance.

Now, as I said, I think the primary problem that we are dealing with is that we are trying to make sure that the international contacts are also connected. We have translators and we have a need to make sure that everything is moving in sync; that's one of the particular problems of this kind of international operation.

Let me say one other thing concerning the excerpt that you saw from Lyndon LaRouche, which was done in 2011. LaRouche's

conception there concerning the idea that was strategy; the idea of thinking about strategy from the standpoint of a galactic process, and then looking then – and only then – at the various political episodes that were occurring on Earth, was a way of trying to actually look at what he often also referred to often as intelligence. He was the founder in 1974, of *Executive Intelligence Review*. And that publication, which is still published to this day, specialized in trying to make his method of intelligence and investigation available generally in American analysis.

This was very successful, in particular, in the drive for certain policy changes that occurred in the United States; most notably, that of March 23, 1983, with the creation of the Strategic Defense Initiative. This was the product of a process of negotiation that LaRouche carried out as a back-channel negotiator with the then-Soviet Union, and with the knowledge of the National Security Council and then-President of the United States Ronald Reagan. That policy, and the creation of that policy, and that dialogue with the then-Soviet Union, is, in one sense, not a model for now, but is the same sort of process that must needs be allowed to continue and to happen between President Donald Trump, President Vladimir Putin, President Xi Jinping, and Prime Minister Narendra Modi, among others. The idea of the Four-Power summit is not exclusionary. It doesn't say that other powers are not involved. In fact, recent proposals have amplified or expanded the number of persons that might, in fact, be involved.

But what is important to understand is that, as LaRouche once said in another document published in 1980 called "A Dialogue with Leonid Brezhnev," then the head of the then-Soviet Union, "The Content of Policy Is the Method By Which It Is Made." So, in the clip that you've seen, there, today, the idea of culture and the idea of what a culture actually is, is a strategic matter. In the case of the United States, and in the

case of the present-day United States, these matters of a cultural paradigm-shift are actually often far more important than the particular political issues that people talk about. For example, if you look at today's United States, the issue of our having gone away from being a productive culture, in fact the most productive economy in the world's history, between the period in particular of the 1933 resurgence of America that occurred under Franklin Roosevelt, through the period of 1945, and then the subsequent period of 1944 through 1971 with the Bretton Woods system. It's been the need to return to that, and to return to these ideas – those that had come into currency under Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency – that is the template for what we are saying should be the character of discussion between President Trump, President Putin, President Xi, and Prime Minister Modi.

I want to make one thing clear to everyone as we are about to transition, to get to the keynote, that in thinking about what we are all involved in today – namely, that global pandemic condition created by the coronavirus: Clearly what has happened is, there is a need for all of us to change our axioms. That the idea of international cooperation among sovereign, independent nation-states, for the purpose of creating a worldwide alternative to what's otherwise going to be, perhaps, the destruction of civilization – not because absolutely everybody would die of the coronavirus or something like that – but the cascading effects and the interconnected effects of a global pandemic condition that we don't really medically understand, plus the ongoing problem of the financial virus that has, of course, plagued humanity particularly since the time of the collapse of the Bretton Woods system, this combination would create a circumstance in which only all nations working together can possibly achieve an actual reconciliation of this process.

I think we're about ready to begin.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche is the founder of the Schiller Institute –

that was back in 1984. She also, of course, is the wife of the late economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche, who passed away in February 2019. She played a crucial, decisive role in a set of conversations and dialogues with the government of China during the period of 1993 to 1996; launching the process that became what we now know as the New Silk Road. And we're happy and proud to present her to you now, to begin the dialogue again. The panel as a whole is, "Instead of Geopolitics, a New Form of Statecraft." So, it's always my honor to introduce Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

The Alternative to a Dark Age and a Third World War

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: After this difficult beginning, I'm all the more happy that I'm finally connected to you. And I'm going to talk about the alternative to a Dark Age, or the danger of a new world war. And even if it's inconceivable for most people at this point, if we do not succeed in the relatively short term in replacing the hopelessly bankrupt financial system by a New Bretton Woods system, exactly as originally intended by Franklin D. Roosevelt, that is, to create an instrument for forcefully overcoming the underdevelopment of the so-called developing sector, then the current orientation of the world...

I don't know if you heard what I said before because there were some technical problems, but I was saying that even if most people cannot imagine that that *can* occur, that unless we, in the very short term, implement a New Bretton Woods system, exactly as Franklin D. Roosevelt had intended it, that the current orientation of the world towards ever more conflicts, both domestically in many states of the world, but also on a strategic level, threatens to escalate into a great new world, a Third World War, which because of the existence of thermonuclear weapons would mean the annihilation of the

human species – the “great kill” even if it is meant in a slightly different way than Lyn just was heard on this video clip.

Although it is absolutely astounding how many misguided people still believe that the COVID-19 pandemic is either no worse than the flu or a just conspiracy of Bill Gates, the much more likely perspective is unfortunately what epidemiologist Dr. Michael Osterholm has said: namely, that we still have an incredibly long journey ahead of us. Until now, 10 million people have been infected, half a million have died from COVID-19, and we have still not reached the peak of the first wave. The almost non-existent health systems of many developing countries are already hopelessly overstretched. The pandemic has ruthlessly exposed the fact that the neo-liberal economic system not only depends on cheap production in the so-called Third World, but has even created in the United States and Europe slave-labor conditions, as can be seen in the outbreak of the virus in the many slaughterhouses in Europe and the United States.

The economic shutdown has thrown a spotlight on the fragility of what is called “globalization.” In the U.S., around 40 million jobs were lost in three months; the central banks pumped an unbelievable over \$20 trillion into the financial system and various government support programs could just barely cover up the timebombs still ticking until expiring of the short-work programs. The IMF currently expects global production to decline by 4.9% this year, and only China is expected to have an increase in production of 2%, which is obviously is much less than it used to be, but nevertheless it grows. Sectors such as air traffic, catering, tourism, the car industry, have suffered massive declines, some of them long-term, but also a large number of medium-sized companies fear they will not survive a second wave and another economic lockdown. The result would be a huge increase in unemployment, poverty and price deflation, while at the same time the

central banks' liquidity pumping is creating hyperinflationary bubbles. Bail-outs of large systemic corporations and banks, as well as politically explosive bail-ins would be further desperate options for governments to implement, but they could not prevent a collapse of the global financial system. A plunge into chaos and anarchy would follow.

In the meantime, a continuation of the current policy would not only lead to increased death rates as a result of the pandemic, but would do absolutely nothing to counter the hunger catastrophe, of which David Beasley of the World Food Program is warning that it will soon take the lives of 300,000 people a day.

Whoever may have thought that a dark age could be ruled out in our modern times, is in for a reality shock. And last but not least, the hedonism acted out by demonstrators who confuse liberties with freedom, is reminiscent of the flagellants and the descriptions of the 14th century as they are given by the writings of Boccaccio, and the paintings of Breughel.

Against this background, it is to be expected that the attempt, originally instigated by the British secret services, to oust President Donald Trump from office by a coup, impeachment or assassination – such was the headline of the British publication *The Spectator* on Jan. 21, 2017 – or by a “Maidan” coup, as President Putin warned in 2016, these will intensify. The instrumentalization of the outrage resulting from the murder of George Floyd by violent groups funded by George Soros is part of this campaign. The reason for the relentless hostility of the neo-liberal establishment and the mainstream media on both sides of the Atlantic against Trump after what, for them, what his unexpected election victory, was, and still is, the intention he expressed at the beginning of his term, to establish good relations with Russia and a good relationship with China. And of course, Trump's promise to end the “endless wars” of his predecessors, to bring U.S. troops home.

What followed was a three-and-a-half-year witch hunt against Trump. The war cry "Russia, Russia, Russia," based on grounds for which not the least shred of evidence subsists, was followed by an attempt at an impeachment, followed by the no less malicious war cry "China, China, China," although there is just as little substance to the charges against China as there was for Russiagate.

During all that, the representatives of the neo-liberal system were not ready for one second to consider that it was the brutal consequences of their own policies for the majority of the population worldwide, that had triggered the global wave of social protest, which included the Brexit and Trump's victory, as well as the mass protests worldwide from Chile to the Yellow Vests in France. But this establishment is never interested in discovering the truth, only in controlling the official political narrative, in compliance with Pompeo's principle, as he explained in his speech in Texas: "I was the CIA director. We lied, we cheated, we stole ... we had entire training courses for that."

NATO's official narrative about Russia's allegedly increasing aggressiveness, accused of "redrawing borders by force in Europe," fails to mention of course the broken promises made to Gorbachov, that NATO would never extend its borders all the way to Russia's borders, and the preceding color revolutions that can be described as acts of war, and finally the coup in Kiev with the open support of Victoria Nuland, which triggered the referendum in Crimea in reaction.

China's "crime" is not only that it has lifted 850 million of its own citizens out of poverty, and has become, with an economic policy based on scientific and technological progress and a population of 1.4 billion people, the second most powerful economic nation, and in some technological areas, such as high-speed rail systems, nuclear fusion, aspects of space exploration and 5G telecommunications, already the number one. In addition, China's offer for cooperation on the

New Silk Road, and the Belt and Road Initiative, is the first real opportunity for the developing countries since the time of colonialism, to overcome poverty and underdevelopment by building infrastructure.

NATO's response to China's regaining its role as a leading nation in the world, a role it played during many centuries of its 5,000-year-long history, has been global expansion into the Indo-Pacific region. This is the stuff of which world wars can be made. And yet, that is exactly the direction that NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg has indicated in his outline for "NATO 2030," which he just presented in a video conference with the Atlantic Council and the German Marshall Fund. German Defense Minister Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer took part in another webinar last Wednesday with Anna Wieslander, director of the Atlantic Council for Northern Europe, who, in opening the event quoted Lord Ismay, NATO's first general secretary, who said that the purpose of NATO is "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down." But AKK (as she is nicknamed) did not even seemingly realize the insult in these remarks. The geopolitical scenario of a globalized NATO, which is openly designed to instrumentalize NATO for the purposes of the British Empire, on based on the Commonwealth, and which would also rope the EU into playing that role, and would finally position India against China, must be totally rejected by all those who have an interest in maintaining world peace.

President Putin has just written, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, a striking article on the pre-history of the Second World War and the course of that war, and called on all nations to publish all the up to now classified historical documents from that time, so that by studying the causes of the greatest catastrophe in the history of mankind up to that point, the lessons will be learned for avoiding an even greater catastrophe today. Putin writes in a very personal tone, he speaks of the suffering of his own

family, of the immense importance June 22nd has for the Russian population, the day on which "life almost comes to a halt," and why May 9th, the anniversary of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War in which 27 million Russians lost their lives, is Russia's most important holiday. But the indirect message is also that just as the Soviet Union defeated Hitler's Germany with a gigantic effort, the Russian people will never surrender to renewed threats. Just as Napoleon was led through a long line of defense into the inhospitable Russian winter, and his army was finally as good as wiped out, the evacuation of the people and industrial capacity to the east from 1941 on allowed the Soviet Union to surpass the military production of the Nazis in only one and a half years.

But also the short-sightedness of the Versailles dictate, the support for Hitler from members of the aristocracy and the Establishment on both sides of the Atlantic, and above all the Munich Pact, which is simply called in Russia the "Munich betrayal" or "Munich conspiracy," is considered as the real trigger for the Second World War. Because it was there, where not only the appeasement of Hitler, but also the joint divvying up of the booty took place, as well as the ice-cold geopolitical calculation, that focussing Hitler's Germany on the East would inevitably lead Germany and the Soviet Union to tear each other to pieces.

According to Putin, what is the main message of the study of the Second World War for today? That it was the failure to take up the task of creating a collective security system that could have prevented this war was the most important piece! Putin's article ends with an urgent reminder of the summit of heads of state of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which he has been proposing since January, and which should address precisely these principles of how to maintain world peace and overcome the world economic crisis.

The most important aspect of that is that this format will put the United States, Russia and China around the same table to

negotiate the principles that must be the basis of international policy if mankind is to avoid wiping itself out! And yesterday after a long phone call between Putin and French President Emmanuel Macron, Macron said that he stands for a Europe from Lisbon to Vladivostok, which opens not only the perspective of an integration of the European Union, the Eurasian Economic Union, the Belt and Road Initiative, but also the establishment of a common security architecture based on common economic interests.

However, if we are to meet the gigantic challenges of the pandemic, the global economic crisis and the profound social shocks that have destroyed the trust of large parts of the population in their institutions in many countries around the world, further steps are necessary. Obviously, cooperation between the United States and China, as the two largest economies, is indispensable. Even if this currently appears to be an insurmountable hurdle, the extremely tense relationship between the United States and China must be replaced by cooperation on the common aims of mankind.

Who, if not the governments of the strongest economies, the countries with the largest populations and the greatest military potential, should solve the problems? The Boltons must be removed from these governments and replaced by responsible people who are able to find, in the cultural phases of their respective cultures, the starting points for cooperation on a higher level. Benjamin Franklin's admiration for Confucian philosophy and Sun Yat-sen's orientation to the ideals of the American Republic are better advisors than Gene Sharp's "How To Start a Revolution" or Samuel Huntington's different scribblings.

One has to define a plane on which the solutions for these quite disparate problems become visible. There is one philosopher, born in the 15th century, known in Russia as Nikolai Kusansky, Nikolaus of Cusa, who developed exactly that method of thinking: the coincidence of opposites, *coincidentia*

oppositorum. This concept expresses the fundamental quality of human creativity, which is able time and time again and at increasingly more developed levels to find solutions on a higher plane, where the conflicts that have arisen on the lower levels, are dissolved.

This can only be the immediate implementation of a credit system, that provides the global economy with credit for industrialization, and thus the real development, of all nations on this planet. The entire life's work of my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, was primarily devoted to achieving this goal; he drew up his first plan for the industrialization of Africa in 1976, the Oasis Plan for the industrialization of the Middle East in 1975; then followed the 40-Year Plan for India in collaboration with Indira Gandhi, *Operation Juárez* with then Mexican President José López Portillo for Latin America; a 50-year development plan for the Pacific Basin; and then finally, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as a peace plan for the 21st century. Many of these projects are being implemented today thanks to China's New Silk Road, and all nations of the world are called upon to contribute to this World Land-Bridge! This is the blueprint for the creation of the 1.5 billion jobs, that are necessary today to overcome the crisis! It should begin with the establishment of a modern health system in every single country, in order to combat the current and future pandemics, which will not only benefit poor countries, but also the so-called developed countries, that can only avoid new waves of infections in that way. Most countries have a large number of unemployed or poorly employed youth, who can be trained as medical personnel and deployed to build up such health centers.

When millions of people are threatened with starvation, as the World Food Program warns, why can farmers not double their food production and be paid a parity price that guarantees their existence, including with regard to the expected

increase in the world's population to over 9 billion by 2050? Can we not consider ourselves as one single human species, and help to build mankind's common construction sites with the same solidarity that the entire Chinese population helped the people in Wuhan and the province of Hubei? Is it not time that we stopped wasting trillions on military build-ups, as President Trump said he would soon take up together with Putin and Xi Jinping, when we could use those resources to overcome hunger, disease and poverty, and to develop the creative potential of the current and future generations?

I think it is time for us, as mankind, faced with an unprecedented disaster, to take the qualitative step of making the 21st century the first truly human century!

Thank you very much.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Helga.

Our next speaker is Dr. Jin Zhongxia, who's the executive director for China of the International Monetary Fund, located in Washington, D.C.

DR. JIN ZHONGXIA: Thank you, Mr. Speed. I would like to thank Schiller Institute for the invitation to attend this important conference. Also, I thank Madame Helga for her excellent keynote speech.

2020 is a very special and challenging year. The trade war, the eruption and spread of coronavirus, the riots in the U.S., world economic recession, and escalated geopolitical tensions, I just name a few major ones. Global growth is projected by the IMF at negative 4.9% this year.

In the following discussion, some of my observations and comments are kind of thoughts in research and of academic by nature, I will speak in my personal capacity only.

Global challenge should be handled globally with a

multilateral approach. No country will be safe until every country is safe.

When we start to discuss the multilateral approach in dealing with the pandemic and the global crisis, I recognize that there is a debate on the value of multilateralism and the multilateral institutions. Some people are talking about economic decoupling, a Cold War, and even a conflict of civilizations. Since I am from China, I ask myself: Is there any fundamental conflict between civilizations in the East and West?

Chinese civilization is unique in many aspects, but it's not fundamentally different from Western civilization. One example: In the 6th century B.C., China had Taiji or Yin Yang concept, which is the co-evolution of two opposite forces. I found in surprise that this was also a core concept in physiological theory in Greek medicine in the same period of time. Another example: A core concept of Confucianism is the "middle course approach," that also corresponds to the "doctrine of the mean" that was explored extensively by Hippocrates, Plato and Aristotle in ancient Greece.

In 16th century, the brilliant Jesuit missionary, Matteo Ricci, recognized the striking parallels in Confucius and Mencius to the Christian concept of man in the images of the God and devoted his life to building an "ecumenical alliance" between China and the West.

During the evolution of trade tension between the United States and China, some opinions in the media have demonized China as an evil trade partner that is systematically engaged in illegal subsidizing, cheating and stealing. That reminds me of the overwhelming public opinion in the media against Jewish people in some parts of Europe before World War II. The truth is that after more than 40 years' market-oriented reform and opening-up, China has already been transformed into a market-based economy. In fact, the share of fiscal resources in GDP

mobilized by some European governments is higher than that in China due to extensive social welfare arrangements, but no body in Europe complain that this welfare has distorted the market.

China has profound tradition of market economy both in theory and practice. In the 6th century B.C., Laozi, a famous philosopher and the founder of Daoism, advised his government to “rule without intervention,” which is an ancient version of the invisible hand of Adam Smith. Another famous economist and philosopher Guanzi, in the 7th century B.C., suggested that in the years of economic depression, government could increase expenditure to implement seemingly wasteful projects for the purpose of creating employment. That is the ancient Chinese version of Keynesian economics. Financially, China was also highly developed. As early as in 11th century, China introduced the first official paper currency in the world.

On the issue of economic and technology decoupling, the attempt to block a major people and civilization from competing fairly with other countries and getting access to new scientific and technological knowledge is morally wrong, and will help China to win sympathy around the world.

On the other hand, China has the largest pool of educated labor force, including a largest pool of engineers. That will enable the country to be more innovative, professional, practical and rational.

Compared with other multi-country free trade zones, China has already become the largest single-country retail market by itself. It is more than equivalent to a free trade zone with a highly integrated infrastructure network, centralized fiscal and monetary policy, and deep and liquid labor and capital market. The authorities have also determined to further open its economy, greatly enhance intellectual property (IP) protection, and implement structural reforms, including introducing competitive neutrality for state-owned enterprises

(SOEs). In the end, it is the effectiveness and efficiency of China's domestic resource allocation that will determine China's international competitiveness.

I am not specialized in geopolitics. But I learned that the scenario of decoupling and a new cold war is based on an old strategy called "divide and conquer," or "offshore balance." It is very smart from the offshore players' perspective. But it will benefit the offshore manipulator at the expense of onshore neighbors. I wonder whether those equally smart onshore players are willing to buy this, and how high a price the offshore player wants to pay to convince so many countries to engage a long-term conflict with their major trade partner.

It is not objective to exaggerate China's conflict with India at the border. It is important to recognize that the current border is largely a stable equilibrium. The common interest of these two ancient civilizations is to cooperate and develop their economies and achieve a joint historical revival. The two countries should benefit from their common cultural heritage based on centuries of peaceful and friendly cultural exchanges, particularly the exchanges in the form of Buddhism.

The history issue between China and Japan often looks like a deadlock, but a forward-looking approach is the key. China has largely recovered its self-confidence, and it is very clear that China's revival does not mean revenge. When new generations from China visit Japan as tourists, most of them feel they like Japan. Japan is China's only neighboring country that has maintained a lot of Chinese characters in their written language, and they use chopsticks, eat rice, use soy sauce, and practice calligraphy, all of these are the typical reflections of East Asian culture.

A healthy and stable Sino-Russian relationship can be much more sustainable than many people's imagination. Their stable cooperative relationship can be attributed to many factors. It is not a coincidence that their combined territory maps the

Mongolian Empire in history. Toward the end of last century, China and Russian leaders reached a wise and visionary agreement to delimit and confirm their common border. Their mutual respect and support to core interest of each other can go a long way.

The biggest loss the United States could incur from a decoupling and a new cold war is that many of the 1.4 billion Chinese people, who are otherwise very friendly toward America, could turn into opponents. By contrast, a friendly and cooperative China will be definitely the Americans' greatest fortune in Asia.

I believe a constructive competition and cooperation between China, the United States and other countries under a rules-based multilateral system should be the right choice. Fortunately, the IMF is still functioning normally and has played a constructive leading role, which is also supported by the World Bank and other multilateral banks.

In just a few months, recently, the IMF has implemented debt relief to more than 27 countries, supported by contributions from a group of better-resourced members, including China. The Fund has augmented its lending instruments to low-income countries by more than 10 billion SDR, and approved emergency financing (RCF and RFI) of 47 billion SDR for more than 74 countries. It has created a new short-term liquidity line (SLL), and is pushing for approval of new agreement of borrowing of 365 billion SDR, and preparing for a new round of Bilateral Borrowing Agreement of 138 billion SDR. China has actively participated in all the above efforts and made its own contribution.

The Fund and the World Bank jointly proposed a Debt Service Suspension Initiative that has been endorsed by the G20. China has further called for an extension of this initiative to 2021. A fair burden-sharing and full participation of all creditors is critical for a successful implementation of this

initiative.

China has made more efforts outside the multilateral framework, including 1) additional \$2 billion grant assistance to most affected countries, especially developing countries, to combat COVID-19 and recover social and economic development; 2) establish a Sino-Africa hospital cooperation program covering 30 hospitals in Africa, China has recently sent five emergency professional medical teams to Africa, which is in addition to the existing 46 Chinese medical teams in Africa; 3) in addition to implementing the G20 debt moratorium initiative, China will provide more assistance to countries that have been most heavily affected, together with other stakeholders; 4) China has promised that once it completes developing and testing its own vaccine, it will provide this product to developing countries as global public goods; 5) China will establish a comprehensive storage and transportation hub to support global medical supplies, under the direction of the United Nations.

The merit of multilateral assistance is that it is rules-based, approved by a collective board representing all its member countries; and the recipient countries are facing the multilateral institution, rather than a particular country or country group, therefore it can reduce (although not eliminate) geopolitical sensitivity. Although there are different views on many different issues, and even bilateral tensions between some member countries, the majority of the Fund's membership have been able to find common ground on many issues.

The Bretton Woods institutions could do two more things, in my view.

First, a general allocation of SDRs that will increase the supply of international reserve asset, reduce the burden of any single country to supply its reserve currency excessively and provide low-income countries necessary resources to

alleviate their debt distress.

Second, the multilateral banks should greatly expand their lending to include not only developing countries, but also developed countries, including the United States, itself. That will fully utilize the low interest rate environment and greatly stimulate global demand and pull up growth in receiving countries.

In conclusion, I wish the after-COVID-19 world a more cooperative and peaceful one. Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much.

Now we will hear from the Hon. Boris Meshchanov, Counselor, Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations

HON. BORIS MESHCHANOV: Dear and distinguished Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche,

Dear colleagues and friends from so many countries,

Our video broadcast audience,

The problems put in the center of today's discussion are of high importance. We welcome highlighting acute questions of international relations through the prism of development, building physical infrastructure, cooperation between major powers in the interests of the poorest and most vulnerable, in accordance with the United Nations Agenda 2030. We fully share the crucial significance of industrialization, eradication of poverty, reforming of international credit-generating institutions and ensuring food security. Those are basically in the spotlight for the whole global community. We emphasize that the right to development persists as a basic human right. Development beats inequality, contributes to peace and is an indispensable condition for building just, peaceful and inclusive societies.

I would like to start my presentation, citing the report by

the United Nations Secretary-General saying: "As we are facing multidimensional and multifaceted impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, global solidarity with Africa is an imperative – now and for recovering better. Ending the pandemic in Africa is essential for ending it across the world." In the context of this challenging crisis we all seek to re-assess the model for development with the needs of the most vulnerable at its cornerstone. I would like to address this issue with respect to how our country deploys relations with the African continent.

It is justified that today more than ever before, our eyes are directed to the regrettable fortunes of populations in remote corners of the world, where governments are grappling with triple crisis of health and finance, trying to avoid widening social disparity and future economic distress. Aware of its historical responsibility for the formation of the modern system of international relations and its further improvement, the Russian Federation considers international development assistance as an effective mechanism to solve global and regional problems, and to respond to new challenges and threats. Our priorities have been the eradication of poverty and promotion of sustainable socio-economic development of partner states; influencing global processes in order to form a stable and just world order based on universally recognized rules of international law and partnership relations among states as well as responding to natural and man-made disasters and other emergencies.

In doing so, as it can easily be seen through the ideals of Russian philosophers and artists and classical Russian literature, assisting our friends abroad has always been based on the respect of the other's dignity. It has been reflected in our national policies and priorities, and technical and humanitarian assistance has always been delivered at the request of the recipient side. We have proceeded from the assumption that any approaches in the spirit of colonial rule,

like the General Act of Berlin of 1884, bringing about the principle of “effective occupation” that prejudiced the freedom of the Africans themselves, attempts to come to an agreement behind one’s back and act solely from the standpoint of mercenary calculation, will most likely not be accepted by these peoples themselves. On the contrary, we value and promote equitable partnership on the international arena ,upholding the principles of truth and justice, respect for the civilizational identity of each people, the path of development chosen by each people themselves.

As the Russian President Vladimir Putin recently emphasized, the development of relations with the countries of the African continent and their regional organizations is one of the priorities of Russian foreign policy. Links between us are based on the friendly relations between the Russian Federation and African states and the traditions of the joint struggle for decolonization and achieving the independence of African states, as well as on the rich experience of multifaceted and mutually beneficial cooperation that meets the interests of our peoples.

Dear colleagues and friends,

One of the main lessons learnt from this pandemic is an urgent need for international solidarity and cooperation, without exclusions and exemptions. In line with this objective, we have committed to giving Russian-African interaction a truly systemic and integrated character. African states are confidently gaining political and economic weight, affirming themselves as one of the important pillars of the multipolar world, and are taking an increasingly active part in working out the decisions of the international community on key issues of the regional and global agenda. We need to respect their rights to benefit equally from globalization, whatever shape it will take following the impacts of the pandemic.

In our strong opinion, the world needs Africa not just like a

pantry of valuable minerals or a bread basket, but strong and sovereign region, developing an equal dialogue with its partners in accordance with the norms of the national legislation, based on the multilateral nature of the world order. Today, when proposals are made to reform the global governance system, we are consistently upholding the need to reflect the role of Africa in those structures that are engaged in global governance.

Our fundamentals are not only ensuring the wide global participation of African states, but also resolving conflict situations, on the principle of "African solution to African problems." Together, we are able to counteract political dictatorship and currency blackmail in the course of international trade and economic cooperation, in order to put pressure on objectionable countries and unfair competition. Introduction of unilateral coercive measures not based on international law, also known as unilateral sanctions, is an example of such practices. Joint efforts are needed to promote trade, investment and sustainable development in order to make the global economic system more socially oriented, to oppose any manifestations of a unilateral approach, protectionism and discrimination, to support the world trade, based on the rules of the World Trade Organization.

Under this paradigm the first Russia-Africa Summit and Economic Forum took place in October 2019 in Sochi, with 92 agreements, contracts, and memoranda of understanding, worth \$12 billion signed and problems of trade, investments and banking, industry and construction, transport and logistics, energy and high-tech addressed, among others.

We paid special attention to identifying promising areas of economic, trade and investment partnership of the Russian Federation, as a member of the Eurasian Economic Union, with the African Union, as well as with the leading regional organizations of Africa – the Arab Maghreb Union, the Sahel Five, the Southern African Development Community, the Common

Market for East and South Africa, the East African Community, Economic Community of West African Countries, Economic Community of Central African States, and others.

In our movement towards Africa we need to be creative and promote new mechanisms for partnership, encourage active participation of business in exhibitions, fairs, and congress events, and develop the practice of exchanging business missions.

Moving towards Africa in this new old world would be impossible without learning each other better, taking into consideration local customs and traditions for our partners, rich cultural and linguistic variety. In Sochi in 2019, we have committed to develop cooperation in the field of education, implement vocational training, and academic exchange programs to promote social stability by protecting people, especially youth, women and persons with disabilities, and expand their capabilities by increasing the availability of education, technical and vocational training. Participants in the Russia-Africa summit confirmed that obtaining quality education and developing skills by young men and women can become a driving force for structural economic transformation and industrialization in African countries, as well as the basis for strengthening the industrial potential necessary to diversify the economy.

It so happened that our country has already contributed to the development of the African continent, in particular, in industry, infrastructure and energy security, areas promoted by the Schiller Institute as the fundamentals of the so-called physical economy, so I would focus on them briefly.

So far, Russia has been involved in the creation of the Russian industrial zone in Egypt. Among the key competencies of Russia for Africa, one cannot overestimate the role of rail infrastructure for the development of Nigeria, Egypt, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Angola. Under current

conditions, it is important that the use of technologies such as medical trains in Africa will prevent the spread of infectious diseases and fight epidemics.

In energy, we count on the future construction of the first nuclear power plant in Egypt and the Russian Center for Nuclear Science and Technology in Rwanda facilitating the development of integrated solutions in the field of nuclear energy in agriculture, health, education, science and industry. Those two are not the only countries in Africa that intend to develop nuclear energy. Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, Sudan and Zambia are also on this growing list. Most African countries suffer from severe electricity shortages. Accordingly, in the near future they should double their generating capacity to meet current needs. The current pandemic-caused crisis, apparently, has aggravated this challenge for them.

In saying this we should not forget about stepping up efforts to combat climate change in Africa, transfer relevant technologies, build the capacity of African states. Meanwhile, general greening of the economy, in our approach, needs to be based on responsibility, consistency and realism. Key to that is technological progress. Serious efforts are being deployed to improve energy efficiency in industry, agriculture, housing and transport. In our country, we have launched national project "Environment" to create incentives for Russian business to implement best "green" technologies, to ensure the environmentally friendly low-emission development. And we will proceed to provide assistance to developing countries, including Africa, to help them meet their own climate goals without prejudice to the objectives of ensuring inclusive and sustainable economic growth, industrialization of economies and leaving no one behind.

The pandemic is spreading across the world, threatening to backslide the efforts applied to build a more resilient architecture. It's high time for humanity, responsibility and

spirit of partnership to be demonstrated. A truly systemic issue with reference to today's discussion, is food security, which holds a special place among Russia's priorities in its efforts to achieve sustainable development globally. First of all, we believe that it has to be addressed at the level of supplying the world enough high-quality food to stabilize international markets, and make it more accessible and affordable for a maximum number of people. At the same time, the zero-hunger goal must be addressed as a matter of urgency for those countries that are food insecure. To that end, over the last 20 years, Russia has been steadily and consistently increasing its own production and export of food – grain, cereals, pulses, meats, poultry, oils, milk and dairy products, etc. Russia has become one of the world's largest exporters of food.

During the pandemic, food supplies were transferred to the Union of Comoros (172 tons) and Madagascar (about 500 tons).

Apart from tackling the problem of food security, Russia donated hundreds of KAMAZ trucks, together with the necessary parts, equipment, and technical support, for key World Food Program operations in Africa. Starting from 2020, \$10 million are being reserved exclusively for Africa. It is the first time that Russia assigns a geographic priority for its voluntary contribution to the World Food Program.

In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, East Africa is experiencing its largest invasion of desert locusts in decades, and our country is making a \$10 million contribution to support FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] operations in Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan and Uganda.

In connection with the coronavirus pandemic, Russia received requests from a total of 29 African countries, as well as from the African Union, asking for assistance in combatting the impacts of COVID-19. To date, units of laboratory supplies and personal protective equipment have been provided to the

Democratic Republic of the Congo; multi-purpose medical modules, tents and accessories to Djibouti; test systems to South Africa and Guinea.

At the same time, we believe that helping a sick person with a virus is paramount, but only part of the problem is solved. A fundamental factor is the availability of an effective preventive and educational system in the countries affected by the epidemic. As an example, I refer to the example of the Republic of Guinea, where two mobile hospitals have been deployed, and where mobile laboratories based on KAMAZ vehicles were transferred, and medications were delivered. With the participation of Russian experts in this country, more than 800 specialists have passed specialized training since 2015. Russia makes a significant contribution to the scientific research of the Ebola virus. With the support of one of the flagships of Russian business, the United Company RUSAL, the Russian-Guinean Research Center for Epidemiology and Prevention of Infectious Diseases was established in the Guinean city of Kindia.

Last, but not least, long and intensive discussion is ongoing concerning the unbearable debt burden of African states. Russia actively contributes to alleviating it under the debt-for-development program intergovernmental agreements. Those between Russia and Madagascar, Mozambique, and Tanzania, are being implemented. For instance, as part of these arrangements, the Government of Mozambique in cooperation with the World Food Program, has launched a multi-disciplinary national school feeding program. It provides for the conversion of a part of the county's debt to Russia amounting to \$40 million during 2017-2021, into activities that address malnutrition among sick children and foster primary education in Mozambique.

With that, I deeply thank you for your attention, and look forward to your questions.

SPEED: And we want to thank you very much, also, Mr. Meshchanov, because we had some problems with the video as you were speaking. We're going to first of all make sure the entire speech is made available immediately in terms of the actual text, and we'd like to also apologize. We'd like to have, at some point and I want to say this publicly, if we can actually re-do your video, because it was not quite in synch. The audio was fine, people could hear it very clearly and it was an extremely important message. And so, I want to thank you, again, very much for what you just did.

MESHCHANOV: Thank you.

SPEED: Our next speaker is Dr. Joycelyn Elders, former Surgeon General of the United States.

DR. JOYCELYN ELDERS: Hello. I'm Dr. Joycelyn Elders, and I am happy to speak to the Schiller Institute conference today, whose theme is "Will Humanity Prosper or Perish?" I hope, as I am sure you all do, that humanity prospers.

Ironically, a lethal disease, the coronavirus pandemic, may be the only way to unify the world to reverse what might otherwise appear to be a sure slide into disaster.

We are here to discuss a new paradigm for the whole world—not just for the richer or more well-off nations. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has proposed that a world healthcare platform must be constructed to respond to the present crisis. She has circulated a short memo to this effect, calling for a Committee of Opposites to be formed to implement it. I would like to respond to one passage of that memo in particular. Here is what it said.

"A very large number of youth in the U.S. and the European nations coming from the economically disadvantaged segments of society are presently looking without a perspective into the future and are therefore exposed to an entire specter of perils. They could be educated through a training program in

the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt's CCC program to become medical auxiliary forces and could be deployed together with doctors and medical professionals in the building of first temporary, and then permanent hospitals and hospital wards in African and other developing sector nations. For the countries of the Southern Hemisphere the support from the industrialized nations is existential: Therefore it will be possible to find cooperating institutions, such as governments, religious and social organizations, as well as youth organizations, who can help to set up such facilities and win the trust in the population for such an approach. In the industrialized nations, for example, hospitals could set up partnerships with existing hospitals in the developing nations, which then could be used as affiliates for the construction of an expanded health system. One can also draw in nongovernmental organizations with experience in so-called conflict areas, such as the Peace Corps, catastrophe protection organizations, and various relief organizations.

"In the U.S. and European nations retired doctors, helpful individuals, and social and religious organizations could work in a Committee to put together teams of medical personnel and apprentices for this deployment...."

Now, I think that this can be done, but we must think about how we would do it. It will be very important, for example, in the countryside of Africa, just as it is important in the cities of the United States, for people from these neighborhoods and communities to be very involved in this process. Therefore, young people from Africa should be paired with young people from America, and be trained together from the beginning. We should remember that they are significant communities of African-American youth that are in the United States, whose parents came from Nigeria, Sudan, Ethiopia, Senegal, and many other nations. Importantly historically black colleges and universities could be used, as well as high school campuses in the urban centers, as central coordinating

points, to assemble volunteers that want to participate in such a program. More broadly, various land-grant colleges, community colleges, and churches, and other organizations already deeply involved in such outreach, need simply be encouraged by young people who want to assist in doing what perhaps only they can do—save the lives of their peers in Africa, the Americas, Asia, and elsewhere through demonstrations of hope and health.

First, we will need many community healthcare workers. We can take a page out of what was done in the American Civil War in 1861 in New York City, with what was called the Sanitary Commission. We just take some people in the community, give them some basic health education, and develop them as medical assistants and medical technicians. Most importantly, they will be very well known in their communities. They can communicate very well with the people in their communities. You can have supervisors of these community healthcare workers, who are also trained, and of course coordinate with nurses, nurse practitioners and doctors. But this gives you a far larger force to work with, which is what we need.

We can't teach what we don't know, and we can't lead where we won't go. We have to have tiers of people who are from the community, healthcare workers who understand the community and know the community, as well as immediate supervisors, to people with enough medical training, all the way up to nurse's assistants, practitioners, doctors, and others, right up to the level of super-specialist. We often do too much special care, and not enough public health. We do not do enough of the basic public health which would do far more to maintain the health, more than 100 surgeons.

This is not an attack against specialization, but it is an assertion that we are in a condition like that of a world war, which requires something that Martin Luther King and others have often talked about—creative, nonviolent directed action, but in the field of health. And we need volunteers, just as

the American civil rights movement had volunteers. They will be the backbone of this effort. In this case, we need to establish brigades and battalions of courageous young people, who may even risk their lives, but in a responsible way, to save the lives of others, both here and in other countries.

This is not, by any means, completely new. Many nations have tried elements of such programs, which have worked relatively successfully in the past, and members of the African Union , or WHO, are well aware of these measures. This, however, is a circumstance that requires the equivalent of a wartime alliance, but this is truly a wartime alliance for progress. Here we can count successes, not in the numbers of enemies killed through combat, but through the numbers of lives saved through healthcare. We will also be aided by the omnipresence of certain social media capabilities that can provide means of close coordination that would otherwise be unavailable.

The fight against this virus must have a human face. There is no section of our population we can afford to ignore. For example, our already-overcrowded and often abusive prisons will see an explosion of infections. Should such people who have been accused of a theft or other non-violent crime, or anyone else, for that matter, be given a de facto death sentence, or be put in harm's way, solely because the rest of us have decided to forget who they are? What about the families that visit them? What about the children, or spouses, or parents attached to those people? And I believe that this can be a mobilization that replaces the image of young people as a problem, or a potential source of unrest, with the image that they are the healers, those dedicated to preserving life, not destroying it.

There may be more than 2 million American young men currently held in prisons for non-violent offenses who could be more than willing to become part of this solution, to help bring health both in their communities here, as well as to other nations. And it would only be in such an emergency as this,

that this sort of bold thinking would be attached to an urgent, dire, but resolvable crisis.

I pray that this moment may find us equal to this challenge to our normal way of thinking. All the world is at stake, and all the world is in need. Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Dr. Elders.

We're now going to hear from Dr. Ding Yifan, Deputy Director, Research Institute of World Development, of the China Development Research Center of China.

DR. DING YIFAN: Dear Friends,

It's a pleasure talking with you on this very important, historical moment. The COVID-19 pandemic has caught the whole world by surprise. Not only have the economies been paralyzed and human life threatened, but all life habits have changed also. Moreover, in many countries, people have not been able to effectively curb the spread of the virus, because they have no experience. Although many institutions have tried to produce vaccines, but are now afraid that the vaccine would be short-lived because the virus evolves so quickly.

In the face of an epidemic, we humans are very vulnerable. If we're not enlightened and work together to fight the virus, the time for the virus to spread will prolong, and the longer we will suffer. So, here, I'd like to highlight four points:

Firstly, when China's epidemic broke out, many countries helped China and provided China with various materials for prevention and to fight the virus, in creating masks. Countries, such as Japan, have picked up sentences from ancient Chinese classics, and write on the boxes for transferring those materials to China, to show the close relationship and cooperation between East Asia area's countries. Once the epidemic situation had been brought under control in China, and the situation became intensified in

Japan and South Korea, China sent a lot of materials to Japan and South Korea, to help people there fight the virus.

Secondly, many such token stories have also been staged between Chinese and American companies. Once the epidemic situation got worsened in the United States, many Chinese companies had sent materials for prevention and to fight the pandemic in the United States, as well as masks, protective clothing, protective glasses, ventilators and even [s/l ratings] for nucleic acid detection. So this cooperation showed that our humanity in society is really a community of common destiny.

Thirdly, unfortunately, the political opinion and the political spirit in the United States have made China unintentionally a scapegoat. Radical Congressmen and Senators try to compete with the hoax in the Trump Administration to show off who has the hardest line toward China. These attitudes cannot help Americans fight the epidemic, on the contrary it can only exacerbate the mistrust between China and the United States, making cooperation even impossible between the Chinese and the American governments, within an obstinate pandemic.

Fourthly, in fact, the world economy has not come out completely from the last financial crisis in 2007, and then, a new crisis happened. The pandemic might make this crisis deeper and more difficult to deal with, because we are faced with a dilemma: Restoring the economy and preventing the virus from spreading. The largest economies in the world need to expand their cooperation and take joint measures to fight the virus, and to boost economic growth. We have to use a stimulus package not only to alleviate the problem of the population in trouble, but also to use this stimulus package to invest in infrastructure, not only in traditional infrastructure, such as highways, bridges, or telecommunications means, but also in the development of new infrastructure, such as means of prevention of epidemics for the masses, and the treatment of

these masses in pandemics, also including the remote means to check the temperature of the masses.

Only by rebuilding trust among big powers can we unite and fight the coronavirus with success. Then we can bring humanity back to the harmonious development path again. So, I think we have to unite our forces or strengths in the middle of the fight against the coronavirus pandemic, and then, we could try to find a way to common development, after the pandemic.

Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much Dr. Ding.

Our next presentation is by former Mayor DeWayne Hopkins, mayor of the town of Muscatine, Iowa. And he represents the China-Muscatine Friendship Society.

FORMER MAYOR DEWAYNE HOPKINS: Good day, everyone. My name is DeWayne Hopkins. I'm the former mayor of a small community in eastern Iowa, located right on the Mississippi River.

And I have a story to tell you. But in order to tell this story, where it begins I'm going to have to move the clock back in time to 1985. Back in that timeframe, the country of the People's Republic of China, sent four individuals to Iowa. These individuals had never been in the United States before, but through the Sister Cities and Sister States organization, these individuals came right directly to Muscatine, Iowa. One of these individuals was Xi Jinping, and of course at the time, he was pretty young, and he was a provincial official in Hebei province.

Well, they came to Muscatine, and they toured some of our plants around town, and so on and so forth. They even enjoyed a barbecue with spareribs and corn on the cob and things of that nature. In any case, they spent three days in Muscatine, and then moved on to Des Moines, Iowa, where they met with then-Governor Terry Branstad.

Now, I'm going to fast forward a little bit to 2016. Our governor was on a kind of an agricultural mission trip to Beijing in the People's Republic of China. And he was meeting with Xi Jinping, who at the time had moved up in the ranks to the position of Vice President. Xi Jinping just happened to ask Governor Branstad, because he had known him for that length of time from 1985 to 2016, he asked him how his friends Sarah and Roger Lande were. Well, Sarah and Roger Lande are residents of Muscatine. Roger is a retired attorney. Back in 1985, Sarah was the President of the Sister States organization here in Iowa. Well, Governor Branstad responded that they were in good health and everything was fine, but that's what started the wheels in motion about a revisit to Muscatine from then-Vice President Xi Jinping. That happened on, I believe it was February 12th. He was on a trip from Washington, D.C., then to meet President Obama in Los Angeles, California. He thought he would have time to stop by Muscatine, Iowa, which he did.

We all greeted him on the porch of the Lande residence. We all went inside, and enjoyed snacks and conversation, and sort of rehashing old times, thus become the title "old friends." So, a great number of his old friends – that is, Xi Jinping's – were in attendance at the Lande residence, and they all had just a marvelous time. Xi Jinping's time came about, he had to leave, and that was OK.

But a short time after returning to China, Xi Jinping suggested via email to Sarah Lande, that we engage a community in China about having a sister city relationship. So, that's what started the wheels churning for that adventure. That city in China became Zhengding. The rest is kind of history. I went to China and visited with the folks in Zhengding; their mayor, Mayor Yang, came to Muscatine and visited with our folks. We sat down and signed a letter of intent to become sister cities. So, that's kind of how that went.

As time went on, Xi Jinping became the President of the

People's Republic of China, and Sarah Lande is still in Muscatine, and they stay in contact every now and then. But it's a relationship that started here in Muscatine, and it's ongoing.

I will say that we have moved hopefully into the future, and we now have in our high school, four years of Mandarin language. We also have an orchestra that is fairly well-versed in the usage of Chinese instruments, which as you may know, are all stringed instruments. They have sent us some of these instruments, and we've learned to play them. And of course, every year, here in Muscatine, is a concert put on by an orchestra either from Beijing or from Shanghai. I believe we've done four of those already. And we're done with this pandemic of the coronavirus, I look for more of those kinds of events to be scheduled.

That's just another element of the relationship that we have with the People's Republic of China. They're outstanding musicians and they communicate with those in attendance at their concerts very, very well. It's a pleasure to have them here. It's a pleasure to know that they'll be coming in the future, and we enjoy having them very much.

I guess, what I'm saying to you is, we're a small community, and we have a friendly relationship with the People's Republic of China: That isn't going to change, and we really don't care a lot about what they do in Washington, D.C., or what they do in Los Angeles, California. We have a relationship with the People's Republic of China. They're great people, they have a good sense of humor; and I wouldn't mind having one of them as a neighbor.

[Mr. Hopkins then played a short clip from a very lively concert by the Chinese orchestra.]

SPEED: Just one correction: Former Mayor Hopkins misspoke: Actually, when Xi Jinping returned to Muscatine in 2012, he

was the Vice-President, not the President at that time. And he came back, and that's when the meeting was, and it was in 2012, not in 2016. We apologize, and the Mayor apologizes for that unintentional misspoken phrase.

Our final presentation is by Daisuke Kotegawa, Research Director at the Canon Institute, and former Executive Director for Japan at the International Monetary Fund.

“Recollection My Involvement in Economic Assistance”

DAISUKE KOTEGAWA: 1. In the mid-1980s, when I worked as a staff member of the World Bank, I had an opportunity to complain about the slow development of African countries despite a large amount of aid to Africa to a British and a French staff, both of whom had devoted their lives to economic development in Africa. Their answer was amazing. “Mr. Kotegawa. It is wrong to expect fast economic growth in Africa which can be compared to those in Asia and Japan. Because Africa is trying to achieve what humanity has done in 2000 years within 100 years.”

2. When I returned to Japan in 1987, I became the budget examiner in the Ministry of Finance in charge of the budget of the foreign economic assistance. We reviewed Japan's basic policies regarding economic assistance to Africa, and we started to try to create a country that will become a model for development in Africa, that is, “Japan” in Africa. I was convinced that it was very important to create a Japan in Africa, because at my days at the World Bank, I realized that Asian countries found Japan as their model and hope, having come to believe that Asian countries can reach the level of Western countries if they work diligently like the Japanese.

3. The first step is to select the target country. The

target country had to have a moderate economic scale, but small enough not to have internal contention such as tribal conflict. We chose Ghana, Cameroon and Malawi. As for Ghana, young and clean leader Rawlings were also a major factor. We poured all three kinds of economic aid into three countries: concessional loans with focus on the construction of economic infrastructure, grants focused on construction of social infrastructure in the medical and educational sector, and technical assistance with the aim of technology transfer through dispatching experts and inviting trainees.

4. A backlash from the former colonial powers was expected, and Japan, which had historically little relationship with African countries, lacked the know-how to build aid projects there. So, we made an arrangement with Crown Agents, a British aid agency, for consulting our projects in Africa. As a result, about one-third of its total annual income in the early '90s came from Japan. Ghana, in particular, has achieved great economic growth and if we had continued to do so, a "Japan" in Africa could have been realized within 1990s.
5. However, having watched the success of such Japanese aid, the British and French began to be vigilant. Ms. Cresson, who became French prime minister in 1991, made such remarks as, "Japanese are yellow ants" and "The Japanese are enemies and are plotting to conquer the world without obeying the rules" and repeated such remarks as "Japanese economic assistance is Jurassic." Against such criticism, Japan was forced to review its aid policy and had to reduce aid to Africa before Ghana became a Japan in Africa. Since then, proposals for UN Millennium 2000 Target, including the debt relief, which mainly targeted Japan's yen loans, have been drafted mainly by the U.K., and Japan's presence in the world of economic assistance has gradually been lost.
6. I think that there is a fundamental difference between Western concept of economic assistance and that of

Japan. The underlining idea of Western aid is a charity. This leads to the emphasis on "humanitarian aid," and the idea of economic independence of recipient country is scarce. On the other hand, the basic idea of Japan's aid is recipient country's economic growth and independence. This is the idea that flows to the root of Japan since the Meiji Restoration, which has been trying to catch up with and overtake the West, witnessing the plight of Asian colonies under imperialism.

7. On the issue of economic assistance policy, I had to fight with the Western countries wannabe scholars, critics, and mass media at home, as well as those abroad, with friends of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who had the same sense of mission. Mr. Ishikawa, who wrote several books at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was my greatest collaborator.
8. One day, a Japanese journalist came to me and started to criticize Japan's aid policy. His argument was not original which echoed the well-known Western criticism of Japan. For example, he said that Japan built hospitals in developing countries, but only some wealthy people in the country can use such hospitals, and it is not for the poor general public. Or he said that Japan is building telephone network in developing countries where most people do not have a telephone, or that Japan has built international airports in the capital in order to advertise its aid. It would not benefit at all the general public in the developing country who did not have the chance to go abroad. He also took the example of the Philippines, claiming that "It is wrong that Japan has built a hospital for the rich in Manila. Sweden built apartments for the poor in the slums of Manila." I asked him, "By the way, what would you be most worried about if you were asked by your company tomorrow to go to Manila next week?" He replied, "Whether I can call up Tokyo smoothly, whether is the airport there is fine, or whether there is a proper

hospital." So, I told him, " What you said are exactly what foreign companies which make investment in the Philippines are concerned about. If there are no problems on such matters, overseas companies will build factories in the Philippines in search for cheap labor and hire people with low wages with minimal education. In this way, employment increases, and the gap between the rich and the poor decreases. I visited to the Smoky Mountain in Manila, which is the core of slum where Sweden built an apartment. The place is a garbage dump, and residents sleep on the bench on the pile of garbage and they protect themselves from rain by the roof made by tablecloth. It stinks very bad. People living there dig out what can be used from the pile of garbage and sell it in the city. The apartment built by Sweden became a slum again in less than six months. Because residents don't have regular employments, and no income. It is not possible to maintain the apartment no matter how splendid the dwelling is. Japan's aid help companies increase employment by building economic infrastructure such as railways, ports, airports, roads, power plants, and telecommunication networks with yen loans, creating preconditions for overseas companies to enter the country, and help provide facilities for basic education as a social infrastructure. Gradually, technology will be transferred from the foreign company to the local company, and the industry will grow in the developing country. Just as we were providing economic assistance to Asian countries with this way of thinking, the value of the yen doubled as a result of the Plaza Accord, and the relocation of factories to Asia began by Japanese companies that were no longer able to stand up to labor costs in Japan. The relocation began in Malaysia, where politics were stable and the power generation capacity built by yen loans was firm, and proceeded to Thailand, Indonesia, and China, and the so-called geese-type economic growth started in Asia. This steady economic

development continued until the Asian economic crisis of the late 1990s.

I allocated to my Japanese colleagues to join the Belt and Road Initiative as proposed by China, especially when they proposed the establishment of AIIB, and also with the United States. Because I thought the cooperation among these three countries are the best mix to build up economic infrastructure in the developing countries. Because, in my view, the Chinese have a shortfall in their capacity to build up the new projects, which is actually the major part of the advantage for Japanese bankers as well as American bankers.

So United States and Japan can draw up a kind of blueprint for economic development and China should be in charge of financing and also actual construction of those projects. And after the completion of those projects, Japan would like to take the lead in maintenance and the rehabilitation of those completed projects, if they are needed. Because this is the kind of area that Japanese companies are quite good at.

So I believe this is the best way of collaborating, for these three countries for the future of this globe.

Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much, Dr. Kotegawa.

We're about to go to the questions and answers. What we're going to do is to allow the panelists who are with us live, to have some cross-talk, to discuss things and to respond to what they have all heard. Not everyone is with us live.

And just prior to doing that, I'd like to introduce my colleague Diane Sare, who has something to say.

DIANE SARE: Right now, we are going to have a greeting from the leader of the LaRouche Society in South Africa by video – Ramasimong Phillip Tsokolibane.

RAMASIMONG PHILLIP TSOKOLIBANE: From the Republic of South Africa, I offer my greetings to those of you gathered virtually around the globe for this important conference. My name is Ramasimong Phillip Tsokolibane, and it is my great honor to lead the LaRouche Movement in South Africa.

The matters upon which you are deliberating will determine whether or not mankind survives our turbulent times. Around the globe, people are in the streets, rising up to protest the intolerable injustice of the dying neo-colonial order that has enslaved all of us. It is a deadly monetarist order that values pieces of speculative financial paper above human life. The collapse of this global British financial empire is certain. What will replace it is not. What must be brought into being is a New World Economic Order based on the unleashing of the greatest power in the universe: the power of human creativity to build on this planet a world of hope, peace, and posterity, where we will be truly, finally free.

We shall extend our dominion beyond Earth into the vast expanse of the universe beyond. This was the mighty dream of the great Lyndon LaRouche, who taught us that the final conjunctural crisis of the old evil British Empire was coming, and that we must, as revolutionaries, be prepared to seize the moment to shepherd the great change for the good.

As we deliberate today, we must remember the teachings of Mr. LaRouche. It is now truly his time, a time in which troubles can be turned into opportunities. To do otherwise, would be to allow those evil people, who lorded over us as the masters of the old empire, to continue their rule in an even more brutish and deadly form. A global fascist order whose policy intention it is to kill more than three-quarters of all people on Earth – that is, if they don't stumble into a general thermonuclear war that kills all of us. As the COVID-19 virus slashes its deadly path across my continent, which will leave tens of millions dead in its wake, if not more, we see the results of the British Empire policy of

enforced underdevelopment, combined with the equally deadly famine and attempts to start wars here and around the globe. We can count more millions murdered through the Empire's policy.

It does not have to be this way. LaRouche's policies and programs for development and jobs point the way to the future. For Africa, it is go with LaRouche, or die with the old neo-colonial empire. Africa wants to lead, and we have, with some help, the means to survive and prosper. My country, the only full-set economy on the continent, can help produce both the machinery and the machine tools required for the industrialization of Africa. We can help train the hundreds of millions of new productive workers that will be needed. We have one of the most advanced nuclear energy industries on the globe, which is under constant attack from London.

So, it is our future and the future of billions of Africans to come, that this conference is discussing. Best wishes for the success of your deliberations.

Panel 1: Questions & Answers

SPEED: Thank you very much, Phillip Tsokolibane.

So, now we're going to go to our live panelists: That will be Helga Zepp-LaRouche, I see Dr. Elders who is there; and Mr. Meshchanov is there – great.

I just want to first ask any of the panelists if they have any response or any thoughts about what they've heard? Helga, I'd like to start with you.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the reason why we wanted to have this conference is to show a way how governments can actually work together; how people can support that, and in that way help to create an environment where the absolute urgent question of a new world economic order, a new financial system can actually be put on the table.

I'm very encouraged, because what Dr. Jin did is very much our approach; that you need a dialogue of cultures. That you need to look for those ideas which resonate in the other culture even if the predicates are different. I think he did an excellent job in doing that.

I think the fact that Mr. Meshchanov chose to focus on Africa is a sign of the times, because I believe that the fate of the Africa continent is really what will decide if we are morally fit to survive. If we cannot get our act together and work together as nations to help to overcome the dangers coming from the locusts, the famine, the pandemic, I think that this is the most crucial focus. Also, to put aside all kinds of geopolitical contrary interests and really work together in the common task of getting humanity into a different age, really into a different era.

I was very happy with what Dr. Elders said, because I think this idea to call on the youth; that they have to have an absolutely important role, because it's their future, it's their world. Young people always like to talk to other people from other countries and work together, so I think that is one of the leverages how we can influence the governments to go in the direction in which they need to go.

Naturally, very delightful was what Mayor Hopkins demonstrated, because it really beats back the idea that small communities can't do much. He has demonstrated that it can be done, and the fact that the great community of Muscatine has a relationship to Xi Jinping, it just is very bold and is a very good example. I think especially in the end, when he blended in these musical performances, it touched off exactly what needs to be touched off – namely, love between different cultures. Because different cultures are not a threat, they are actually an enrichment once you start to know them and to encounter them.

I also want to thank Ding Yifan, who is an old acquaintance of

ours going back to the 1990s, and so is Mr. Kotegawa. So, I think this was really a very powerful and very useful demonstration of how you can work together on different levels and set an example.

SPEED: Counselor Meshchanov, I have a particular thing I'd like to ask you, because we had a question which is going to come your way, and also your speech very much dealt with the question of Africa. But one of the questions that came in, I think you can maybe answer as you give us your own reflections is: "What is President Putin's thinking in calling for a P5 summit [Five-Power summit], and how does this compare with Mrs. LaRouche's proposal?"

MESHCHANOV: Thank you for your question, but first off, thank you for inviting us. Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak and deliberate on very acute and intelligent problems of the current moment.

Actually, at the United Nations, we have been involved in organizing the summit even before the pandemic, and we're still looking forward to having it under the new circumstances. We proceed from our President Vladimir Putin's own statements earlier this year from Jerusalem, when proposing the summit of the United Nations Security Council Five. The rationale for organizing the summit is not to miss, as he said, new sprouts of hate and discrimination between people and peoples.

According to our President, the country's founders, the United Nations, and the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, that the responsibility for preserving civilization lies with them. These countries are called upon to become an example for other states in this regard. So, such a summit would demonstrate loyalty of countries to their responsibilities; countries that combatted together back to back against Nazism and fascism, back 75 years ago. [<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/62646>]

So, this is how we see it, and how we see the objectives of this summit. We believe that this current moment unfortunately has contributed to this rationale, because borders and discrimination and inequality between countries are getting worse. That is why we have selected the issue of Africa for our presentation at this event of the Schiller Institute. Because we are strongly convinced that, as one of the previous speakers has stated, and it's commonplace in the United Nations, no one is safe, if someone is not safe.

Reflecting on my colleagues' presentations, I was highly impressed by our friend from Muscatine's presentation on the cultural links between the peoples of the United States and China; specifically because my previous posts were somehow associated with promoting direct links between people, between human beings, in consular posts in Greece and Mongolia. It's very timely now to speak about culture, about eternal values that unite peoples and actually can overcome the politicizing trend in international economic relations.

We also, to conclude, speak of Africa, and many thanks to our colleague from South Africa, a member country of the BRICS association, an association that we're trying to build on principles of dignity and respect for sovereignty, and promoting independent ways of making decisions. That is the only way our new multipolar world is capable of saving humanity from new conflicts and new wars. Thank you.

SPEED: Thank you very much. Dr. Elders, we're going to ask you for your comments, but I also see someone who is a colleague of yours, who I think is up there on the screen. If I'm not mistaken, that is Dr. Kildare Clarke from New York City. I know Dr. Clarke has sort of a short time, and he's been waiting in the queue. Dr. Clarke, is there something you'd like to say, before we hear from Dr. Elders?

DR. KILDARE CLARKE: I would like to say a lot, and I don't think I probably have the time here. So, for the 4 o'clock

youth meeting, I hope I can get by. I agree a lot with Dr. Elders. The problem to me is that I recognize that we've got to fundamentally change the educational system in this country, if we really want to get out of the problems we are facing. And we cannot continue to have groups upon groups, planning groups and proposals – we've got to act emergently. We've got to change educational systems; we do not have to wait until he tries to get to high school or college, before he knows that he's going to go to medical school. These things can begin in the elementary school. You've got to expose people. When they are exposed, they get interested. We are selectively excluding a large part of the population who can become excellent healthcare workers. They might not start in medical school. They could be assistants, learn, understand what it takes to get there, and go back to school. But if we do not expose them now, we're going to lose a whole generation of excellent physicians, nurses, and other healthcare professionals, because we don't think it was OK to educate them now...

SPEED: I need to tell you, Dr. Clarke, your audio is bad. I think we got the basic thrust of what you were saying, which is you were pointing out that the entire educational system has to be changed. If you didn't know this, we've been having some technical problems all morning. Dr. Elders, were you able to make out what he was saying?

DR. ELDERS: Yes.

SPEED: Dr. Clarke, I'm going to ask you to let her respond, and also get her reflections, because I think she knew clearly what you were getting at. So, Dr. Elders?

DR. ELDERS: I thank first of all, the Schiller Institute for putting on this conference. I think it's been excellent in bringing up some problems that we all have. One of the things we all have to know is, whatever we're talking about doing, you can't do it unless you're healthy. So, I feel very

strongly we've got to have healthy populations, and we've got to start early. I agree with Dr. Clarke. I always tell people that children are half as tall as they'll ever be by the time they're three. They know half as much as they'll ever know by the time they're four. Hope, will, and drive has been determined by the time they're five. So, we've got to start early. Children can't be what they can't see. So, we've got to make sure that they're exposed, and we can start them early. They don't have to start out being a brain surgeon, but they can start out being what they can be.

And most of all, we've got to keep them healthy. All human beings feel that the three things that they need to be, more than anything else, they need to feel that they can be successful. We need to make sure they're healthy, educated, motivated, and have hope for the future. I thought, that's where we can start, and every country can start with that. What we've heard about what we're doing for countries, but we've got to start with health. And we've got to educate them. You can't keep an ignorant population healthy. So, we've got to start with educating the population, and we've certainly got to start with doing everything we can to keep them healthy. We have to know that we've got our trust and global solidarity. If we don't trust each other to do the things we need to do, we can't get it done. We have to go out and work in the communities. Find out what the communities need, rather than giving them what we think they need.

I especially enjoyed the Counselor from Japan's talk on the things that they were doing. Sometimes you think you're doing exactly what a country needs. Going into Africa and doing what they needed; but maybe they needed something else. Involve the African nations to find out what does the nation feel that they need, and help them develop what they think they want and need. And we may have to start in our small communities, starting out with the young people; training them to be community health workers. Later, they grow up to be nurses,

and nurse-practitioners, physicians, and then to being super-specialists. But we want to improve the health of the world, which we've got to do, because we all know this coronavirus has taught us that anytime one country is not healthy, all the rest, we're all at risk. So, we've got to make sure that we help every country to be healthy and improve their health. We've got to start with the young people who are going to determine what the world's going to be. We have to do everything we can to train them to be the best that they can be.

I never fail to go to an old Chinese proverb that says that "The society grows great when old men and old women plant trees under whose shade they know they'll never sit." To me, this institute, what you're trying to do with the Schiller Institute is pull the nations together in solidarity, globally, so that they can plant trees for the bright young people of the future to sit under. Thank you.

SPEED: Helga, do you have anything you'd like to say at this point, either to Dr. Clarke, or in response to this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No, I just feel very – my heart is moved by what you are saying, because it is that kind of human spirit which is needed now to move mountains. And these mountains need to be moved quickly, because the dangers are many. So, I'm very happy that you are saying what you are saying.

SPEED: So Dr. Clarke, we're going to move on, because we have other questions. But I need to know if you will be able to join us for the later panel, when we will have a panel of youth. That's going to be later this afternoon. I don't know if your schedule allows it, but it would be important.

DR. CLARKE: I'll make myself available.

SPEED: And we have to do something about your audio over there on the other side, too. Thank you.

Diane, we're going to come back to you now. Do you have something for us?

SARE: Yes. I have a question from the Ambassador from Ghana to Canada. But I actually wanted to bring up one thing, since it turns out Mr. Meshchanov has been involved in cultural affairs, which is to express my desire that at some point, somehow, the city of St. Petersburg, which apparently had an absolutely phenomenal chorus, was the location of the premier of Beethoven's sublime work, the *Missa Solemnis*. I know the chorus there must have been excellent, because our chorus is working on it, and it's very difficult. This being the Year of Beethoven, and Beethoven being a composer who I think really embodies the love of mankind as a whole, I think it would be something we have to figure out how to commemorate, if not this year because of the COVID, then as soon as possible.

So now, having said that, I have a question from Ambassador J. Ayikoi Otoo, who is the High Commissioner from Ghana to Ottawa, Canada. He writes:

"I think the suggestion for four leaders to meet to brainstorm on the effects of the pandemic in order to find universal solutions is a brilliant one. But, with President Trump reeling under pressure for not having taken the pandemic seriously, and with this leading to several deaths, with President Trump pushing the blame on China and making derogatory remarks about China – Can you see these two leaders working together? Considering the fact that President Trump recently withdrew from a Zoom conference organized by leaders of the EU and China, on the subject of the raising of money to fight the pandemic worldwide, what are the prospects for the four leaders, whom you cite [I think he's referring to Mrs. LaRouche], to come together?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, I want to make one important correction in your question, because it may be true that President Trump was not picking up on the warnings coming from

China quickly enough, but neither did the European countries. They also lost precious time. But I want to emphatically make the point that this pandemic would not be a pandemic if there would have been a good health system in every country. And that is a provable fact because, in Wuhan and Hubei province, the Chinese were able to contain it, to put strict quarantine, and then after two months it was under control. That approach, if you had a similar health system in every country in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia, in Europe, you could have stopped this from becoming a pandemic. Therefore, I think it's very important to say that the blame of all this is the neo-liberal system which prevented the building up of infrastructures and health systems in the whole world.

This was a point made by my late husband already in 1973. He warned, and actually set up a biological holocaust taskforce to investigate the effects of the IMF policies at that time. And in the following years, of the so-called IMF conditionalities, which prevented developing countries from investing in their health systems, because they were forced to pay their debt burden first. These conditionalities actually created the condition that the pandemic even could arise. Naturally, the predecessors of Trump, such as the Bushes, such as Obama, they did much more to contribute to create the conditions than President Trump in his admittedly slightly delayed reaction. So, I just wanted to correct that, because it's very easy to say it's the guilt of Trump, but he definitely did not cause the problem 50 years ago.

I think that unfortunately, I believe that this situation will get so much worse. I think the surges which you see now in more than two dozen states of the United States, you see it in Brazil, in India. In general, it is estimated that this is not even a second wave; this is still the first wave which has not yet peaked. Several of the American epidemiologists and virologists said it's no point to talk of a peak; the peak is not yet here.

So, I fear that the kind of collapse which we are seeing right now in terms of the effects of the economic shutdown, is also just the beginning. I think the situation will worsen in the short-term, long before the election takes place in November, and that the kind of social ferment which exists right now – which in part is due to the murder of George Floyd and others, but it's also naturally manipulated and taken over by people who just want to create social trouble in the same way like President Putin warned that Trump would be faced with a "Maidan."

So, it definitely has absolutely elements of that as well. I think this will get worse, and that means our intervention in the United States, but also around the world will be absolutely crucial. Because it is my absolute conviction that if you have more examples like that of the Mayor of Muscatine, people who just start relationships and create an environment which counters the absolutely malicious lies in the mainstream media and the crazy talk by such people as Marco Rubio or Menendez, or such people who just are completely irresponsible in what they say. There should be a standard of truth that you shouldn't say things which are made up; but some of these people have lost all hesitations to just, for their own purposes, lie.

So, I think it's very important that this is being countered by a lot of citizens. And I think if we can get this initiative, which I proposed with this taskforce to find solutions on the level of the coincidence of opposites, that can become an important factor, because the idea that you have to replace geopolitical confrontation with cooperation to solve this pandemic and all the other problems together, must become the steamroller in the population. I also think that if there is a chorus of countries – from Africa, from Latin America, from other places – and individuals of positions, who demand that the problems of humanity are so big that they only can be solved by the leading countries; the most powerful

economically, the most powerful militarily, and those countries which have the most population, that they must get together. Because where else should the solution come from?

I think if we all work together, we can orchestrate an environment where these ideas are being picked up, and all the advantages which lie in that may convince even those countries which seem to be at loggerheads right now, to actually come together and work together, because it will benefit them more than to keep the confrontation going.

SPEED: Thank you. Our next question is from Isaiah K. Koech, Counsellor for the Kenyan High Commission [embassy] in Ottawa, Canada. I think this question will be largely for Helga and for Mr. Meshchanov.

“Whereas there is advocacy for the world’s powerful countries to meet in the ‘Four-Power’ Summit to discuss solutions that would mitigate global crises, how sure are we that the powerful leaders will incorporate issues that directly affect African countries? (This question is based on the premise that the Four-Power Summit will not have any representation from the African continent which is equally large and full of potential).”

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, Mr. Meshchanov, if you want to go first?

MESHCHANOV: OK. With this, I will try to briefly focus on several questions posed before, starting with a positive conversation of our colleague referring to cultural links. We would like to reiterate our deep understanding that culture is stronger than politics, and we are availing of this opportunity to thank the Schiller Institute for issuing brilliant chorus song in Russian associated with Victory Day in May, which we would highly encourage everyone to see a brilliant and bright presentation of cultural links and culture bridging gaps between our countries. We are deeply appreciative of this work by the Schiller Institute.

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dcLGy8yI0VM&t=5s>]

And of course the Year of Beethoven deserves to be commemorated. Our embassies, consulates, and missions all over the world are open, especially in these difficult times, to any proposals of collaboration in the cultural sphere. So, thank you very much for your remarks.

As for the four leaders summit proposal by the Schiller Institute, we believe it's a great idea, and not contradicting the Russian President Vladimir Putin. I would like once again to reiterate the idea of five countries, specifically the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, was issued and proposed in association with the 75-year anniversary of victory in the Great Patriotic War – the Second World War, talking globally. It is addressing the idea of recollecting the common responsibility of our countries for preventing discrimination, hatred, hatred on borders between countries, bearing in mind the responsibility lying with these specific countries, which are founders of the United Nations, and winners in the Second World War.

So, that was the rationale to reiterate, but that doesn't prejudice against deliberating on any alternative forums. I'm speaking in my personal capacity of course now, but that reminds me of the rationale behind the establishment of the BRICS association, which somehow started back in the 1990s from the ideas of our outstanding and well-known academic and diplomat, and former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Yevgeny Primakov, who tabled the idea of Russia, India, and China collaboration and systemic cooperation, meetings, and summits. That was sort of an idea that could also be taken into consideration, because our great predecessor Mr. Primakov foresaw the rising role of India, and the rising role of African countries, as a natural process of moving forward the multipolar world after the collapse of the bipolar system. That is why we strongly believe in multilateralism, multilateral forums.

Coming to the third question of the United States and China, and the possibility of cooperation, and all the controversies and conflicts that we see now. We also do not have very smooth and easy relationships with the Western world and the United States, as you are, of course, aware. But still we try to find mutual interests; that we did even under the Cold War situation back many decades. Now, something that contributes to finding solutions is the pressure of business circles, investors, diasporas, cultural links, parliamentary relations. Even being oppressed by coercive measures by several Western countries, we stick to the policy of cooperation and collaboration with our Western partners. China is also objectively interested in developing relationships with the United States, as well as the United States cannot do without China in the modern economic system. That is why we are sort of optimistic on U.S.-China reconciliation.

To focus briefly on African countries, we believe that the development of the African continent recently, not only in terms of economic growth, but also diversifying trade and investor partnerships, and maturing political collaboration between African countries, will contribute to their capability of speaking in one voice. That probably opens good perspectives of African countries joining the global governance system which is going to be revisited and reformulated. As I also stated in my presentation, our country has always spoken on raising involvement of African countries in any global forums. It should be inclusive, not exclusive.

With this, I thank you.

SPEED: OK, very good. Helga, do you have anything?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I would like to add that there is probably not any problem globally, both regionally and economically and otherwise, which could not be solved if the geopolitical confrontation between the United States, Russia, and China in particular, would be eliminated. Because the entire game plan

of what we call the British Empire, which is really the City of London, Wall Street, the financial institutions which are behind the neo-liberal system; their entire ability to keep the rule over the world's institutions depends on the geopolitical game to divide the United States and Russia and China. People don't realize that it is exactly the same forces financial, media, political, who are behind the coup attempt against Trump; who are behind the anti-Russia campaign; and who are behind the anti-China campaign. Once you realize that, you have a completely different view, and the reason why my husband originally many years ago picked up on the idea of Prime Minister Primakov, and added the United States to this combination of Russia, China, and India was the recognition that you need a combination of states which are powerful enough to be stronger than the City of London and Wall Street. Once these four, or especially those three, get together, then you can solve any other problem. I have said many times, this summit is not going to be only one summit. Because the problems are so deep and many, that you probably need a whole summit process, where you start to put the kinds of mechanisms like for a New Bretton Woods system into motion; you start to take care of the cultural question, the health system. So, I look at it more that once you have this format, that the presidents of those countries start to cooperate to solve the common problems of mankind, you can develop it to become an integrative process where naturally other countries, other continents, other states are absolutely welcomed to support that process. But I think it's important to first put together the core of power which can actually change the world, and not just have it like many conferences where you have a democratic kind of back and forth and nothing gets accomplished. I think this is also why President Putin wants to keep the veto power in the Permanent Five countries so that it doesn't degenerate into just a debate where no results can be accomplished. It should be open; we are organizing that countries such as Japan or Germany, Italy, France, countries from Africa. They should absolutely support that. The best thing is to do it now; to add

your voice that such a summit must take place, and I think it can be done. I think it's absolutely doable, but we need a worldwide mobilization to accomplish it.

SPEED: We're getting a lot of questions, and that's very good. But we have the problem that we lost some time at the beginning of the broadcast. So, what we're going to do here is, first of all, we're going to encourage people to keep going with the questions. Several of them are with respect to the coronavirus pandemic and related matters. The next panel, which will begin at 1:30 p.m., will continue to cover that, and we will try to refer some of the questions there. Also, we certainly will refer all of your questions to any of the panelists to have them answer.

We're going to take two more questions, one of which will come from me, and then the other one will be from Diane. We'll then ask the panelists to conclude.

This is a question from Dr. Abdul Alim-Muhammad of Washington, D.C.; well-known to the Schiller Institute, and very important in our work over the years. This one, I believe, is for both Dr. Elders and for Helga: "How can the rest of the world learn and benefit from the Chinese and Cuban collaboration in flattening the curve of the epidemic centered in Wuhan? How can those lessons be applied here in the United States and elsewhere, like Brazil and countries in Africa, to flatten the curve? Why isn't Cuba's interferon alpha-2B available to save American lives? Should there be an international standard of criminal public health neglect?" Then, he just appends to this "The Crime of Tuskegee"; he's talking about the Tuskegee syphilis experiments. "Was the deliberate withholding of known effective treatments to suit a racist agenda? Is history repeating on a global scale?"

So, that's his question. Either Dr. Elders or Helga, whichever would like to start.

DR. ELDERS: I think we all realize that we have a global pandemic now. But as in all pandemics, we've got to have the right leaders if we want to come out of this, and I think what the Schiller Institute is doing, we've got to have the kind of leaders who are willing to lead. And they have got to make the sacrifices and do the things that they need to do to lead and move forward. Our public health system has not been well funded. We've got to invest more in our public health, but when we think of public health, we've got to always remember, that public health is not just about individuals. It's about the whole community; it's all of us. We've all got to be involved, and you can't keep our people healthy if we don't educate them to be healthy. I think that that's an important issue that all of our communities have to be aware of. The reason? I won't say the reason, I don't know the reasons. Some of the reasons why we in the United States, our curve is not flattened as well as that in China and some of the other countries is because of our culture and the education of our people. We're not willing to do the things; we know we need to do them, but we just didn't do them. Like our social distancing, which we could do. Handwashing. Wearing a mask. Then, everybody wanted to get back, and start socializing again. So, these are things the Chinese were willing to do and did. They enforced it, and we did not do it. That was partly related to our leadership, that we've not done.

If we think about the Tuskegee Institute, I think that was a public health, leadership mistake. We've worked through that now. I do not feel in any way that anybody was trying to take anything away or trying to not provide therapy or treatment. And I do not feel that we're not trying to do everything we can now to make sure we do what we can to eliminate the coronavirus. But we do not have a vaccine; we do not have adequate medications. All we have are the public health issues that we know we need to follow in order to get it done. We've got to educate our people. The reason why we're seeing more problems in our very low-income, less well-educated people is

because of what's happened. We know that we've got to address those issues if we're really going to make a difference.

And I think the same is true for Brazil. I think Brazil is behaving much like America; we're not doing the things we know we need to do.

SPEED: OK. Helga, do you have anything, or should we continue?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I just would like to add briefly that if people remember, in January, when China started to take these very rigid measures – quarantining people, tracing contacts, cutting out social contact by allowing families to go shopping only once every three days and only one member of the family – all of these things. There was a huge freak-out in the West, saying “This is a dictatorship! See how horrible! They're violating human rights again.” But in reality, what helped them to contain is aided by a deep cultural difference between Western and Chinese culture. In the West, it was a big accomplishment that the rights of individuals were held high. This is a good thing, but unfortunately, this individuality became excessive. People mistook freedom with liberties and hedonism. What Dr. Elders just said, people wanted to go back to the beaches, they wanted to go back to partying. You have these really insane behaviors which are an expression of such exaggerated individuality. While the Chinese culture – and all Asian cultures, for that matter – have traditionally much more focus on the common good as the primary thing. And that the individual right is sort of subsumed under the right of the community and the cultural good. The individual cannot prosper if the community does not prosper. I think this is a cultural difference which I think is very much worth to study. Because we will come out of this pandemic with the need to adjust some of our values. They may not be exactly what people tout to be the so-called “Western values”; because these Western values – that's a whole other subject. But I think we have to really think how we can give humanity principles for our durable survival. And that is part of this process that we are trying

to do with these kinds of conferences; that people start to really reflect and say, "How can we become a species of rationality and creativity, and not compete with some piggies who are trying to get to the trough the quickest?" I think it's really a fundamental question of identity, of moral values, which has to be addressed.

SPEED: OK. Last question for this panel will be from Diane Sare.

SARE: This question is from Dr. Katherine Alexander-Theodotou of the Anglo-Hellenic and Cypriot Law Association. It is in four parts.

"1. What do you suggest to do in an effort to bring the European nations together to reflect on democracy, basing the institutions on democratic lines, creating a real democratic union, *including Russia*? The vast culture of the civilization of Europe will be the fortress of prosperity and peace.

"2. How can the Schiller Institute assist? The Schiller Institute can assist by continuously advocating unity, cooperation, education, and preventing the undermining of nations' sovereignty of Europe by others ruled by undemocratic institutions such as Turkey, threatening the sovereignty of its neighbors such as Greece and Cyprus.

"3. There is a need for European health policy and coordination of the health authorities in order to have common standards of health policy and provide competent healthcare to the peoples of Europe.

"4. There is the question of slave populations throughout Europe, especially in the U.K., where there are almost 1 million people living for almost 15 years with no identity, as they are immigrants [I think she means no legal identity] whose voice is being suppressed by the immigration laws. There are also others in other European countries. How can we stop this system of slave labor?"

Those are the questions.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this present EU needs to be changed, because I think the EU has developed into a gigantic bureaucracy which is very little in touch with the interests of its member states. I could cite you a whole list of examples for this. I think we have to really think how to integrate Russia. I think one of the lessons Putin said in his article was that there was a failure before World War II to develop an integrative security system. I'm quite interested – I'm putting it carefully – I'm quite interested about the report that between Putin and Macron in a long phone conversation yesterday, Macron said that he stands for a Europe which goes from Lisbon to Vladivostok, which obviously would mean that you really talk more about the Eurasian Economic Union, the Belt and Road Initiative integrated into one body. I think I'm a firm believer in the principle of sovereignty. I think this present crisis has demonstrated that in any case the EU did nothing. It was the nations which jumped in and recognized that you need food security in a nation; you need sovereign control over your production of medicine and health equipment.

Nicolaus of Cusa, who I quoted earlier, was the first one to develop the concept of why only a sovereign nation-state which has a reciprocal relationship between the government and the governed, which I think is the only way how you can guarantee how the common good is being defended; especially under conditions of crisis. So, I think this present EU, which is trying to attach itself to a NATO globalization, to play all kinds of geopolitical games, is not necessarily the vehicle with which Europe should be reformed. Maybe that should be the subject of a whole other webinar, because this is a very complicated question. But I think an alliance of sovereign nation-states in the spirit of de Gaulle would make much more sense to represent the interests of all the people.

As for the slave labor, I think that has come out, that this

present neo-liberal system depends not only on the exploitation of cheap labor in countries like Bangladesh or some other countries, but that you have slave labor conditions inside the Western countries. Like in Germany, where it's now seven or eight slaughterhouses which have all Romanians and people from other East European countries, who are living in horrible conditions. They have become the breeding ground for COVID-19 break-outs, because there is no health system, no social distancing is possible. I think taking care of the health system is the first precondition for everything to function, exactly as Dr. Elders says. If you are not healthy, you cannot do anything. So, protection of the health of the citizens has to really start in every country, not just in some.

SPEED: All right. So, we're now at the conclusion. We've got about one minute per person for responses. I'd like to get kind of a summary idea. We'll start with you, Mr. Meshchanov, if you have any remarks that you'd like to make in conclusion.

MESHCHANOV: Thank you. I had some technical problems, and unfortunately couldn't catch the last part of the discussion. But now, wrapping up what has been laid out in this very important discussion, I see in an optimistic way what is happening. Meaning that when the situation is up-ending, and this is something that has been happening in any crisis in history, the word crisis derives from the Asian-Greek word of *krisi*, which means taking decisions; taking choice. So, we need to take the right decision, the right choice; and I fully support Mrs. Helga LaRouche's statement on changing values after this crisis. We believe that in this crisis, constructive forces such as the Schiller Institute and many others in our country as well, are heard better. That's probably one of the systemic significances of this crisis. Briefly, speaking on our President's article, which you have repeatedly referred to, Mr. Putin underscores in his article devoted to the 75th anniversary of the war end, the Munich

conspiracy. That is something that he starts with, but he finishes his article by underscoring the significance of cooperation, collaboration, and shared responsibility of great powers. That is why we are optimistic on this future cooperation which sometimes crises and great systemic catastrophes can contribute to.

SPEED: Thank you, Counselor. Dr. Elders, any concluding remarks?

DR. ELDERS: This has been one excellent conference, and I think what is talked about is how in all conferences we need to trust each other, we need to learn to work together, and that our cooperation and trust is going to do more to overcome this virus and the health of our people than anything else. The more we squabble among each other, the more this virus grows, divides, and spreads. So, the first thing is, we want to improve our economy, educate our people. We've got to first do everything we can to keep them healthy. We just can't develop an excellent working society unless we have a healthy society. We know how; and it's time we began to use the knowledge we know and make our leaders stop squabbling about where, when, and how it started. Let's look at what we can do to make a solution. We need to get all nations that we can involved, so we can all work together to try and make a healthy global world. That's how I feel we're going to also address our economy.

SPEED: Thank you. Helga?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I would like to bring people's memories back to what we saw in the beginning – the video of Lyn; who focussed very much on the fact that we are the creative species. At least, the only one which has been discovered in the universe so far. I think if we strengthen that quality of our species which distinguishes us from all other ones, the creativity, then also the question of trust will be easy. Because a human being who relates to the creativity of another one, doesn't

have prejudices. At best, you have a wish to increase the creativity of the other one for the common good of all of humanity. I think it is that rethinking of trying to make people better people, to make them do more good, to really get rid of all of this hedonistic decay of our culture which prevents people from being creative. Because if people just want to go partying and get drunk and have dope, they are ruining that which makes them human. I think may be hopefully one of the outcomes, because I believe absolutely that we need a renaissance of cultural values, of Classical culture. That we all have to learn to think like Beethoven, and to think like Lyndon LaRouche. Then we are best equipped to deal with this and any other problem.

SPEED: Thank you. I want to thank all of the panelists who were with us today. We're going to conclude this first panel. But I think we managed to soldier through all of the difficulties that may have some metaphorical importance to what we're going to have to do in the world as a whole to make this dialogue work as well.

LaRouche ledte den egentlige opstand mod City of London og Wall Street

Den 8. juni (EIRNS) – Hvem stoppede fremgangen for den amerikanske borgerrettighedsbevægelse for 50 år siden, før den kunne fokusere på sorte arbejderes frihed fra nød og frygt? Hvorfor blev Dr. Martin Luther King dræbt, da han satte økonomiske rettigheder og en ende på Vietnam-krigen, hvor de blev sendt hen for at dø, i centrum af sin dagsorden? Hvorfor

er forskellen på rigdom mellem husstande af henholdsvis sorte og hvide amerikanere i dag så meget større end den var for 50 år siden?

Og hvorfor har mere end 80 % af arbejdende amerikanere og 2,2 milliarder arbejdende folk verden over intet produktivt arbejde som de kan stole på? Hvorfor har en viruspandemi, for den sags skyld, fået lov til at smide 2,2 milliarder ud af arbejde i flere måneder, og true hundreder af millioner med hungersnød, specielt i Afrika? Hvorfor har næsten alle nationer i verden reduceret antallet af hospitalssenge og investeringer i den offentlige sundhedssektor i årtier, vel vidende at pandemier var på vej?

Kun den afdøde Lyndon LaRouche besvarede disse spørgsmål i mere end 50 år – siden han i 1967 advarede om, at det britiske imperiums banker ødelagde kredit- og investeringssystemet knyttet til Bretton Woods, og ødelagde hvad der var tilovers af præsident Franklin Roosevelts planer for udvikling efter 2. verdenskrig. I 1974 sagde han, at globale pandemier ville blive udslaget, hvis dette blev tilladt. Borgerrettighedsveteraner og afrikanske ledere blev tiltrukket til LaRouche, fordi han besvarede disse spørgsmål og ubønhørligt udfordrede det britisk imperiums systems ubegrænsede finansspekulation og dødelige nedskæringspolitik i den "tredje verden" og "fjerde verden".

Det er derfor, at den tidligere ambassadør for Burundi til USA, Jacques Bacamurwanko, i sidste uge sagde om justitsministeriet og den slags: "Fjern deres knæ fra Lyndon LaRouches hals". Jacques Bacamurwanko fortsatte: "De protesterende aktivister, efter det vederstyggelige mord på George Floyd af en politiofficer fra Minneapolis, burde fortælles, at det var det samme antiamerikanske system, som var ansvarligt for stranguleringen af Lyndon LaRouche Jr. Lys hals blev bogstavelig talt lukket sammen af den samme bande af hvide racister (white supremacists -red.), der ikke ønskede,

at han udøvede sin ret til at stemme, til at rejse frit omkring her eller i udlandet. Den gode nyhed er, at denne morderiske bande ikke lykkedes med at stoppe udbredelsen, vidt og bredt, af LaRouches frihed og idéer.”

I denne dybe krise er det tåbeligt at deltage i oprør, som tilsigter at tvinge Præsident Donald Trump ud af embedet, tilrettelagt af de samme britiske imperialistiske kredse og agenter, som har forsøgt at eliminere ham, siden før hans tiltrædelse. Denne krise kræver en dybtgående løsning; den kræver en fundamental ny økonomi, fuld af produktiv beskæftigelse, rumvidenskab og teknologi samt arbejde med kraftigere energikilder. En ny økonomi, som Sydafrikas præsident netop har opfordret til, ledet af en mobilisering af ny og højteknologisk infrastruktur.

LaRouche foreslog, at en gruppe af ledende nationer, med denne nye teknologi som mål, afholder et topmøde og skaber et nyt, globalt kreditsystem. Han sagde: ”Der er nu en uberegnelig krise i gang verden over... Dette er en krise som vil afgøre hvem der kommer til at kontrollere verden. Bliver det en gruppe af nationer, eller bliver det et genopstået Britisk Imperium, som aldrig rigtig forsvandt – som tager over fra USA og etablerer et verdensherredømme gennem globalisering?”

LaRouches politiske aktionskomité's rapport: ”LaRouche-planen til at genåbne USA's økonomi: Verden behøver 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser”, er alternativet til den dybe krise, som verdens økonomier nu er gledet ind i. I løbet af de næste uger søger vi at organisere et højlydt, internationalt ”kor”, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche kaldte det, af stemmer der giver resonans for et topmøde mellem mindst, USA's, Kinas, Ruslands og Indiens ledere, med mange andre velkomne, for at realisere denne forandring.

En international konference vil bringe dette kor til udtryk om tre uger fra i dag, d. 27. juni. I de samme tre uger må

Londons forsøg på at ødelægge USA, gennem afsættelsen af en præsident, stoppes.

Dette er LaRouches revolutionære udfordring til sammenhobningen af City of London og Wall Street, som gennem spekulation har bortødslet menneskelivets værd gennem det sidste halve århundrede.

Sorte liv betyder noget – så stop Holocaust i Afrika, skab 1,5 milliard job.

Den 7. juni (EIRNS) – Mens hele verden nu oversvømmes med slagordene 'sorte liv betyder noget' (black lives matter), må man spørge: Hvad er det ønskede resultat? At skabe et anstændigt liv for de fattige i Amerika, hvoraf mange er sorte og latinoer? De fleste mennesker anerkender, at de massive demonstrationer i USA og i store dele af verden i dag er drevet af mere end racistisk politibrutalitet – de er resultatet af det katastrofale sammenbrud i økonomien midt i en dødbringende pandemi – begge omstændigheder der påvirker den sorte befolkning mere intenst, men som er universelle katastrofer.

Hvorom alting er, bortset fra EIR-programmet, der blev udgivet i sidste uge, og som kræver en hurtig skabelse af 1,5 milliarder job og et lige så presserende topmøde med lederne af USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien for at iværksætte det nødvendige hasteprogram, ser der ud til at være ringe opmærksomhed omkring de faktiske forbrydelser, der bliver

begået imod de fattige i USA og langt de fleste lande i Afrika og Sydamerika, fra de mere end tredive års finansielle og økonomiske politik. Under slagordene om "globalisering", "fri handel" og "miljøbeskyttelse" er de virkelige industrielle økonomier blevet ødelagt, infrastruktur har fået lov til at rådne, og udviklingslandene nægtet enhver industriel udvikling, bortset fra Kinas soloindsats for at tilvejebringe fysisk udvikling gennem Den nye Silkevej/ Bælte- og Vejinitiativet.

FN's direktør for verdens fødevarerprogram, David Beasley, har råbt op så højt han kan om, at Afrika i løbet af kun få uger eller højst måneder vil have en mulig sultedødelighed på 300.000 pr. dag i forbindelse med coronavirusset, med fødevarerforsyningskæder der også knækkes af den økonomiske krise, kombineret med et af de værste græshoppeangreb i moderne historie. Betyder disse sorte liv noget?

At male "Black Lives Matter" med ti meter høje bogstaver i gul maling på Washingtons 16th Street vil ikke gøre noget for at løse disse reelle problemer. Faktisk skal det bemærkes, at den officielle 'Black Lives Matter'-bevægelse blev finansieret med 60 millioner dollars fra George Soros, og i alt over 400 millioner \$ fra andre Wall Street-fonde, mens terroristorganisationen Antifa og andre åbenlyst voldelige bander – mange af dem primært hvide – har opereret under dække af demonstrationerne.

Det drivende fokus for "bevægelsen" er fjernelsen af Donald Trump fra embedet, mens indsatsen i vid udstrækning styres af de samme kræfter, som orkestrerede fase et og fase to i kupforsøget – Obamas korrupte efterretningsteam, hvoraf mange nu selv står overfor fængsling for deres forbrydelser; af deres kontrollører i det britiske imperium, MI6 og GCHQ, og af de prostituerede i pressekorpsset, der svor på, at Trump samarbejdede fordækt med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, og at Putin stjal valget.

To medieartikler i denne weekend demonstrerer den faktiske hensigt med denne såkaldte bevægelse. Tysklands *Der Spiegel*, det mest udbredte magasin i Europa, har en forsidehistorie med Trump der holder en tændstik, med en brændende by bag sig, under titlen: "Pyromanen – en præsident sætter sit land i brand. Den ledende artikel lægger hele skylden for krisen på Trump, alt imens den antyder, at Trump planlægger en "Rigsdagsbrand" for at gøre sig selv til diktator efter samme model som Hitler, og muligvis vil nægte at anerkende valgresultatet, hvis han taber. Man antyder et militærkup for at stoppe den formodede fare.

Her i USA indrømmer magasinet *The Atlantic* åbent, at "bevægelsen" faktisk er en "farverevolution" efter samme model som Maidan-kupet i Ukraine i 2014. Læsere af *EIR* ved, at det var nøjagtigt den samme anglo-amerikanske bande – Soros, Obama og hans vicepræsident Biden og hans efterretningsteam, sammen med pressen, der åbent iscenesatte det voldelige nynazistiske kup mod den demokratisk valgte regering i Ukraine, som det er dokumenteret i *EIR*'s "Hvordan Obama og Soros bragte nazisterne til magten i Ukraine."

'Håb og begejstring' midt i kampen

Den 1. juni (EIRNS) – En nation, som endelig har fundet tilbage på vejen til reel, menneskelig udforskning af solsystemet og efterfølgende revolutioner i videnskab og teknologi, har i de seneste fire nætter set voksende optøjer med det formål at afsætte præsidenten, som havde bragt den tilbage på denne vej. De voldelige optøjer, som sigtede på at omstyrte Kinas autoritet i Hongkong, er nu bevidst blevet

"spredt" for at forsøge at vælte et Hvidt Hus, der netop i går bebrejdede Kina for at håndhæve denne autoritet.

I by efter by ser vi kontrasten mellem afro-amerikanere i forpinte protester mod politidrab af ubevæbnede, sorte amerikanere, og en pøbel af anarkistiske uromagere, hvoraf nogle tydeligvis er veteraner og professionelle i afbrændinger, slagsmål og ødelæggelser, der finder paller fulde med sten på mystisk vis placeret langs vejen til disses natlige optøjer. Vi kender ikke organisatorerne endnu. Men det britisk efterretningsvæsen var dybt involveret i Hongkong-optøjerne, og en gruppe af tidligere britiske udenrigsministre er blevet dannet for at klappe dem selv på ryggen for det britiske "lederskab" i forsøget på at vælte Kina i Hongkong.

Der er rigelig med mennesker rundt om i verden, som ønsker at udbrede ironierne mod Præsident Donald Trump; eller mod formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy Pelosi, som havde kaldt optøjerne og overfaldene i Hongkong for "et smukt syn"; eller mod guvernører, der holdt folk i deres hjem i tre måneder pga. coronavirusset, nu for ingen verdens nytte.

Men, hvad der betyder noget er, at millioner af mennesker havde lavtlønnet arbejde og ingen produktiv fremtid før pandemien, og nu har de mistet disse arbejdspladser; alt imens amerikanere i byerne i tyve år har været ude af stand til at få angiveligt "reformerede, omorganiserede, gentrænede" politistyrker til at stoppe disse drab.

Hvad der betyder noget er, på en synlig måde, at opbygge en ny, anderledes fremtid – en fremtid der netop kunne skimtes i Amerikas tilbagevenden til rummet d. 30. maj og den påtænkte tilbagevenden til Månen om fire år for at påbegynde vores march ud i solsystemet.

Det er i lyset af en sådan fremtid, at Sydafrikas præsident, Cyril Ramaphosa, gav sine lykønskninger for rumopsendelsen til

sin landsmand, Elon Musk, chefen og hoveddesigner af SpaceX, fordi "i midten af vores kamp mod COVID-19... har vi [sydafrikanere] fået dette håb og denne begejstring". En ny bedrift i rummet tilhører altid hele menneskeheden.

LaRouches Politiske Aktionskomité's nye rapport om hvordan 50 millioner nye, faglærte arbejdspladser kan skabes i USA og 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser verden over – med de rumrejsende nationers udforskningsprogrammer som spydspidsen – kan faktisk bringe amerikanere sammen, specielt unge amerikanere. Og den, rapporten, blev udarbejdet for at bringe lederne af disse teknologisk førende nationer sammen – USA, Kina, Rusland, Indien – i et topmøde for et nyt kreditsystem og denne store opgave.

5 %-Løsningen

Den 28. maj (EIRNS) – 'Executive Intelligence Review' annoncerede i dag, at det stiller en separat 29-siders digital reproduktion af forsidehistorien af EIR-magasinet 29. maj 2020 til rådighed: "LaRouche-planen til genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi": Verden har brug for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job." Dette diskussionsgrundlag – der giver detaljerede oplysninger om den måde, hvorpå 50 millioner nye, produktive job kan skabes i USA som drivkraft til et globalt fremstød for industrialisering, som vil give produktiv beskæftigelse til 1,5 milliarder, for øjeblikket ledige mennesker, over hele verden – er begyndt at cirkulere blandt ingeniører, arbejdere, landmænd, videnskabsfolk, studerende og andre over hele landet. Det oversættes også til en række fremmede sprog, med henblik på at opnå bred cirkulation

internationalt.

Kernen i rapportens forslag er Lyndon LaRouches specifikation af, at en virkelig sund, anti-entropisk økonomi må have omkring halvdelen af sin arbejdsstyrke beskæftiget som produktive, vareproducerende arbejdere, og yderligere 5 % skal involveres i det videnskabelige og teknologiske arbejde, der er den kreative motor, som driver hele økonomien fremad. I det indledende afsnit af kapitel 6 i den nye undersøgelse, "America's Space Mission: Youth's Next Frontier," (Amerikas rum-mission: Ungdommens næste grænseland) sættes der skarpt fokus på dette punkt:

"Amerikas rumfartsektor vil spille en afgørende rolle i at flytte 5 % af den amerikanske arbejdsstyrke til forskning og udvikling. Som specificeret af LaRouche, er dette nøglen til at øge produktiviteten for hele arbejdsstyrken. 'Stigninger i produktivitet kommer ene og alene fra forbedringer i teknologi, der stammer fra grundlæggende videnskabelige opdagelser; jo højere hastighed hvormed grundlæggende fysiske opdagelser omdannes til praksis, jo større er stigningen i produktiviteten pr. indbygger og per kvadratkilometer areal'. (Lyndon LaRouche, 2. september, 2000)

Denne anskuelse lokaliserer bedst betydningen af Amerikas forestående tilbagevenden til at opsende rumfartøjer fra sit eget territorium, en opgave der blev udsat fra i går, 27. maj, til lørdag 30. maj på grund af vejret. Amerikas øjne vender sig endnu en gang mod himlen. Som Nicole Mann fra NASA's astronautkontor erklærede: "Dette handler ikke kun om en opsendelse; dette er 'startskuddet' for Amerika. Det handler ikke kun om NASA; det er 'startskuddet' for Amerika, og det er enormt ... Det er det første store skridt på vores køreplan for Artemis-missionen til Månen, og i sidste ende til Mars". Rummet er endvidere et domæne, der kræver internationalt samarbejde, som NASA-administratør Jim Bridenstine for nylig understregede, da han blev spurgt om det amerikanske forhold til Rusland: "Vores samarbejde er hævet over jordisk

geopolitik”.

Der er ikke meget andet, der er vigtigere end dette. USA og hele verden bliver ramt af en økonomisk, politisk og kulturel chokbølge, der er værre end hvad vi har set i nyere tid, advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag. Den kommer fra en forværret pandemi, massearbejdsløshed, en økonomisk sammenbrudskrise og en skræmmende optrapning i retning af krig mellem USA og Kina og USA og Rusland. Intet mindre end Lyndon LaRouches forslag om konkursomlægning af det nuværende finanssystem og oprettelsen af et nyt Bretton Woods, vil være i stand til fuldstændig at ændre denne globale dynamik, tilstrækkelig hurtigt. De uophørlige provokationer fra udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo, sammen med andre, der handler på vegne af det britiske imperiums geopolitik, dominerer i stigende grad det officielle Washingtons politik, og sætter Kina og Rusland under pres. Vi ignorerer deres stigende alarmerede advarsler om denne politiske tendens – til fare for os selv, udtalte Zepp-LaRouche. Tværtimod er det netop øjeblikket, hvor vi burde samarbejde tæt med Kina, Rusland, Indien og andre nationer om rumforskning, stoppe pandemien og genoplive verdensøkonomien med 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job.

Man kunne kalde det 5 %-løsningen.

Pressemeddelelse

Skab 50 millioner amerikanske arbejdspladser for at genopbygge verden

Den 27. maj (EIRNS) – “LaRouche-planen for at genåbne økonomien: Verden behøver 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser” blev udgivet af LaRouches Politiske Aktionskomite (LPAC) d. 23. maj, 2020. Forslagene bygger på LaRouches metode for fysisk økonomi anvendt i den svimlende opgave at hyre 1,5 milliarder produktivt arbejdende mennesker på denne jord – nær halvdelen af arbejdsstyrken – som nu er de facto arbejdsløse.

Dette bemærkelsesværdige program for at skabe 50 millioner produktive amerikanske arbejdspladser, er det eneste seriøse svar på “the big one”: Den samtidige sygdomspandemi, hungersnødspandemi, arbejdsløshedspandemi, samt finanssammenbruddet. Den amerikanske økonomi som “genåbner” bliver nødt til at være en ny økonomi, omstruktureret og omdannet til at genopbygge en knust verdensøkonomi, der skaber et moderne sundhedssystem i alle underudviklede nationer, samt ny infrastruktur indenfor energiproduktion, vandforsyning og højhastighedstransport. Det skal være en åbning til Det amerikanske System for industrialisering og videnskabeligt fremskridt, på global målestok.

Der findes intet bedre eksempel for dette, end Amerikas tilbagevenden til rummet, med den ventede opsendelse af en amerikansk-produceret, bemannet raket til den internationale rumstation (ISS). Den grundlæggende forudsætning i den nye rapport er, at økonomisk vækst må være drevet af gennembrud i videnskab og teknologi, hvis gennembrud medfører stigninger i den produktive arbejdskraft. Det nuværende samarbejde i rummet må blive til en fuldgældig, international Måne-til-Mars-mission, som en “videnskabsmotor” for den samlede proces for

at skabe ny, højteknologisk, produktiv beskæftigelse og uddannelse af unge mennesker, der kan påtage sig nye forskningsområder. Den nye rapport adresserer opgaven at omdanne den amerikanske arbejdsstyrke til at påtage sig denne udfordring, med et særligt spændende nyt begreb, præsenteret i kapitlet "Amerikas Rum-mission; Ungdommens Næste Grænse."

Det er tid til at amerikanere tænker stort igen. Spørg ikke hvordan eller hvornår økonomien genåbner. Spørg: "Hvad skal egenskaben og retningen være af den økonomi, som genåbner?" Den globale pandemi har revet masken af det fejlslåede britiske, neo-liberale økonomiske system og udstillet den tragiske forvandling af det agro-industrielle grundlag i vestlige økonomier til udhulede konsum- og underholdningsdrevne service-økonomier. Den har udstillet den lige så tragiske idé at de "underudviklede" lande til stadighed kunne forblive underudviklede uden folkemorderiske konsekvenser. Det system er dødt og det må begraves af et forbund af større nationer ledet af USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, om skabelsen af et nyt internationalt Bretton Woods-kreditsystem, baseret på det som Franklin Roosevelt havde i sinde: at løfte nationers økonomier over hele verden, og som længe er fordret af Lyndon LaRouche.

LaRouche præsenterede valgene, som vi står over for, i et webcast fra d. 14. juni, 2007: "Der er en uberegnelig global krise i gang... Dette er en krise, som handler om hvem der skal kontrollere verden. Vil det blive en gruppe af nationer, eller vil det blive det genopståede Britiske Imperium, som aldrig rigtig forsvandt – som overtager fra USA og etablerer dets verdensstyre gennem globalisering?"

Den nye rapport understreger den essentielle rolle som USA spiller, som en del af dette "nationsforbund." På den anden side, hvis et økonomisk "genopretningsprogram" forsøges alene for den amerikanske økonomi – ved at undgå dette samarbejde og ignorere de underudviklede nationers nødråb for

hospitalsbyggerier, sundhedsforsyninger, elektricitetsproduktion, vandinfrastruktur og nye transportsystemer – vil Wall Street og City of London kontrollere det. Og de vil sikre sig, at det bliver en “Grøn New Deal” og en ny “grøn finansboble” skabt til at erstatte deres sammenstyrtende “altings boble”.

Denne rapport indeholder også et særligt budskab til det amerikanske folk fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som opfordrer til en genopblomstring af USA's historiske identitet, som dette blev personificeret af George Washington, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, og, fremfor alle, hendes afdøde mand, Lyndon LaRouche. Hun fornyer sin appel til Præsident Trump om at frikende LaRouche.

Et nyt sprog for økonomi

I kernen af rapporten er der et begreb, fremsat af Amerikas første finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, og videreudviklet af Lyndon LaRouche, at profit ikke kan måles i monetær terminologi, men kun i fysisk økonomisk vækst, drevet af gennembrud i videnskab og teknologi, som vil forøge den produktive arbejdskraft. Det betyder at man må se på arbejdskraften, ikke i form af penge, men i form af produktive relationer.

Forskellige af rapportens kapitler adresserer dette på enestående måder.

Kapitel 2 ser undersøger arbejde fra standpunktet af præcise definitioner af et nødvendigt, produktivt arbejde, ikke fra standpunktet af at få en lønseddel, og viser den forfærdende arbejdsløshed, eller overkvalificeret arbejdskraft af 1,5 milliarder mennesker globalt, og mere end 100 millioner i USA.

Kapitel 3 viser udfordringen at flytte nutidens økonomi, hvor

mindre end 20% af vores arbejdskraft er beskæftiget med produktive aktiviteter (og endnu færre i egentlig produktion), til én, hvor 50% kan ansættes produktivt i at varetage verdens enorme fornødenheder indenfor sundhed, fødevarer og infrastruktur.

Kapitel 6 præsenterer en spændende, ny idé om at kvalificere vores unge til at deltage i den form for økonomi, som kan blive omdannet af Projekt Artemis og fremtidige rum-missioner, gennem skabelsen af et "Rum-CCC", baseret på 1930ernes Civile Konserveringskorps, der trænede 3 millioner unge mænd.

Indholdsfortegnelse:

1. Indledning
2. "Broder, kan du skænke et job?"
3. Hvordan millioner af nye, produktive arbejdspladser skabes for USA og verden
4. Fordoblingen af fødevarereproduktionen; millionvis af højteknologiske familiegårde
5. Fremtidens Sundhedssystem
6. Amerikas Rum-mission; Ungdommens Næste Grænse
7. Et Hamiltonsk Kreditsystem for Udvikling
8. Helga Zepp-LaRouche: En Appel til amerikanske borgere: Hvad Verden har brug for fra Amerika!

For at kunne bekæmpe

pandemien, må det Britiske Imperiums anti-kinesiske heksejagt bekæmpes

Den 20. maj (EIRNS) – De episke problemer, som vi er konfronteret med, i bekæmpelsen af pandemien, påbegyndelsen af en ny verdensøkonomi, og sideløbende minimering af kaos og nød, kræver en yderligere opgave: At kalde den nuværende, intense anti-Kina-kampagne hvad den er – en sort propaganda-operation. Den er antændt af de samme britiske netværk, som anstiftede "Russiagate", afsættelsesforsøget af Præsident Donald Trump, og alle sådanne operationer for at forhindre det potentielle samarbejde, mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og andre nationer, hen imod en ny struktur til verdens fordel. Dette ville markere enden på Londons kontrol baseret på geopolitik og monetarisme; og Trumps tidlige tilbøjelighed i retningen af venskabsdiplomati har været bandlyst af disse kredse.

I sit ugentlige Schiller Institut-webcast i dag, diskuterede Helga Zepp-LaRouche disse britiske netværk, inklusiv deres forsøg på at splitte Kina og USA, samt opbygningen af politiske blokke, ligesom under den kolde krig. Hun advarede at dette vil føre til et sammenbrud af økonomiske funktioner og hyperinflation. Hun anførte, at blandt de mest skingre stemmer, er dem fra Trumps økonomi- og handelsrådgiver, Peter Navarro, Forsvarsminister Mark Esper og Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo.

Hun sagde: "Det er tydeligt at Præsident Trump sættes under enormt pres, fordi han er oppe imod pandemien; der er enorme økonomiske konsekvenser – USA's centralbank har lige offentliggjort, at sammenbruddet af USA's økonomi i 2. kvartal vil være 30%; arbejdsløsheden stiger; og åbenlyst har det faktum, at flere personer er blevet testet positive, og faktisk blev syge med coronavirusset i og omkring det Hvide

Hus, skabt en atomsfære for Præsident Trump, hvor han virkelig sættes under et enormt pres.

Jeg mener at enhver, som er interesseret i at løse menneskehedens problemer, bør tale om, at denne heksejagt mod kinesere, den McCarthyisme stil med at anholde kinesiske videnskabsfolk, eller sågar amerikanske videnskabsfolk med kinesisk baggrund, det er virkelig ekstremt farligt og er et meget skidt varsel! Det skal stoppes og folk burde ikke falde for denne propaganda, fordi den er komplet ubegrundet."

Hun opfordrede folk til at se på, hvad der præsenteres som fakta mod Kina, eller andre mål, og se, at de i virkeligheden er geopolitiske angreb. De indeholder gentagelsen af "store løgne."

Ved dagens ugentlige briefing fra Udenrigsministeriet, overgik Pompeo sig selv. Han hævdede at Kina skylder verden "så meget som omkring 9 billioner dollars, ifølge vores skøn," for arbejdspladser og tabte liv i USA og globalt. Pompeo sagde, at han havde foreslået Trump forskellige måder, hvorpå Kina kunne tvinges til "at betale" for COVID-19-pandemien. Præsidenten er "begyndt at overveje at svare tilbage... Jeg ønsker ikke at komme ham i forkøbet med hensyn til at diskutere hvordan...".

Pompeo indledte disse bemærkninger med en svada. "Først, grundlæggende fakta. Kina har været regeret af et brutalt, autoritært regime, et kommunistregime siden 1949... Vi undervurderede gevaldigt i hvilken grad Beijing er ideologisk og politisk fjendtlighedsindret overfor frie nationer. Hele verden vågner op til dette faktum."

Som komplet modpol til disse spydigheder understregede Zepp-LaRouche, at idéen om USA's og Kinas samarbejde er "sandsynligvis det mest vigtige strategiske spørgsmål, fordi, hvis disse to store økonomier, den tidligere stærkeste økonomi og den opkommende økonomi, som trods alt har 1,4 milliarder

mennesker, hvis de samarbejder kan man næsten løse et hvilket som helst problem i hele verden; hvis de tørner sammen, kunne det føre til ødelæggelsen af hele menneskeheden.”

Hun gav eksemplet om nødvendigheden for at udvikle fusionskraft – grundlaget for et fuldstændigt nyt produktivitetsdomæne for fremtiden. Kinas arbejder med dette, og Kinas Eksperimentale Avancerede Superledende Tokamak (EAST) skrider fremad, som et afgørende projekt. Beskrivende CGTN's TV-udsendelse "Den kunstige Sols Kraft: Fusion," sagde hun, at "det de siger er, at fusion er revolutionært, af den simple årsag at når man kan skabe et gennembrud og har kommercielt brug af fusionskraft, vil det levere energi, ikke kun til 1,4 milliarder kinesere, men til hele verden i årtusinder fremover. Og det er grunden til at Kina lige nu forener de bedste hjerner i verden, lige netop for at få sådan et crashprogram.

De siger at fusionskraft er ligeså vigtigt, og ligeså stort som menneskets landing på månen. Folk, som kender dette program, vil indse, at det er præcis dette, som LaRouches "Fire Love" handler om, nemlig, at vi bliver nødt til at have internationalt samarbejde for et crashprogram for fusionskraft; at vi har brug en ny fusionsøkonomisk platform, og at vi har brug for et internationalt samarbejde i rumforskning. Og det er vejen frem!"

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, May 20, 2020

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

America's Historic Enemies – and the Russiagate Enemies of Donald Trump – Are Behind the Escalation Against China

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to our webcast with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is May 20, 2020.

Helga, each week as we do these webcasts, it seems as though

the danger in the world keeps escalating: We have a series of crises, and there's a definite push coming from especially the City of London and their allies in the United States to add to the destabilization. In the last couple of days there's been another escalation in the anti-China campaign around the World Health Assembly annual meeting. What was going on there, and what's the background to this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, most people in the United States and in Europe and elsewhere cannot have helped but notice that the anti-China tone has become absolutely shrill. If you listen to what people like Navarro and Esper, and Tucker Carlson, and Pompeo are saying, it's a kind of accusation which is really, if it all would be true, it would be casus belli, but if it's a lie, it's even more casus belli. One has to remember that a lot of the anti-China forces, it originated with British intelligence, MI5, MI6 – these were the same forces which were focussing for the first three years of the Trump Administration on Russiagate, all the accusations that Russia manipulated the 2016 election; and if one looks back now, what was coming out of this, what was the matter of it? Nothing! It was all a big lie. What was the ground for the impeachment? The same thing! And it is exactly that same apparatus which is now focussing on the effort to divide China and the United States, because these forces need the kind of geopolitical manipulation in order to keep control, because if the large powers of the world would work together then the role of the British diminishes into insignificance.

Now, obviously, the pandemic has created a total crisis, it's a health crisis which is very big. The "opening up" of the economy, so-called, which is a terrible word to even use, is creating all kinds of dangers, and obviously, there is an effort to get President Trump to go with this whole anti-China campaign. And unfortunately, he signed a letter – it's not clear if he really wrote all of it, which may not be the case, because there's a lot of detail in there which I doubt the

President would fill out himself – but he basically wrote a letter to the head of the World Health Organization, Dr. Tedros on the occasion of the World Health Assembly annual meeting in Geneva, or virtual, in which he basically repeats all of these accusations, that China covered up, that they didn't transmit the information in time, that they delayed, that they caused all these economic hardships; and he accuses the WHO of having been completely in the pocket of China. And he is demanding that the WHO should prove within 30 days that they are independent of China, or else the U.S. will even leave the WHO altogether let alone cutting off funding.

Now this is very unfortunate, because he has a lot of remarks in there which are simply factually not true. One of them is that he quotes the British medical journal The Lancet, that they would have already reported in the beginning of December about the virus, and so forth. That is too bad, because immediately the editor of The Lancet refuted it, and said that they never had published anything like that, but their first reporting was on Jan. 24th. This is really an Achilles' heel of Trump's, and one can only say that we need to point to the geopolitical nature of these lies. We should remember what Pompeo said that when he headed the CIA, they made it sort of a sport to lie, to cheat, and that is obviously what is going on right now.

I think this very dangerous, because if you accuse another country of such enormous accusations, this is normally the kind of black propaganda which is being put out before wars. And it's being noted in China as a very, very serious thing. And I think we should all try to do our best to undo this.

SCHLANGER:

...and Trump. Is this coming from the same British networks? We see it from Pompeo and others in the U.S., but we've identified groups like the Henry Jackson Society, they're

continuing their escalation against China, aren't they?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. And the aim is to really, potentially even decouple. Now, if you decouple the countries which are allied with the United States from those which are allied with China, in other words, you go at the minimum into a bloc building as what existed in the Cold War. I think under the present conditions, this would lead for sure to a collapse of the world financial system and a hyperinflationary blowout of the system, so I think this is absolutely playing with fire.

SCHLANGER: The letter from Trump was addressed to WHO director Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus; he spoke at the World Health Assembly annual meeting of the World Health Organization, as did Xi Jinping; the U.S. was there only represented by HHS Secretary Alex Azar, but what did they have to say in addressing the concerns of the entire world about the coronavirus pandemic?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: What Dr. Tedros said was that the World Health Organization must work so that this pandemic is never being repeated, in other words, that it caught the whole world relatively unprepared, because all the warnings were there. And he said the tools were all there, but they were not used, due to a "temporary amnesia." He called for a remedy of that, and really establish a world health system. And Xi Jinping made a really remarkable speech, and all those people who are being bombarded by the anti-China propaganda, I would really challenge you to just go to your laptop or whatever, print out or look at the speech which was given by Xi Jinping, because it's an extraordinary speech. [http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-05/18/c_139067018.htm] He says, for example, that world is hit with a pandemic; 210 countries and regions are affected, already many lives have been lost and that the most precious thing is human life.

Now I would wish that the former finance minister of Germany, Wolfgang Schäuble would have such a noble conception of the

human being, because he said, recently, that it's not the function of the state to protect life as the highest priority. So in that case, I would say that the leader of a Communist Party has a better standard on the question of human life – and I'm saying this deliberately as a polemic.

Now, Xi Jinping, then proceeds to say that there must be a focus on Africa, that the world community has to help Africa with this pandemic, and in general, has to work together as a community for a shared future of civilization.

So I think the effort to take over this World Health Organization annual meeting, there was a resolution which was anti-China, which did not succeed; and there was a resolution accepted, that, indeed, after the pandemic has been successfully defeated, there should be an investigation, into what was the origin of the virus to better understand how it functioned, in order to avoid and protect against future such problems, but it should be done under the auspices of the World Health Organization.

Those people who are right now falling into the propaganda that it's all Bill Gates, who's trying to become rich – even richer than he is already – by being behind the WHO, well, there are many private firms which help finance the WHO, but does it help if the U.S. is pulling out, if the governments are underpaying the WHO? I think the remedy is that the governments take responsibility and supply the World Health Organization with the necessary means, because from everything I have seen, and we have studied this from the very beginning, because we were extremely attentive to when the first information from Wuhan came, we compared the notes, what was put out when by the Chinese government; who did not respond, like the Health Minister Jens Spahn. He said in January, “oh, the virus will never come to Germany”; in February, he said “oh the German health system is perfectly prepared...” So we have studied this as it happened. So a lot of the facts which are in the letter of President Trump to Dr. Tedros are simply

factually not true.

But, once the pandemic is overcome, there must be an investigation because the world needs to better understand the nature of this virus, and viruses in general and also whether the present world health system can be improved. But it should be done in a cooperative spirit, in the spirit of a shared humanity and not as a part of a confrontation and geopolitical attacks.

SCHLANGER: It seems as though some of the discussion and the proposals that were adopted were along the lines of what you've called for in terms of what you've called for in terms of a global effort to improve health service everywhere. We've also seen other forms of cooperation – President Trump is sending ventilators to Russia that the U.S. is going to pay for. But where do we stand on the other question, of vaccine. There's a discussion of this of "Warp Speed" program: what do you make of that?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: We have to see. On the one side, it is naturally good to call on all labs to work high speed on vaccines, and it's also obviously important that the President of the United States takes a leading role in that, that all the resources must be mobilized. But I would really warn against rushing it, because there are many new labs which have promised vaccines soon – I think a vaccine, especially one which will be used by the entire world population is something which has to be really tested on the highest standards. And that has to be seen. China already has said they will provide the whole with that vaccine, and I think there must be a cooperative approach. This is such a big threat to all of humanity that the best would be if the United States, the Europeans, Russians, Chinese, and others would all work together, because the more time is lost to find an adequate vaccine, the more people will die, and that should really be taken as a change a paradigm shift to cooperate.

It is obvious that President Trump is being put under enormous pressure, because he is up against the pandemic; there is an incredible economic consequences – the Federal Reserve just said that the collapse of the U.S. economy in the second quarter will be 30%; unemployment is going up; and obviously the fact that there were several people who tested positive and actually became sick with coronavirus in and around the White House, has created an atmosphere for President Trump where he is really put under enormous pressure. I think anybody who is interested in solving humanity's problems should make their voice heard, that this witch-hunt against Chinese, the McCarthyite style of arresting Chinese scientists, or even American scientists with Chinese backgrounds, that is really extremely dangerous and forebodes very bad! It has to be stopped and people should not fall for this propaganda, because it is completely unjustified.

SCHLANGER: It should be noted that this started before the coronavirus: You had people like Marco Rubio, Senator from Florida, whom Trump had called "little Marco," who's now taken over the Senate Intelligence Committee, he's directly collaborating with the Henry Jackson Society in the anti-China campaign. You've had a lot of this ongoing in the background. Where do you think U.S.-China relations will go, and what's the view in China?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: That's probably the most important strategic question, because if the two largest economies, the previously strongest economy and the rising economy, which after all, has 1.4 billion people, if they work together, you can almost solve any problem of the entire world; if they clash, it could lead to the destruction of all of humanity. And in China, people are extremely aware of what's going on, naturally. There are many articles warning of a new McCarthyism in the United States, and the so-called Two Sessions meeting, which is about to start in China [May 21 and 22], that's the legislative body, called the National People's Congress and

the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference; these two bodies have put the U.S.-China relationship on their agenda. And we have to see – maybe we'll get some clarity on what China is intending to do in response to this McCarthyism coming from the United States.

But people don't understand China. They have these absolute prejudices, but they don't make the effort to find out what makes this country tick, and I want to give you a little window, which gives you a good insight: And that is the fact that CGTN, which is the official Chinese TV network, have started a series called "Decoding the Future," which will start exactly on the occasion of these two sessions. And the first such broadcast is "The Power of Artificial Sun: Fusion" [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3CKd4Syb0ak>]. They're discussing the EAST program; EAST stands for Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak, and it is the fusion research center in Hefei, where they already succeeded about a year ago, to confine a plasma at a high temperature of over 100 million degrees Celsius; that is six times the heat which exists in the core of the Sun, and they were able to confine that plasma for more than 10 seconds, which represents a world record. So, China, in terms of fusion research is right now a world leader, and they're also participating in the ITER [International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor] program in Cadarache, France, where 35 countries participate.

In any case, what they say is that fusion is revolutionary, for the very reason that once you can make a breakthrough and have commercial use of fusion power, it will provide energy security not only for 1.4 billion Chinese, but for the whole world for millennia to come. And that is why China right now uniting the best minds of the world to get exactly such a crash program. They say that fusion is as important, and as great as man's landing on the Moon. People who know this program will recognize that is exactly what the fourth point of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws is all about, namely that we

have to have international cooperation for a crash program for fusion power, that we need a new platform of the fusion economy, and that we need international cooperation space exploration. And that is the way to go!

I'm absolutely sure that the offers from China for all nations to cooperate in these programs are still on the table, and if we are avoiding a clash which could lead to World War III, it has to be the kind of visionary cooperation for these future decoding the secrets of the future of the universe and our human civilization, how we will get out of this terrible crisis. I think this is a very inspiring.

And people think this is a Communist China doing that – well, maybe, there is something to this approach which is right! People should not just say “Communist China...” If they're going to get a breakthrough in fusion and they put an absolute priority on that, maybe there is something in their policy which is right. I just want to put this out as a question mark.

SCHLANGER: And then you contrast that with the insanity of the Green financial bubble, which seems to be the approach that came out of this Merkel-Macron session to discuss the financial crisis in Europe. This is the BlackRock, the equity firm, the speculation firm, which was handed by the Federal Reserve the right to determine who gets the funds to engage in speculation, and they're behind the Green financial bubble. What happened with Macron and Merkel? And is Europe fully committed to this Green policy?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this Macron-Merkel – which is this deal whereby they want to buy EU500 billion worth of bonds; this is supposed to be financed by taking this money from the financial markets. But then it's supposed to be paid back through the EU budget – so it's not really a grant, because if the EU budget is supposed to finance it after three years, it will be paid by the taxpayers. So the southern Europeans, who

are all very happy, saying, "this is a grant" – it's not that. It's basically another effort to keep the banking system afloat.

It is opposed by Austria, Holland, Denmark, Sweden; also important layers within the CDU [the German Christian Democratic Union] are calling on all CDU Members of Parliament and the European Parliament to prevent it from happening... so I don't think it's necessarily agreed that it will go anywhere. But one should always keep in mind, this is happening in the context of the EU Commission having hired who? But BlackRock, the largest asset manager in the world, to write a new legislation to integrate the Green Deal with the general EU program. Now you can hire the Devil to do your job, because you have now the EU Commission being run by BlackRock and the Federal Reserve having hired BlackRock to manage their \$4 trillion program to keep the banking system afloat. So BlackRock is de facto running the financial policies of the United States and Europe. And it just happens to be that that is exactly what was discussed at the Jackson Hole meeting last August, the big meeting of bankers and central bank governors, which takes place every year in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. And that is where the central bankers, especially then Bank of England governor Mark Carney, and Michael Bloomberg, and BlackRock and others had put out this line that there needs to be a "regime change," that practically the power has to go entirely to the central banks, and they have to run the international financial system.

So what you see here in action, is exactly that. And given the fact that Mark Carney and Bloomberg are identical with this Green Deal agenda, this is not foreboding good at all. So, if they will impose the Green Deal ideas on top of the already extremely weakened economy as a result of the pandemic, you will have a collapse of Europe and the United States as industrial powers. You cannot do that.

I think you have contrast that with the opposite approach

taken by China with the fusion crash program, and I think that we have to do everything to change that, and that is why the Schiller Institute and our associates in the United States are working on crash program for a completely different approach: Namely, to answer the pandemic and the problems which are now really jumping into the eyes of everybody, with the issue of a 1.5 billion new jobs program, a program to create 1.5 billion new, productive jobs, which will be announced shortly on our channels.

SCHLANGER: Let me just remind people who don't remember, that Carney and BlackRock worked out a compact among leading banks by which they said they will not make any credit available to any bank or any corporation which is still engaging in creating a (quote) "carbon-footprint" (unquote). In other words, they're forcing the credit to go into the Green financial bubble.

Now, Helga, this is in contrast, you talked about the program that we're about to put out, the 1.5 billion jobs, the emphasis on science and research and development investment – that's completely contrasted through the Hamiltonian credit system. And this, I think is what we have to emphasize, and our supporters have to take the LaRouche Four Laws and especially this idea of the Hamiltonian credit: that would be the complete opposite of this Green New Deal, and is the only way to get out of this crisis, isn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. People should just step back and look at the situation as it is now becoming obvious, as a result of this pandemic. You had the pandemic spreading, there was the lockdown of the economy, the lockdown already affected Europe, some European countries more than others, but also the United States very severely, and it's ongoing. But much, much worse was the effect on the so-called developing countries, which unfortunately are not so developing at all, because it hit what is generally called, in a nefarious way, the "informal economy." But that is just a PR word for the fact that it's a

shadow economy: It's people working from hand to mouth, who have no resources, who have no benefits, no social security, no health system, and when they are locked down, they are in danger of dying of starvation within days! And that is exactly the warning which was put out by the head of the World Food Program David Beasley, who said that the ongoing crisis of agriculture, the collapse of the farm sector in the United States and in Europe, these meat-packing plants, where people living and working in slave-labor conditions, immigrants became infected because the working conditions were so bad; these were shut down. Then the farmers had to "euthanize" – this is a terrible word to even use for animals – they had to kill tens of millions of hogs, chickens, bury them instead of processing them for food. This is leading to a collapse and interruption of the supply chain, while, at the same time as Beasley is warning, we are looking at famine of "biblical dimensions" where the danger is that up to 300,000 people per day could die in the short term of hunger!

Now, that is completely insane, and that in part is the result of the neo-liberal policies which denied development of the developing countries for the last 50 years at least; which is the result of an absolutely profit-oriented system of agriculture under the control of only five cartels – this is why these labor conditions are so absolutely horrendous. And that has to be changed: We need to go back to family farms. We have to have a parity price for agricultural goods, the farmers have to be able to live off their work. We have to double world production – this is a call I already made in 2008, that the 2.5-2.7 billion tons of food production has to be doubled! If you consider that the world population is increasing and you already have almost a billion people – not food secure, now being threatened with starvation – 2 billion people not having clean water, you need to build up agriculture. If you look at the condition of the world, it is now the time to completely reverse that and really industrialize the developing sector. Now, for the United

States, that means we will have to create 50 million productive jobs in the short term, but for the developing countries, we need more than a billion jobs, because you will have a lot of young people, who either will die, or try to migrate to the north, or, we will use this incredible crisis to really turn it around, and do what Franklin D. Roosevelt intended with the Bretton Woods system in the beginning – namely, that the development of Global South, or the developing countries, has to occur. Roosevelt, at the time of the preparation of the Bretton Woods system said, the increase of the living standard of the whole world population will be the basis for stability and peace in the world, and that is exactly the task we have in front of us, and that is the life work of Lyndon LaRouche, who after all, for 50 years worked on development programs for every single part of the world:

*He worked on an Africa development program, which we published in 1976 the first time;

*He worked on an “Oasis Plan,” for the development of the Middle East;

*He worked on a 50-year development program for the Pacific Basin;

*We worked with Indira Gandhi on a 40-year development program for India;

*We worked with José López Portillo on a Latin American-wide economic and infrastructure integration;

*Naturally a reindustrialization of the United States;

*And the Eurasian Land-Bridge, in response to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

So for the last 50 years, LaRouche, my late husband, and the LaRouche movement, we have worked on concrete development programs. We published that in an updated form in 2014 called

the “New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge,” and now is the time, under conditions of this crisis to upgrade this and create 1.5 billion new productive job, and really start a new chapter in the history of humanity. And that is what I’m calling on you to support and help us to put on the agenda instead of geopolitical confrontation.

SCHLANGER: And you can find the key to that on our website: Lyndon LaRouche’s four economic laws [https://larouchepub.com/lar/2014/4124four_laws.html]. Helga, I don’t have anything else to ask. Is there anything else you want to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: We will put under this program the petition for a world health system, a link to the video about this world health system. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2020/05/08/coronavirus-petition-for-global-health-infrastructure/>] And I would really ask you to help us to distribute this petition as widely as you can, all your social media, your email lists, your colleagues, your friends, and make it a snowballing demand, because we need a chorus of forces in the world to demand such a change in the strategic policies.

SCHLANGER: Helga, with that, thank you a lot, and I’ll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

Wall Streets’ ’helbredelse’

afhænger af en vaccine? Økonomisk genrejsning afhænger af LaRouches Nye Bretton Woods

Den 18. maj (EIRNS) – USA's centralbankchef, Jerome Powell, tydeligvis bekymret over et langvarigt finanskrak, har givet to store interviews indenfor fem dage, og vil i morgen vidne i Senatet, alt sammen for at sige at finansministeriets og Kongressens "hjælp" med over 3 billioner \$ ikke er nok til en "genrejsning". Powell fortalte CBS' nyhedsprogram "60 Minutter", at USA vil opleve et kollaps i BNP på op til 30%, og 25% i arbejdsløshed gennem 2. kvartal. Dette vil ikke blive genoprettet, sagde han, før slutningen af 2021, og ikke uden ekstra billioner i lån og udgifter – og ikke uden en vaccine.

Powell ved at corona-pandemien imploderer en enorm "altomfattende boble" med virksomhedernes gæld i centrum: Centralbankens nye Rapport angående Finansiell Stabilitet antyder ængsteligt dette.

Der er et deflatorisk sammenbrud i efterspørgslen; Powell og Wall Street venter, venligst, på en vaccine til at genoprette den, fordi de ingen idé har, om hvordan man "skaber" efterspørgsel med kreditter til reel fysisk-økonomisk ekspansion eller store infrastrukturprojekter. Så de bliver ved med at opfordre Kongressen til at give penge til folk, delstater, byer, hospitaler – frem for alt til finansmarkederne – imens økonomien styrtdykker. Hvad Wall Street og City of London virkelig søger efter er en ny boble, en stor "grøn finansboble", anført af Larry Finks BlackRock, som leder de finansielle redningsaktioner af både USA og den Europæiske Union.

Den virkelige efterspørgsel er til stede, og yderst presserende.

Den 26. april forpligtede Ghanas præsident sit land til at bygge 88 lokale og regionale hospitaler i år, i distrikter hvor de ikke eksisterer, og at påbegynde bygningen af regionale hospitaler i de 6 nye regioner, som ingen har, for at redde menneskeliv fra pandemien, der nu spreder sig i udviklingslandene. Stort set hver eneste af dem har brug for det samme. Hvordan kan Ghana og den underudviklede del af verden gøre dette? Kun hvis de førende teknologiske nationer bliver enige om at iværksætte et internationalt kreditsystem, udformet til at finansiere eksport af kapitalgoder til, og økonomisk infrastruktur i, udviklingslandene. Titusinder af nye hospitaler er nødvendige. Mange, mange millioner af nye produktive job venter – og ellers, millioner af unødvendige dødsfald pga. COVID-19.

Sydafrikas energiministerium spurgte om hvorfra det kunne importere et dusin små og/eller modulære reaktorer, for at imødekomme det store energiunderskud. Det er i alle udviklingslande presserende at udfylde den enorme energimangel til at forsørge nye hospitaler og husholdninger. Mere end 1 milliard mennesker verden over har ingen adgang til elektricitet. Hvordan kan denne adgang stilles til rådighed, herunder kommercialiseringen af små modulære reaktorer, midt i en pandemi, for at redde menneskeliv fra denne pandemi? Ved at ledeerne fra mindst USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien mødes nu, for at genetablere et kreditsystem, som Franklin Roosevelts Bretton Woods-system.

FN's Verdensfødevareprogram advarer om, at hvis ikke tabet af arbejdspladser, indkomst og fødevareproduktion, som sker i hele verden, vendes gennem nødforanstaltninger, da kunne lige så mange mennesker dø per dag, som er døde fra pandemien i hele verden indtil nu. Hvordan kan dette gøres uden en ny orden for selvforsyning af fødevarer i hver nation, og

incitamentet til landmænd om at producere al den mad de kan?

Et Nyt Bretton Woods, rent faktisk udformet til at påbegynde hurtig industriel og landbrugsmæssig udvikling i det "Globale Syd", blev skitseret af den afdøde Lyndon LaRouche, som i årtier foreslog det sammen med store udviklingsprojekter. Nu skal det skabes, og Helga Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret til, at minimum de fire førende nationer afholder et topmøde og påbegynder dette. Hun har igangsat et "Apollo-projekt" for et verdenssundhedssystem; og en global underskriftsindsamling for dette.

Tag en hvilken som helst anden tilgang til "helbredelse" end denne livline for hele planeten, baseret på de store nationers samarbejde, og Wall Street vil kontrollere den og forvandle den til en "grøn finansboble".

Vær med i underskriftsindsamlingen; krævet et Nyt Bretton Woods, som forudsat af LaRouche.

https://www.skrivunder.net/global_sundhedsinfrastruktur

Storbritannien burde afkobles, ikke Kina

Den 17. maj (EIRNS) – Den farligste udvikling, der kan ske i den nuværende strategiske situation, er USA's afkobling fra Kina, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion i søndags. Verden står over for en eksistentiel krise med en

kombineret pandemi og hungersnød "af bibelske proportioner", alt sammen som et resultat af et systemisk finansielt og økonomisk sammenbrud, der gentagne gange er blevet forudsagt af Lyndon LaRouche. Ingen løsning på denne krise er tilgængelig for menneskeheden uden USA's og Kinas tætte samarbejde – sammen med Rusland, Indien og andre nationer – centreret om den presserende, højteknologiske udvikling af den underudviklede sektor. Det er det centrale punkt i LaRouchePACs kommende "LaRouche-plan for genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har behov for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job."

Det faktum, at al snavset omkring det britiske-Obama-støttede kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump endelig kommer frem – og at Trump insisterer på, at folk vil blive fængslet for dette – hjælper med til at styrke denne politiske mulighed.

Men hvis forholdet mellem USA og Kina kører skævt, hvis der sker en alvorlig afkobling, af den slags som briterne aktivt arbejder for gennem deres agenter i positioner, som Mike Pompeo, vil planeten brække over i konkurrerende blokke, meget som det skete under Den kolde Krig – blot denne gang under forhold af en sammenbrudskrise. Zepp-LaRouche uddybede: Dette vil være ødelæggende for USA, det vil skabe kaos i hele Europa, og det vil sætte verden på en kurs mod krig mellem supermagterne.

Den amerikanske ambassadør i Polen, Georgette Mosbacher, agerer efter den samme britiske geopolitiske drejebog som Pompeo. Hun opfordrede til, at amerikanske atomvåben, der nu er stationeret i Tyskland, skulle overføres til et mere fjælsomt Polen – et stenkast fra Ruslands grænse. Den tidligere FN-våbeninspektør Scott Ritter svarede syrligt: "Simpelthen en af de dumme ideer i verden. Den russiske overkommando takker i øvrigt for at have gjort det lettere at overmande og bemægtige sig denne såkaldte nukleare afskrækkelse – Google 1st Guards Tank Army". Nyhedsbureauet Sputnik International bemærkede korrekt, at dette hurtigt

kunne eskalere til en ny cubansk missilkrise.

Voldsomt angreb på internationalt samarbejde sker samtidig med et muligt skifte i den globale dagsorden

Den 22. april (EIRNS) – Bortset fra reel krig, ser vi en optrapning af ekstreme diplomatiske beskyldninger, juridiske kneb, og militære provokationer, der udgør et angreb på internationalt samarbejde, netop når der er allermest brug for et sådant mod pandemien, og mod den underliggende monetaristiske og malthusianske virus. Tag ikke fejl, dette er ikke blot en eller anden vedblivende britisk geopolitik, gennemført af en flok tosser. De farlige fjendtligheder, fokuseret på det afgørende forhold mellem præsidenterne Donald Trump og Xi Jinping, er tilrettelagt for at forpurre det dybgående potentiale ved Schiller Instituttets internationale politiske arrangement denne weekend – og mobiliseringen omkring dette, hvilket er et uundværligt element for at forandre den samlede verdens dagsorden i en positiv retning.

Vores væsentlige rolle er at øge vores egen rækkevidde og rekrutteringsproces.

Kort sagt er der, hvad angår Kinas og USA's forhold, som blev

fejret i New York City i går ved en (virtuel) ankomstceremoni for flere fly med medicinsk udstyr fra Kina, en række parallelle tiltag i gang for at forsøge at smadre den venskabelige dynamik mellem Trump og Xi. Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo afholdt i dag en pressekonference, hvor han langede ud efter Kinas kommunistiske Parti og Verdenssundhedsorganisationen for at dække over kilden og spredningen af SARS-CoV-2-virusset. I går aftes medvirkede Trumps rådgiver, Peter Navarro, chef for Kontoret for Handels- og Produktionspolitik og koordinator for den Nationale Forsvarslov, på Fox News for heftigt at angribe og anklage Kina for "fire drab": for at "masseproducere" Wuhan-virusset i et laboratorium; for at gemme det i ugevis, bag Verdenssundhedsorganisationens ryg; for at "støvsuge" antiviral-medikamenter op; og for at sende "forfalskede" versioner til USA. Han påstod også, at den amerikanske befolkning troede på hans nedrige nonsens.

I går blev Missouri den først stat til at anlægge erstatningssag mod Kina for angivelig dårlig håndtering af virusset. I dag meddelte Mississippi, at de vil gøre det samme. Listen fortsætter, og inkluderer militær konfrontation. USA's flåde har tre skibe i det Sydkinesiske Hav, i nærheden af et kinesisk overvågningsfartøj.

Alt imens, verdens pandemi og økonomiske sammenbrud kræver overvejelser og handling – ikke løgne og aggression. For eksempel modtog FN's sikkerhedsråd en briefing fra David Beasley, den administrerende direktør af Verdens Fødevareprogram, angående det øjeblikkelige behov for komplette og pålidelige mængder af basisfødevarer, opdelt til 36 lande, der er fuldstændig afhængige af dette for at overleve. Han advarede om en "hungersnødspandemi" blandt 265 millioner mennesker.

Gennemfør dette: Der er eksperter, i de internationale kulisser, til at rådslå om at realisere denne fødevarelivline

– fra at sikre landbrugsproduktionen på begge hemisfærer, til transportlogistikken. Det samme må ske for alle grundlæggende områder – industri, energi, vand, transport, brændstof. Dette er den grundlæggende understøtning af de pandemiske nødforanstaltninger, og for det globale sundhedsmæssige sikkerhedssystem, som må oprettes.

Tyske Højesteretsdom rammer Bankredning– Gør en ende på det Britiske Imperies verdensomspændende City of London-system

Den 6. maj (EIRNS)–Da den tyske højesteret denne uge dømte den Europæiske Centralbanks (ECB) konstante redningsaktion af de største banker i Europa, ved at overføre befolkningens værdier til disse banker, til at være illegal, tog de kun et skridt, omdog et vigtigt skridt, henimod tilendebringelsen af det Britiske Imperies politik, som har ruineret de industrielle økonomier de sidste 50 år. Dette peger i retningen af det, som EIR og LaRouchePAC har mobiliseret for–at gøre en ende på den imperiale, finansielle kontrol fra City of Londons banker, over det globale finansielle og økonomiske system, og erstatte det med en befolknings-tjenelig politik, baseret på Alexander Hamiltons og Lyndon LaRouches Amerikanske System.

Umiddelbart efter det store finanskrak i 2008–da disse banker, med deres vilde spekulationer, bragte alle verdens nationers økonomier i knæ–dikterede City of London, ved G20-mødet i

april, 2009 i London, modsvaret til dette krak. Intet nyt system—alle større nationer må organisere en finansiel redningsaktion af bankerne, og bidrage 500 milliarder \$ til Verdens Valutafond, ovenpå udvidelsen af redningsaktionen selv. Disse 11 år har set enorme overførsler af rigdomme fra de fattige og middelklassen til de største banker—nu langt større—samt de rigeste virksomhedsejere. Ingen domstol greb ind på nogen betydelig måde i dette røveri—faktisk har nogle aktivt tilskyndet dette mod udviklingslande—indtil nu.

Allerede for 50 år siden ødelagde City of London Præsident Franklin Roosevelts Bretton Woods-system, sat op for efterkrigstiden, hvilket var det eneste system, som havde økonomisk vækst, menneskers produktive arbejde og udryddelsen af fattigdom for øje. Roosevelts idé var baseret på det Amerikanske System for produktivitet, og videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt. I stedet for dette, pålagde "the City" de sidste 50 års globale spekulationskasino med flydende vekselkurser, bobler, krak, og redningsaktioner. I 2009 insisterede London på et nyt årti med de største redningsaktioner fra centralbankerne nogensinde set. Og i marts, dette år, begyndte en endnu større redningsaktion, som "svar" på coronapandemien.

Globaliseringens "bankstere" og økonomer har reageret, som var de blevet mægtigt stukket, på den Tyske Højesterets dom, d. 5. maj, mod ECB (se EIR's Daily Alert, 6. maj, 2020). Den Europæiske Centralbank selv protesterede, at "EU-Domstolen dømte i december, 2018, at ECB handler indenfor dennes mandat for prisstabilitet,"—som om at den blot holder priserne stabile, når den trykker 750 milliarder € om året, for at opkøbe obligationer fra de store banker. Et "globalist"-medlem af EU-parlamentet, og tidligere belgisk premierminister, Guy Verhofstadt, gav sin mening til kende på Twitter: "Hvis hver eneste forfatningsdomstol for hvert eneste medlemsland laver sin egen fortolkning af hvad Europa kan, og ikke kan gøre, er det begyndelsen på slutningen... Nu da den Tyske Højesteret

tydeligvis forsøger at stække vingerne på ECB, må den Europæiske Kommission stå ved sit politiske ansvar..." George Calhoun begræd i dag i magasinet Forbes: "I går tilendebagte den Tyske Forfatningsdomstol (Bundesverfassungsgericht, hvis I vil)–Tysklands nærmeste tilsvarende institution til USA's Højesteret–essentielt ECB's samlede program for kvantitative lempelser."

Men vi må gøre en ende, ikke blot på ECB, men på hele de sidste 50 års altid-voksende, gigantiske, spekulationsfodrede banker, ubetalelig gæld og nedskæringspolitik, som har bragt City of London tilbage i førersædet for verdens finans. Dette system lukkede ned for hospitaler og den offentlige sundhedsforsorgs kapaciteter, som vi nu har brug for. Det øgede den ekstreme fattigdom overalt på den sydlige halvkugle, selv imens Kina afskaffede den fattigdom for 850 millioner mennesker. Det har derfor ladet nationerne på den sydlige halvkugle stå tilbage, uden offentlige sundhedsforanstaltninger mod den hurtige spredning af COVID-19–medmindre de største nationer mobiliserer for at opbygge disse.

USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien–disse magter, som det Britiske Imperies efterretningstjeneste konstant har arbejdet på at adskille–må begynde denne opbygning nu, ellers vil flere millioner dø. Det betyder at de skal skabe et nyt verdensomspændende kreditsystem; eller, i virkeligheden, vende tilbage til Franklin Roosevelts intention med sit "Amerikanske System" i Bretton Woods, som City of London ødelagde. Dette er opgaven, igen, ved Schiller Instituttets jubilæum for Befrielsen, denne lørdag. Denne gang er fjenden det Britiske Imperium.

En kolossal udfordring: Vi er konfronteret med to globale pandemier

Den 15. maj (EIRNS) – COVID-19-pandemien er nu i sandhed verdensomspændende og har allerede dræbt næsten 300.000 mennesker, med måneder og sandsynligvis år tilbage. Det burde have aflivet "globalisternes" illusion om, at systemet med frihandel, lave lønninger og finansspekulation, som har drevet verden siden 1970'erne, er forenelig med menneskelig overlevelse, for ikke at nævne menneskelige opfindelser og fremskridt.

De største nationer var ikke forberedte på at behandle ofrene for den alvorlige pandemi-lungebetændelse; de havde ikke hospitalerne, de mest moderne medicinske apparater, eller sundhedspersonalets udstyr klar. De ikke-industrialiserede udviklingslande kæmper nu for at udvikle et forsvar imod det.

Der er nu tydeligvis en anden, værre, global pandemi – hungersnød og ekstrem, livstruende fattigdom. Halvdelen af verdens samlede arbejdsstyrke er arbejdsløs – mere end 1,6 milliarder mennesker, som i høj grad overlever gennem "uformelt arbejde", der er forsvundet i knækkede kæder af udbud og efterspørgsel, lukkede grænser, offentlige sundhedsmæssige nedlukninger. Ekspertterne fra Verdens Fødevareprogram står ved deres vurdering: "Elendig fattigdom" og fødevaremangel er ved at blive så omsiggribende, at 300.000 mennesker snart kunne dø hver eneste dag af hungersnødspandemien.

De største, teknologisk førende nationer – især USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – bliver nødt til at mødes og enes om at påbegynde og finansiere et kæmpemæssigt opbygningsprojekt –

den offentlige sundhedsinfrastruktur, som disse lande har brug for og mangler, foruden anden grundlæggende infrastruktur.

Og de førende nationer har ligeledes brug for ny offentlig, sundhedsinfrastruktur. De havde ikke det nødvendige antal hospitalssenge. Det er grunden til, at 40-45.000 amerikanere uden coronavirus-smitte er døde siden slutningen af februar, fordi de ikke gik til hospitalet eller klinikken, når de var nødt til det. Og amerikanere med COVID-19 døde i hjemmet, eller på plejehjem.

Det nye verdenssundhedssystem, som Schiller Instituttet mobiliserer og afholder internationaler konferencer for, er nødvendigt for hver nation på denne planet. De fire største nationer, som vi nævnte, samt andre der samarbejder, må træffe beslutningerne til at lede opbygningen af dette.

Angående hvorfor to tredjedele af alle 3,3 milliarder arbejdsdygtige personer i verden kun har "uformelt" arbejde, grundlæggende set ikke-produktivt arbejde, måned-til-måned- og endog dag-til-dag-"småjobs" – i udviklingslande og selv i nogle dele af USA – med umulige lave indkomster: Et halvt århundredes globaliseret system for afindustrialisering, finansiel og "lige-til-tiden"-frihandel, med hvert land virkelig blot producerende nogle få produkter, har kastet den menneskelige arbejdsstyrke ud i dette uføre.

Og af de 50 millioner amerikanere, som enten er arbejdsløse eller tvunget ud i deltidsjobs lige nu, havde 45 millioner – 90% – af dem intet produktivt arbejde før de mistede det.

LaRouches repræsentant i Filippinerne, Butch Valdes, blev citeret på følgende måde i Manila Bulletin: "Dette vil ikke slutte næste måned. Verden og Filippinerne vil stå overfor økonomisk smitte. Underudviklede, dårligt udstyrede nationer vil konfronteres med alvorlige konsekvenser. Vi bliver nødt til at få et paradigmeskifte... Rulle globaliseringen tilbage,

forbyde centralbanker og etablere nationalbanker, fremtvinge et kollaps af det spekulative investeringssystem (hasardspil) og bringe ressourcer over i den fysiske økonomi. USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien må lede verden hen mod denne forandring for at redde civilisationen. Derudover må offentlige værker bringes tilbage under statskontrol, mens 'målingen af vækst ændres fra den ubrugelige BNP til energiforbrug (kalorieindtagning) per person; f.eks. energiproduktion per kvadratkilometer, hospitalssenge i forhold til befolkningsantallet, lignende metoder i målingen af produktionen af varer'".

Omkring 1,5 milliarder nye produktive arbejdspladser verden over. Den eneste måde at trodse udfordringen fra disse to globale pandemier.

Stop den McCarthy-agtige heksejagt imod Kina og præsident Trump

Den 14. maj (EIRNS) – For et halvt år siden, i november 2019, offentliggjorde Executive Intelligence Review en polemisk 24-siders pjece med ovenstående overskrift. Den begyndte som følger:

"I en webcast den 10. maj 1997 drøftede Lyndon LaRouche det presserende behov for en firemagts-alliance mellem suveræne nationer for at gendanne økonomisk fornuft – 'imod den største

magt på planeten, som er det britiske imperium, kaldet det britiske statssamfund (Commonwealth)'. Det er fjenden".

"I den tale, leveret for 22 år siden, skitserede LaRouche en strategi for dagens krise.

"Og hvis, en skønne dag, eksempelvis en søndag formiddag, efter et weekendmøde, præsidenten for De Forenede Stater, Kinas præsident og et par andre mennesker skulle udtale:" Vi har i denne weekend konstateret, baseret på vores rådgivere og kendsgerningerne, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot. Og at vi, i kraft af vores ansvar som statsoverhoveder, vil sætte disse bankerotte institutioner under konkursbehandling i almenhedens interesse. Og det er i vores interesse at samarbejde som nationer om at gøre dette og undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet". Resultatet er så, at en sådan meddelelse... betyder, at hele systemet, fra det øjeblik af, er blevet anbragt i guillotinen, og at hovedet ruller ned ad gaden (Alan Greenspans hoved måske). Det betyder, at vi på det tidspunkt har drivkraften til straks at opbygge et nyt finansielt og monetært system."

Indledningen til pjecen fortsatte: "Dette nye finanssystem er nu mere presserende end nogensinde. Denne pjece er beregnet som modgift imod kampagnen for at forgifte forholdet mellem USA og Kina og sabotere et nyt system fra at blive til. Som LaRouche bemærkede, var det kun kombinationen af De Forenede Stater, Kina, Rusland og Indien, der ved at arbejde sammen, ville have gennemslagskraften til at få et nyt system på plads."

Hvad der var sandt for et halvt år siden, da EIR først offentliggjorde disse linjer, er dobbelt så sandt i dag. En endnu mere ondskabsfuld bølge af anti-kinesisk Mccarthyisme er blevet sluppet løs i de seneste dage og uger:

- FBI har advaret alle amerikanske forskere, der

samarbejder med kinesiske kolleger om at udvikle en vaccine mod coronavirus, om, at de kunne være en del af en kinesisk spionring, og blive anklaget i overensstemmelse hermed.

- Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo holdt en tølperagtig tale til de amerikanske guvernører for et par uger siden, hvor han truede dem til at stoppe med at indgå handels- og økonomiske aftaler med Kina.
- FBI's websted advarede mod enhver amerikansk deltagelse i Kinas 'Tusind Talenter'-program for akademisk udveksling og sagde truende, at selvom medlemskab af Tusind Talenter-programmet ikke er teknisk ulovligt, har FBI-undersøgelser "afsløret, at deltagerne ofte tilskyndes til at overføre forskning de udfører i USA til Kina".
- Og den største McCarthy-agtige operation af dem alle, det igangværende kupforsøg imod præsident Donald Trump, eskalerede senest med en korrupt dommers afslag på at henlægge de falske anklager mod general Michael Flynn, selvom justitsministeriet meddelte, at det ville gøre det.

En fremtrædende ledende artikel i Kinas Global Times i går behandlede spørgsmålet lige på og hårdt: "Såfremt denne neo-McCarthyisme skulle genopstå i USA, vil den signalere en start på en ny kold krig mellem Kina og USA ... [Sådan] opførsel vil til syvende og sidst give bagslag. Dette vil underminere Trumps perspektiv for genvalg ... Det udgør farlige trusler mod verdensfred og stabilitet."

Det strategiske formål med denne nye McCarthyisme er, som EIR advarede om i sin pjece november 2019, at "sabotere et nyt system fra at blive til." Et sådant nyt system er tættere på i dag end nogensinde, da et planetarisk systemisk sammenbrud er undervejs; et sammenbrud der kombinerer en dødbringende global pandemi, et kollaps af det transatlantiske finanssystem, hungersnød "af bibelske proportioner", og mere. Og i denne krise erkendes og høres LaRouche-bevægelsens stemme rundt om i verden, med dens unikke autoritative løsning på sammenbruddet, krisen, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går, herunder i en række af de store nationer, der ville være del af Lyndon LaRouches firemagts-alliance.

Denne stemme vil nu blive styrket med den kommende udgivelse af en programmatisk løsning på sammenbrudskrisen i sin helhed, "LaRouche-planen for at genåbne den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har brug for 1.5 milliarder nye, produktive jobs".

Dette er "den store"

Den 13. maj (EIRNS)–Der har været et voksende antal alvorlige advarsler fra forskellige kilder, der advarer, at hvis vi, som nationer og individer, ikke forandrer tingenes gang, kunne det føre til "den store". Men dette er en alvorlig fejltagelse, betonedes Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, i sit ugentlige internationale webcast. Problemet, sagde hun, er at folk fokuserer på aspekter af krisen–såsom pandemien, finanskrisen, den globale hungersnød, krigsfaren–men ikke ser den overordnede årsag: at vi befinder os i et sammenbrud under opsejling i 50 år. Der findes ingen løsning til nogle af problemerne uden at adressere alle kriserne på én gang.

Selvom det er tåbeligt at sælge konspirationsteorier, der bebrejder Kina eller Præsident Donald Trump for pandemien, er det lige så tåbeligt at bebrejde coronaviruset selv. Virusser vil altid dukke frem, men det faktum at der er en pandemi er ene og alene pga. 50 års systematisk afmontering af de offentlige sundhedskapaciteter i de trans-Atlantiske nationer, forbundet med afindustrialiseringen, som forringede arbejde og levestandard. Føj hertil legaliseringen af stoffer og opioider, og andre aspekter af kulturens nedværdigelse. Endnu værre var fornægtelsen af modernisering og industrielt fremskridt i udviklingslandene, som efterlod Sydamerika og Afrika sårbare for et holocaust ikke set mage til i århundreder.

FNs Verdensfødevarerprogram (World Food Program) advarer om 300.000 dødsfald dagligt, indenfor et par måneder, fra virusset og hungersnød, hvis ikke nødforanstaltninger i fattige lande tages nu—en proces som er fuldstændig afhængig af et tæt samarbejde mellem verdens to største økonomier, Kina og USA. Et John Hopkins-studie, udgivet i Lancet, d. 12. maj, som undersøgte pandemiens potentielle konsekvenser i 118 lav- eller middelindkomst-lande i hele verden, advarede at over de næste måneder, kunne en ekstra 1,15 millioner børn under 5 år, og 56.700 mødre, der lige har født, dø af akut underernæring og andre undgåelige årsager, som et resultat af sammenbruddet af et allerede sårbart sundhedssystem i disse lande—6000 børn og 344 mødre hver dag.

Det er det britisk imperiale system, som har nedgraderet det Hamiltonske, amerikanske system, baseret på en forøgelse af produktiviteten, til et, baseret på maksimeringen af "aktieværdier," forbundet med ondsksfulde nedskæringsbetingelser, som er den egentlige årsag til pandemien.

Der findes ingen "tilbage til det gode gamle," hvor verden var før pandemien eksponerede det eksisterende systems forfald. Hvis ikke de britiske og amerikanske krigsmagere bag

massepsykosen mod Kina og Rusland bliver erstattet med en ny agenda, baseret på et øjeblikkeligt samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og USA, og andre villige nationer, for at adressere det samlede omfang af denne globale krise, som Lyndon LaRouche gjorde dette gennem hele sit liv, så er menneskeheden i sandhed konfronteret med spørgsmålet, om vi er moralsk egnede til at overleve.

Schiller Instituttets konferencer over internettet, som fejrede mødet mellem amerikanske og sovjetiske tropper ved Elben, d. 25. april, og som fejrede Befrielsen, d. 9. maj, demonstrerede muligheden for en sådan global anstrengelse: En Sundhedssilkevej, for at adressere pandemien; genetableringen af det partnerskab, som sejrede over fascismens trussel i 1930'erne og 1940'erne, for at adressere den genopstående fascisme i dag; at forene landmænd verden over for at gendrive "karteliseringen" af fødevareproduktion; skabelsen af 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser, ved at genrejse de udviklede økonomier og ved at udvikle de forhenværende koloniserede nationer. Alt dette er nu indenfor vores rækkevidde, eftersom alle mennesker er tvunget af denne krise til droppe deres illusioner og falske aksiomer, og at aktivere deres kreative potentiale for at adressere denne civilisatoriske krise.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 14
maj 2020.
Den nye coronastrategi og**

kampen for økonomisk genrejsning

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Resumé

Coronakrisen:

Mette Frederiksen og regeringen viser stadigvæk stærkt lederskab under coronakrisen med den ny coronastrategi, men vi skal bruge de nødvendige penge til at ansætte folk til testning, laboratorier og smittesporing.

Konspirationsteorierne om, at coronakrisen det er bare en komplot for at Bill Gates kan sælge farlige vacciner til verden, eller for at indføre et diktatur er vildledende propaganda. Det er heller ikke rigtigt at COVID19 skulle være skabt i et kinesisk laboratorium.

Vi står med "The Big One" siger Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

Kombinationen af kriser: sundhed, økonomi, landbrug – det hele. Hvad Lyndon LaRouche havde advaret om i 50 år.

Som LaRouche altid spurgte: Har vores civilisation den moralske kapacitet til at overleve?

Verdens Fødevareorganisationen WFP advarer om, at 300.000 mennesker kan dø om dagen pga. det coronaudløste kollaps i fødevareproduktion, hvis vi ikke gør noget. 3,3 mia. mennesker arbejder i uformelle jobs, uden nogen form for social sikkerhed.

Vi har brug for et nyt nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem og

LaRouches fire økonomisk love.

Schiller Instituttet arbejder på en plan for halvanden milliarder nye jobs til at opbygge verden.

Glem den klimadagsordenen.

75 år-året for den 9. maj 1945: Victory in Europe Day:

Ånden fra Elben, hvor amerikanske og russiske soldater rakte hånden til hinanden og svor "Aldrig mere".

Vi har brug for en alliance mellem USA-Rusland-Kina samt Indien for at lave et globalt paradigmeskifte.

USA:

Justitsministeriet har droppet retsagen imod General Michael Flynn.

Mindst 22% arbejdsløshed.

Kvantitative lempelser for finansverden, men ikke meget til produktion.

Vil Trump vedtage Schiller Instituttets program?

Vi må udbrede kendskab til Schiller Instituttets løsninger.

Skab en renæssance.

Gå med i Schiller Instituttets kampagne.

En metode for 'hele

Økonomien' til Verden – 1.5 milliarder nye produktive jobs!

Den 12. maj (EIRNS) – For at bekæmpe den nye coronavirus-pandemi, og lykkes økonomisk bagefter, er der ingen 'halve løsninger', hverken geografisk eller med enkelte økonomiske sektorer – landbrug, produktion, skibsfart, sundhedsvæsen osv. Eller nation for nation – ikke engang USA eller Kina. Der er kun metoden med 'hele' verden, foretaget af samarbejdende suveræne nationer. Helga Zepp-LaRouche talte om dette til medarbejdere i dag, efter at have mødt et team der er gået i gang med at frembringe et økonomisk program så hurtigt som muligt, under arbejdstitlen: "Verden har brug for 1.5 milliarder nye produktive jobs".

Dette nye LaRouchePAC-program vil præsentere det fulde omfang af nødvendig agroindustriel aktivitet inden for en produktiv platform med energi, vand, transport, videnskab og uddannelse. Dets overordnede perspektiv er i tråd med nødvendigheden af, at de fire stormagter konfererer og griber til handling og samarbejde. De repræsenterer de store økonomier og menneskelige ressourcer. De stærke økonomier i Japan, Tyskland, Frankrig, Italien med flere er også nødvendige. Bekæmpelsen af pandemien og opbygningen af Afrika er en verdensprioritet.

Programmet vil skitsere det nødvendige fokus for at tillempe den aktuelle diskussion om "genåbning", test og alle andre aspekter af post-pandemisk planlægning, selvom den sydlige halvkugle først netop nu oplever den første bølge af pandemien. Endvidere, at udsigten til at virusset blusser op i løbet af de kommende to år erkendes. Også "sultpandemien" trænger sig på.

Sæt dette overordnede synspunkt i kontrast til den store afledning af offentlighedens opmærksomhed væk fra spørgsmål om økonomisk beredskabsopbygning og omstilling, for i stedet at skyde skylden på præsident Donald Trump, hælde til diverse konspirationsteorier, og mest af alt, bebrejde Kina for at smitte verden og for alle andre genvordigheder. Hvad sker der, når dine høner holder op med at lægge æg, og brønden løber tør? Skyd skylden på Kina! Sjovt, men dødbringende.

"Vi er i krig lige nu", med Kina, sagde Peter Navarro mandag på to store tv-stationer. Navarro er assistent for præsidenten, direktør for handels- og produktionspolitik og koordinator for loven om den nationale forsvarspolitik. Han sagde: "Vi er i krig, tag ikke fejl af det. Kineserne slap en virus løs i verden". Han sagde: "Det er ikke et spørgsmål om at straffe dem, det er et spørgsmål om at stille Kina til ansvar – at holde det Kinesiske kommunistiske Parti ansvarligt".

Optrapningen mod Kina inkluderer at presse præsident Trump til at forsøge at få ham til at modsætte sig Kina på alle områder, fra virusset til handelsforbindelser. Dette er klassisk britisk geopolitik med 'os-imod-dem', og de netværk der udøver presset kommer lige ud af det britiske imperialistiske efterretningsssamfund.

Zepp-LaRouche understregede i dag, "Det er tid for os til at fokusere på løsninger". Vi er i en dramatisk situation. I løbet af de sidste to uger har vi – gennem centrale ideer og begivenheder – været i diskussion om dette med tusinder af mennesker, i betragtning af Schiller Instituttets konferencer, LaRouches nationale politiske grupperes initiativer, internationale konferenceopkald – alt sammen under pandemiske omstændigheder. Vi vil trappe op.

Vi kan sige til folk: Lyndon LaRouche advarede igennem 50 år om, hvad vi står over for i dag. Faktisk kan man tage de selvsamme ord fra mange af hans advarsler fra dengang og

erfare, at de passer, nøjagtigt, som om han talte om hvad der sker i dag. I 1997 sagde han én ting højt og tydeligt: "Der er ingen grund til at nogen på denne planet, der er i stand til at arbejde, skal stå uden arbejde! Og 'projektet' [Eurasien/Verdens-Landbroen] er midlet."

Coronavirus - underskriftsindsamling: For global sundhedsinfrastruktur

Vi, de undertegnede, støtter Schiller Instituttets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouches opfordring til global sundhedsmæssig og økonomisk infrastruktur til at imødegå coronavirus-pandemien og den underudvikling (både økonomisk og videnskabelig), der gjorde os sårbare over for den.

Coronavirus-pandemien, der fejer henover kloden – og de økonomiske virkninger af de sundhedsforanstaltninger der er truffet for at knuse den – afslører den utilgivelige mangel på udvikling af den menneskelige art og kræver en global tilgang for at behandle – ikke alene det coronavirus, der i øjeblikket truer os – men også den underudvikling der efterlader os modtagelige for, at pandemien kræver frygtelig mange ofre.

Når sundhedssystemer selv i udviklede regioner, såsom Norditalien, er blevet udfordret ud over dets kapacitet, hvad er da udsigterne for mindre udviklede nationer, der har en enorm mangel på sundhedsinfrastruktur og mangler sikker adgang til rent vand, sanitet og nærende mad? Hvordan kan en person, der er afhængig af den daglige indkomst for at forsørge

familien, forblive hjemme i flere uger? Hvordan kan folk uden rent vand praktisere god håndhygiejne? Hvis der ikke er intensiv-senge til rådighed, kan læger så redde livet for et offer med svære Covid-19-symptomer?

Alt imens de akutte lidelser fra coronavirus kræver vores opmærksomhed, hvad med de 800.000 børn under 5 år der dør af diarrésygdomme hvert år? Hvordan kan sundheden for de hundreder af millioner af mennesker, der i øjeblikket er ramt af fødevareusikkerhed, sikres?

Vi kræver en global sundhedsinfrastruktur i den bredeste forstand.

Verden har brug for flere hospitaler, nye intensiv-sengepladser, yderligere ventilatorer, mange flere uddannede læger, øget produktionskapacitet for PPE og testudstyr i en størrelsesorden langt over den, der eksisterede i starten af dette udbrud. Men der er også brug for meget mere. Fattigdom, underernæring, manglende adgang til forbedret vand og sanitet – dette er også sundhedsspørgsmål. Vores fælles værdighed som medlemmer af den menneskelige race ansporer os til at samarbejde om at fjerne fattigdom gennem udvikling. Hele verden må beskyttes mod sygdomme, der truer os alle.

Barrierer for samarbejdet mellem USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien må overvindes for at sikre, at verden aldrig igen terroriseres af en sådan trussel.

For at muliggøre alt dette kræves et nyt Bretton Woods – internationale aftaler om økonomisk udvikling efter Franklin Roosevelts model og livssyn ved afslutningen af 2. verdenskrig, som videreudviklet af Lyndon LaRouches studier og forslag.

Underskriv gerne erklæringen begge steder:

I Danmark: via www.skrivunder.net

Internationalt: via Schiller Instituttets internationale hjemmeside

At fejre og forny sejren over fascismen

Den 8. maj (EIRNS) – Imens Rusland, sammen med andre civiliserede nationer, tager del i fejringen af V-E-sejrsdagen i dag, afholder Schiller Instituttet et arrangement, udformet til at konsolidere og fremme samarbejdet mellem USA, Rusland og Kina. Dette vil kræve overvindelsen af det Britiske Imperiums forsøg på at forhindre et sådant samarbejde.

Betragt den britiske rolle i skabelsen af "Russiagate"-avisanden, om hvilken Præsident Trump torsdag fortalte journalister: "Rusland-svindelnnummeret gjorde det svært for Rusland og USA at forhandle med hinanden. Det er en meget vigtig nation. Vi er den mest magtfulde nation; de er en meget magtfuld nation. Hvorfor skulle vi ikke forhandle med hinanden?" I en fornuftig og udviklende verden er der selvfølgelig ingen grund til, at disse to lande ikke skulle kunne "forhandle med hinanden."

De nylige afsløringer, som dokumenterer hvordan den tidligere Nationale Sikkerhedsrådgiver, Michael Flynn, blev lokket i en fælde, blev efterfulgt af torsdagens offentliggørelse af de hemmeligt stemplede interviewer fra december, 2017, udført af Efterretningskomiteen i Repræsentanternes Hus. Disse nyligt

frigivne udskrifter bidrager med yderligere eksplosivt materiale, herunder den direkte indrømmelse af CrowdStrikes præsident, Shawn Henry, at "vi ingen konkrete beviser havde på, at data blev overført fra DNC." Robert Mueller vidste dette. Adam Schiff – nu formand for denne komité – vidste dette. Undersøgelsen af kupmagerne fortsætter.

Tag eksemplet med USA's anden store, naturlige allierede, Kina. Tidligt i april spredte den glødende fortalere for det Britiske Imperium, Niall Ferguson, den absurde løgn, at Kina valgte at tillade internationale flyafgange fra Wuhan, efter nedlukningen af interne rejser, hvilket gjorde det muligt for kinesere at sprede coronaviruset over hele kloden. Det britiske Henry Jackson-Selskab skubbede hårdt på for en "coronavirus-kompensation", kravet om at Kina skal betale omkring 4 billioner \$ for dennes angivelige "skyld" i ikke at have givet rettidig information om den nye sygdom. Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeos insisterer på at han har "enorme beviser" på, at viruset kom fra Wuhans Institut for Virologi, passer med udtalelserne fra britiske institutioner.

Skrøbelighederne i verdens økonomiske og sundhedsrelaterede infrastruktur, bragt i søgelyset af corona-pandemien, kræver en ende på generationer af tvungen underudvikling. Nutidens akse, bestående af London og Wall Street, må smadres ligeså bestemt som fascismen blev besejret i 2. Verdenskrig. Denne akse af nutidens finansielle imperium er grunden til, at vi stadig har fattigdom i verden, 75 år efter en krig, hvis konklusion skulle have set enden på det, som Franklin Roosevelt kaldte det "18. århundredes metoder" for britisk, fransk og anden kolonialisme.

Som indbydelsen til Schiller Instituttets arrangement i dag lyder:

"Verden ville byde det ægte Amerika velkommen, Franklin Roosevelts anti-kolonialistiske Amerika for efterkrigstiden,

det Amerika forbundet med krigsveteranen fra 2. verdenskrig, Lyndon LaRouche, og hans 'Fire Love'. Den største ære, som kunne vises de over 70 millioner mennesker, som døde i løbet af denne krig, ville være at forpligte os til at opbygge en alliance blandt nationer – firemagtsaftalen. Helga Zepp-LaRouche betonedede: 'De fire betydeligste nationer i verden – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – må nu etablere et Nyt Bretton Woods-system, og sammen med andre nationer, som ønsker dette, skabe et nyt paradigme for internationalt samarbejde blandt nationer, der lader sig lede af menneskehedens fælles mål. Den fjerde af Lyndon LaRouches fire love definerer den kvalitativt højere økonomiske platform, fornuftens højere niveau – Nicolaus Cusanus' "Coincidentia Oppositorum" (Modsætningernes Sammenfald *-red.*), hvor modsætningerne fra geopolitisk konfrontation vil blive overvundet.

Lad os derfor tilstræbe denne ophøjede diskussion i skyggen af de udødelige regimentter, der ønsker at se den verden, som de kæmpede, og døde for, endelig blive til virkelighed."

'Giv ikke alene regeringerne skylden for dette. Tag selv en lige stor del af skylden'

Den 7. maj (EIRNS) – På tærsklen til fejringen af 75-årsdagen for V-E-dagen, de allieredes sejr over fascismen i 2. verdenskrig den 9. maj, høres opfordringen til fornyet amerikansk samarbejde med især Kina og Rusland for at forhindre krig, bekæmpe den globale COVID-19-pandemi, og opbygge et nyt paradigme for sundhed og udvikling for alle folkeslag, i dag klart og tydeligt fra LaRouche-bevægelsen.

Et uddrag af Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale til Schiller Instituttets konference den 25.-26. april blev i dag sendt både som video og som afskrift på CGTN's (China Global Television Network –red.) engelsksprogede webside og deres kinesiske Weibo.com (Kinas version af Twitter), og har allerede modtaget over 1 million visninger.

I sine bemærkninger i det 2,5 minutters lange uddrag, kritiserede Zepp-LaRouche skarpt dem der nægter at samarbejde med Kina, men angriber landet i stedet, og noterede at "tonen mod Kina er blevet meget skinger":

De vestlige demokratiers regelbaserede orden... synes nu på randen af sammenbrud, alt imens den hævder, at Beijing forfølger en "strategi for ubegrænset krigsførelse". Faktum er, at det britiske imperiums liberale system er slået fejl med et brag. Hvordan kunne nogen i de såkaldte 'avancerede lande' – og vi ser nu med coronavirus-pandemien, hvor avancerede de er – antage i så meget som ét minut, at den brutale fattigdom i Afrika, Latinamerika og nogle asiatiske lande er selvforskyldte? Hvis Vesten igennem de sidste 70 år havde gjort, hvad Kina har gjort i Afrika siden 1960'erne, men især i de seneste 10 år, nemlig at bygge jernbaner, dæmninger, kraftværker og industriparker, ville hele Afrika kunne nyde godt af udviklingen, som man ser i dag i Sydkorea eller Singapore, eller endnu bedre. [Men] Afrika har som et resultat af denne [britisk imperialistiske] politik stort set intet sundhedssystem, ingen infrastruktur. Halvdelen af befolkningen har ikke adgang til ferskvand eller sanitet eller elektricitet, fordi det britiske imperium bevidst har undertrykt dem. Hvis man tager højde for den samlede effekt af denne politik, vil der fremkomme et tal på millioner af mennesker, hvis liv er blevet forkortet af sult og ubehandlede sygdomme."

En af de ledende "skingre røster", som Zepp-LaRouche henviste til, tilhører udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo, der har overgået sig selv med ikke mindre end 90 presse-interviews i den sidste

måned; interviews der alle bagvasker Kina med den ene løgn efter den anden, med det åbenlyse mål at forhindre præsident Donald Trump i at opbygge et forhold med venskab og samarbejde med Kina – og Rusland – hvilket han gentagne gange har anført som sit politiske mål. Pompeo har senest forlangt, at Taiwan fik lov til at deltage som observatør i WHO “og i andre FN-organer” – en provokerende krænkelse af USA’s mangeårige aftale med Kina om ‘One China’ -politikken.

USA er konfronteret med de samme diametralt modsatte politiske muligheder i spørgsmålet om Rusland. Den 9. maj vil Schiller Instituttet være vært for en større internetbegivenhed for at fejre V-E-dagen, og atter hellige vores nation til en sådan samarbejdsalliance, som vi smedede med Sovjetunionen og andre under 2. verdenskrig. Imod dette hører vi, igen, den skingre stemme fra udenrigsministeriet, der udsendte en erklæring der angriber Rusland og Sovjetunionen angiveligt for at indføre “totalitære regimer” efter 2. verdenskrig – en erklæring, der var underskrevet af udenrigsministrene for en række central- og østeuropæiske nationer, som arbejder tæt sammen med det britiske imperium. Og det blev gjort, til trods for at præsident Trump og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin havde afgivet en fælles erklæring den 25. april, 75-årsdagen for det berømte møde ved Elben; en erklæring der mindede om, at “ånden fra Elben” er et eksempel på, hvordan vores lande kan tilsidesætte forskelle, opbygge tillid og samarbejde i forfølgelsen af en større sag.

Præsident Trumps evne til at afvise den konfrontationspolitik, hvormed det britiske imperium har “oversvømmet zonen” omkring ham, blev kraftigt styrket i går, da justitsministeriet endelig besluttede at henlægge de fabrikerede anklager mod Michael Flynn i Russiagate-sagen. Som et telegram fra Associated Press skuffet bemærkede: “Dette træk er et lammende tilbageslag for en af den særlige rådgiver Robert Muellers mærkesager.”

Men se ikke på dette som en tilskuer ville, i forventning om

hvad præsident Trump dernæst vil gøre. Se i stedet situationen med Franklin D. Roosevelts øjne, Roosevelt, der da han blev nomineret til præsident i 1932, sagde:

”Ud af hver krise, enhver trængsel, hver en katastrofe rejser menneskeheden sig med en del større viden, højere anstændighed, renere formål. I dag skal vi have gennemgået en periode med slap tænkning, faldende moral, en æra af egoisme, blandt mænd og kvinder og blandt nationer. Giv ikke alene regeringerne skylden for dette. Tag selv en lige stor del af skylden”.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Der er brug for et nyt stærkt håndtryk mellem Øst og Vest

Den 5. maj (EIRNS) – Den overvældende virkelighed er det faktum, at vi er på vej mod en utrolig krise, understregede Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i en briefing i dag, idet hun talte om den pandemiske og økonomiske “katastrofe, der udfolder sig i ufattelige størrelsesordener”. Hun henviste til advarsler fra medicinske eksperter som Dr. Christian Drosten fra Charité Hospital’s Institute of Virology i Berlin, om virkningerne af pandemien, der nu rammer i fattige områder overalt i verden, og kan ses som massedød i Manaus, Brasilien, fødevare-optøjer i Nigeria og andre rædsler.

Rå statistikker fra Den Internationale Arbejdsorganisation understreger pointen: Ud af den samlede verdensbefolkning på 7,8 mia. udgør arbejdsstyrken 3,3 mia., hvoraf 2 mia. er beskæftiget i den “uformelle” økonomi – hvilket betyder, at de

og deres kære fra dag til dag lever fra hånden til munden. Hvis der er nogen afbrydelser betyder det katastrofe. Selv hvis virusset ikke rammer, vil manglen på mad og vand medføre sygdom og død.

Men hvor forfærdeligt det end er, er situationen ikke dømt på forhånd. Det er en opfordring til handling. Menneskeheden kan samle sig og konferere om udfordringerne, hvilket betyder at udtænke og gennemføre de nødvendige fysisk/økonomiske foranstaltninger, og at afsløre og stoppe det geopolitiske anti-Kina, anti-Rusland-vanvid, igangsat for at forhindre at der reddes liv og indføres et nyt system. Det nuværende geopolitiske mål er at kanøfle præsident Donald Trump til at underkaste sig de anti-kinesiske krigshøge i hans administration, for at forhindre hvad verden har brug for: samarbejde mellem stormagterne – præsident Trump, Xi Jinping, Vladimir Putin og premierminister Narendra Modi, og andre villige. Drejebogen for konfrontationen kommer direkte fra London, centrum for det døende monetaristiske system.

Et eksempel på de daglige geopolitiske angreb blev vist i går aftes på det amerikanske Fox TV, med anklager mod Kina fra "Five Eyes", britisk efterretningsevne, om at Kina bevidst spredte SARS-CoV-2-virusset. En tidslinje for Kinas påståede forbrydelser blev præsenteret af reporter Sharri Markson fra Australiens Daily Telegraph, der havde offentliggjort redegørelsen fra Five Eyes over en stor seks-siders artikel den 2. maj. Fox-værten Tucker Carlson advarede: "Imens pandemien udspiller sig, planlægger Kina at herske over verden ... "

Visse amerikanske kongresmedlemmer overgår sig selv i så henseende. I denne uge vil senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) indføre et lovforslag om at "indføre strenge sanktioner mod kinesiske regeringseksponenter, der dækkede over pandemien", sagde han. Cruz fortalte Fox News 2. maj: "Kina er efter min mening den største geopolitiske trussel, som USA står over for i det kommende århundrede."

Føj til dette krigshysteri blandingen af desperation og frygt, som millioner af mennesker, der er udsat for anti-videnskabelig propaganda, allerede føler, og det ønskede resultat opnås af manipulatorerne: impotent og farlig hedonisme.

Det haster med at gå videre med den optimisme og de løsninger, der blev diskuteret af netværk fra hele verden blandt deltagere på Schiller Instituttets konference den 25.-26. april om "Menneskehedens eksistens afhænger nu af oprettelsen af et nyt paradigme."

I går afholdt 'Bevægelsen af Alliancefri Lande' (Non-Aligned Movement) et topmøde mellem 40 nationer med titlen: "Forenet imod COVID-19", med mange af landene repræsenteret ved deres stats- eller regeringschefer, herunder Indiens premierminister Modi, Ægyptens præsident Abdel Fattah El-Sisi, Irans Præsident Hassan Rouhani. De forpligtede sig til at oprette en specialenhed til at kortlægge medlemslandenes behov. Deres endelige kommuniké erklærede, at "i lyset af denne type globale nødsituation må solidariteten være i centrum for vores bestræbelser, og der kræves et højt niveau af etisk og humanistisk engagement, hvor solidaritet og uselvsk samarbejde er fremherskende for at kunne give de nødlidende medicin, medicinsk udstyr og forsyninger, mad, udveksling af ekspertise og god praksis."

Dette er ånden i en alliance for menneskehedens almene vel. Tag del i denne ånd ved Schiller Instituttets konference, lørdag den 9. maj – "75 årsdagen for V-E-dagen: Fejr sejren over fascismen med et nyt Bretton Woods-system."

Ved en mindehøjtidelighed den 24. april for mødet mellem amerikanske og sovjetiske styrker ved Elben, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche i sine forberedte bemærkninger:

"Der kræves et nyt, stærkt håndtryk mellem Øst og Vest for at tackle denne livstruende krise i dag og få en løsning bragt på

banen. Schiller Instituttet har udarbejdet en handlingsplan, der er baseret på den afdøde økonom Lyndon LaRouches forslag til et firemagts-møde for at omorganisere det fejlslagne system. Dette er Rusland, USA, Kina og Indien ... de nuværende omstændigheder ser måske ikke særlig gunstige ud for at opnå et sådant 'nyt håndtryk' mellem Øst og Vest. Da krisen imidlertid vil forstærkes inden for den nærmeste fremtid, vil der forekomme forandringer og muligheder.

"Sejren over fascismen for 75 år siden, der blev betalt med så mange modige menneskers liv, kan inspirere os til at påtage os denne nye, skræmmende opgave. Tak og Guds velsignelse".

**Den britiske liberalismes
forbrydelser og undergang
og 'Det Nye Paradigme' for
menneskehedens fremtid.**

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche hovedtale
ved Schiller Instituttets
internationale
internetkonference den 25.**

april 2020.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg hilser alle jer, der ser denne internetkonference fra hele verden, og jeg tror, at I alle er klar over, at menneskeslægten lige nu er konfronteret med en hidtil uset krise. Den truer ikke alene med at koste mange millioner menneskeliv på grund af sygdom og sult, med at feje mange af de institutioner, som folk har taget for givet indtil nu, af banen, og med at kaste store dele af verden ind i en ny mørk tidsalder, herunder kulturelt, men den kunne også føre til termonuklear krig, der potentielt ville udslette hele menneskeheden.

Denne krise er mere vidtgående end i det 14. århundrede, da den Sorte Pest udslettede en tredjedel af befolkningen fra Indien til Island. Det er mere alvorligt end Den store Depression i 1930'erne, fordi den potentielt kan ødelægge mere økonomisk substans. Og hvis der udbræder krig, vil det bestemt have værre følger end verdenskrigene i det 20. århundrede, fordi det sandsynligvis vil involvere brugen af termonukleare våben.

På grund af globaliseringen og internationaliseringen af mange systemer, herunder internettet, atomvåben, er vi alle i den samme båd. Og i modsætning til tidligere epoker, da en del af planeten blomstrede mens en anden kollapsede, vil der denne gang ikke være nogen delvise løsninger. Mere end nogensinde før i vores historie udfordres vi som samfund, som én menneskehed, til at nå til enighed om nye principper, der kan garantere menneskehedens langsigtede evne til at overleve. Det er pointen med denne konference: Hvordan kan vi identificere årsagerne til denne krise, eliminere dem og åbne et nyt kapitel i universalhistorien, der fører vores eksistens ud af geopolitisk konfrontation, ind på et niveau af fornuft, der sømmer sig for menneskehedens identitet som en kreativ art?

Nogle mennesker spekulerer på, hvorfor jeg midt i en pandemisk

og finansiell krise også rejser spørgsmålet om faren for atomkrig? Fordi de skandaløse og ondsindede beskyldninger mod Kina fremsat af de britiske hemmelige tjenester MI6 og MI5 og deres propagandaapparat – Henry Jackson-Selskabet i London, Atlanterhavsrådet og forskellige "klyngeagenter" på begge sider af Atlanterhavet – beskylder Kina for COVID-19-pandemien, fordi man angiveligt enten forsinkede informationen om den, eller endog brugte biologisk krigsførelse mod Vesten. Dette drejer sig om opbygningen af et fjendebillede med henblik på krig. Den uforskammede med hvilken Henry Jackson-Selskabet – den hårde kerne blandt de liberale neokonservative og den britiske krigsfaktion på begge sider af Atlanterhavet – kræver milliarder af dollars i erstatning, kan kun ses som en provokation, beregnet på at gøde jorden for et strategisk slutopgør.

Det er den hysteriske, men i sidste ende desperate reaktion fra et imperium, der er klar over, at det hele er ovre, og at verden aldrig mere vil vende tilbage til den allerede udrullede strategiske orientering for en unipolær verden, den såkaldte "Washington Consensus" og "regelbaserede orden", som man var i stand til at opretholde, i det mindste som en facade, indtil udbruddet af COVID-19. Krigspartiets beregninger var forkerte; den erklærede forhastet "historiens afslutning" efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, hvilket også var knyttet til illusionen om, at Kina ville udvikle sig til et liberalt demokrati i britisk stil, hvis blot det fik medlemskab af WTO; og at alle andre lande også ville blive omdannet til vestlige demokratier via en politik for regimeskifte, enten gennem farverevolutioner eller interventionskrige.

Kinas enestående verdenshistoriske kulturelle bedrifter – ikke alene at løfte 850 millioner af sine egne mennesker ud af fattigdom, men også, med den Nye Silkevej, at give udviklingslande muligheden for første gang at overvinde såvel den kolonialistiske politik, der stadig i dag gennemføres af

IMF, såvel som den deraf forårsagede fattigdom – blev mødt med vantro og rædsel af de forskellige talerør for det britiske imperium. Efter at de vestlige medier i omkring fire år havde ignoreret det største infrastrukturprogram i historien, blev angreb på såkaldte “autokratiske regimer”, som Kina, Rusland og andre, pludselig optrappet af de samme medier, som siden 2015 har profileret sig i “Heksejagten” mod præsident Trump, i aftalt spil med kupforsøget fra de britiske hemmelige tjenester.

Men da først tallene for marts og april blev frigivet, der viste, at Kina ikke blot har været i stand til at knuse pandemien mere effektivt, men også at overvinde de økonomiske konsekvenser af krisen meget lettere end de vestlige lande, som på grund af privatisering af sundhedssektoren var helt uforberedt på pandemien, blev tonen imod Kina skingrende. De vestlige demokratiers “regelrette orden”, den eneste “demokratiske legitimitet”, har været på gyngende grund i lang tid, og truer nu med at kollapse, mens det hævdes, at Beijing forfølger en “strategi for ubegrænset krigsførelse”. Kendsgerningen er, at det liberale system knyttet til det britiske imperium har slået fejl. Men det betyder ikke, at de styrker der er allieret med imperiet ikke stadigvæk, i deres kvaler, kan påføre enorme skader, for eksempel ved at indlede en verdenskrig.

Det er på høje tid at rette på navnene, som Konfutse ville sige. Hvis ideen er at udarbejde en liste over skyldige parter og erstatningskrav på grund af den aktuelle krise, så må det være listen over virkningerne af den britiske liberalisme, hvis ledende skikkelse, Winston Churchill, bærer hovedansvaret for udeladelsen af det vigtigste aspekt i det Bretton Woods-system, som Franklin D. Roosevelt havde til hensigt for efterkrigstiden: nemlig en kreditmekanisme til at overvinde kolonialismen og industrialisere udviklingssektoren. På grund af denne mangel blev det britiske imperiums kontrol over den såkaldt Tredje Verden foreviget i efterkrigstiden. Denne

situation blev derefter forværret, efter at præsident Nixon afsluttede Bretton Woods-systemet i august 1971, hvilket førte til en række af dereguleringer af de finansielle markeder, den berygtede 'outsourcing' til lande med billig arbejdskraft og IMF's betingelser ('conditionalities', *red.*). Det eneste formål med hele denne politik var at opretholde en kolonialistisk udplyndring og forhindre enhver seriøs udvikling i disse lande.

Hvordan kunne nogen i de såkaldt "avancerede lande" – og vi ser nu med coronavirus-pandemien, præcis hvor avancerede de er – antage i så meget som et minut, at den brutale fattigdom i Afrika, Latinamerika og nogle asiatiske lande er selvindlysende eller selvforskyldt? Hvis Vesten i de sidste 70 år havde gjort, hvad Kina har udrettet i Afrika siden 1960'erne, men især i de sidste 10 år nu, nemlig at bygge jernbaner, dæmninger, kraftværker og industriparker, ville hele Afrika nyde godt af et udviklingsniveau, som man ser i Sydkorea eller Singapore i dag – eller bedre! Afrika har som følge af denne politik stort set intet sundhedssystem, ingen infrastruktur; halvdelen af befolkningen har ikke adgang til rent vand, sanitet eller elektricitet, fordi det britiske imperium bevidst undertrykte dem ved at arbejde gennem IMF og Verdensbanken... gennem Verdensnaturfonden, der i tvivlstilfælde betragter beskyttelsen af en insektart som vigtigere end millioner af menneskers liv! Hvis man tager højde for den samlede virkning af denne politik, vil der fremkomme et tal på millioner af mennesker, hvis liv er blevet forkortet af sult og ubehandlede sygdomme! I modsætning til myten om at det britiske imperium ophørte med at eksistere en gang for alle med koloniernes uafhængighed og overleveringsceremonien i Hongkong den 30. juni 1997, eksisterer det stadig i form af neoliberal monetaristisk kontrol over verdens finansielle system; en kontrol, der altid har været indbegrebet af imperialisme.

Et andet eksempel på ren propaganda fra imperiet er at sige,

at lande i den Tredje Verden simpelthen ikke ønsker at udvikle sig. Virkeligheden er, at selv ideen om FN's udviklings-årtier de facto blev elimineret med afslutningen på Bretton Woods, og dets erstatning med ideen om befolkningsreduktion, Romklubbens grove ideer om de formodede grænser for vækst og John D. Rockefeller III's misantropiske forestillinger, som han præsenterede dem på FN's befolkningskonference i Bukarest i 1974, eller Henry Kissingers skandaløse NSSM 200 fra samme år; der blot var gammel skimmelsvamp fra påstandene af den onde pastor Malthus', det Britiske østindiske Selskabs bladsmører, som for sin del plagierede ideerne fra den venetianske "økonom" Giannaria Ortes.

Lyndon LaRouche reagerede på dette paradigmeskifte, da han i 1973 i forbindelse med en række undersøgelser om virkningerne af IMF-politikken, begyndte at advare om, at den voksende underernæring, svækkelse af immunsystemet, manglende hygiejne osv. ville føre til fremkomsten af globale pandemier. Efter tusindvis af taler og skrifter fra LaRouche, der har cirkuleret i de mellemliggende fem årtier over alle fem kontinenter, er der ingen der kan sige, at den aktuelle pandemi ikke var forudseelig! Især da LaRouches hele livsværk var dediceret til, blandt andet, at udarbejde udviklingsprogrammer, der netop ville have forhindret det!

Den grundlæggende årsag til at det liberale paradigme og den nuværende underliggende, transatlantiske "regelrette orden" har fejlet, og hvorfor etablissementet har vist sig at være så fuldstændig ude af stand til at reflektere over årsagerne til denne fiasko, er knyttet til det aksiomatiske grundlag og generelt accepterede antagelser om dette paradigmes menneskesyn, såvel som dets begreb om stat og videnskab.

Efter den første opkomst, under den italienske renæssance, af ideer og former for en statsdannelse, der bevidst fremmer de kreative åndsevner hos en voksende andel af befolkningen, og rollen af videnskabelige fremskridt som kilde til social rigdom, lancerede det daværende feudale oligarki knyttet til

det daværende førende imperium, Venedig, en bevidst modoffensiv, hvor Paolo Sarpi, som den førende tænker i det venetianske oligarki, fremførte sin lære, hvorfra Oplysningstiden og liberalisme i sidste ende udviklede sig. Ideen var at kontrollere den videnskabelige debat, men at fornægte evnen til at erkende og opdage reelle universelle principper, at undertrykke potentialet for 'Prometheus' (der ifølge sagnet gav mennesket ilden, *red.*) – om nødvendigt med magt – at reducere mennesker til niveauet for sansemæssig oplevelse, og dogmatisere det tilbagestående i "den menneskelig natur".

Fra denne tradition udsprang den mekanistiske videnskabelige tradition forbundet med Galilei Galileo og Isaac Newton, John von Neumanns og Norbert Wieneres spil- og informationsteori, og for nyligt de algoritmer, der ligger til grund for derivathandlen i dagens kasinoøkonomi. Det empiriske og materialistiske dogme og dekadente menneskebillede, der blev bragt til torvs af Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, John Locke og John Stuart Mill, er stadig den dag i dag grundlaget for den britiske liberalisme, og den virus, der mere end noget andet, har bidraget til den nuværende tilstand i verden.

Det britiske imperiums oligarkiske tankegang, der benægter alle mennesker, men især alle farvede mennesker, den guddommelige gnist af kreativitet bliver udtrykt i fuld klarhed i adskillige skrifter og udsagn, hvis blot folk bryder sig om at se efter det, fra prins Phillips berygtede ønske om blive reinkarneret som et dødbringende virus for at hjælpe med at reducere overbefolkningen af den menneskelige race, til det foragtelige syn der blev udtrykt af Adam Smith i hans "Theory of the Moral Sentiment" fra 1759:

"Administrationen af universets store system... omsorgen for rationelle og fornuftige væseners universelle lykke er Guds – og ikke menneskets – afdeling. Mennesket er tildelt en langt mere ydmyg rolle, hvilken meget bedre svarer til svagheden af

hans evner, og hans begrænsede forståelse; menneskets rolle vedrører hans egen lykke, og den af hans familie, hans venner, hans land ... Naturen leder os til størstedelen af dette med oprindelige og øjeblikkelige instinkter. Sult, tørst, den lidenskab der forener kønnene, kærligheden til glæde og frygt for smerte, får os til at opfylde disse mål for deres egen skyld og uden nogen overvejelser vedrørende deres tilbøjelighed til at gavnede større mål, som 'naturens store dirigent' havde til hensigt at opnå med dem."

Eftersom alle disse egenskaber gælder lige såvel for dyr, er det åbenlyst også i orden at 'udrense flokken' med jævne mellemrum, ligesom spartanerne dræbte heloterne, da de troede, de ville blive for mange. Dette misantropiske billede af mennesket forstærkes gennem ren racisme, som Bertrand Russell udtrykte det så skamløst i *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization*:

"Den hvide befolkning i verden vil snart ophøre med at vokse. De asiatiske racer vil blive flere, og negrene endnu flere, før deres fødselsrate falder tilstrækkeligt til at gøre deres antal stabilt uden hjælp af krig og pest... Indtil det sker, kan fordelene, som socialismen sigter mod, kun delvist realiseres, og de mindre frugtbare racer bliver nødt til at forsvare sig mod de mere frodige ved metoder, der er modbydelige, omend de er nødvendige."

Det er netop denne racistiske ideologi, der var retfærdiggørelsen af kolonialisme, slavehandelen, opiumskrigen, og for at være ærlig, er det i sidste ende også årsagen til den monumentale ligegyldighed, som store dele af befolkningen i Vesten viser, når de hører nyheden om græshoppesværme i Afrika og i nogle asiatiske lande, som kunne have været elimineret for to måneder siden til en omkostning af kun 75 millioner dollars.

Og intet har ændret sig i den grundlæggende støtte til eugenik (racehygiejne -red.) blandt repræsentanter for

imperiet. Dette blev endnu en gang understreget af en skribent i Daily Telegraph, i en artikel af Jeremy Warner i begyndelsen af marts:

"Ikke for at gå i detaljer, men fra et ganske uengageret økonomisk perspektiv, kunne COVID-19 sågar vise sig at være en smule gavnlig i det længere løb, ved uforholdsmæssigt at rense ud blandt ældre pensionister)."

Det er disse barbariske præmisser for det liberale dogme, selv hvis det næppe er moderigtigt at indrømme deres eksistens i de såkaldte udviklede lande, som for mange år siden førte Lyndon LaRouche til at insistere på, at en kombination af de fire økonomisk og militært vigtigste lande i verden – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – var nødvendig for at gennemføre den bydende nødvendige reorganisering af verdensordenen. Denne reorganisering må dog begynde med den utvetydige og bestemte afvisning af dette liberale dogmes menneskesyn samt dets politiske implikationer. Det britiske imperium i alle dets fremtoninger, men mest af alt dets kontrol over finanssystemet må tilendebringes.

Disse fire nationer – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – må øjeblikkeligt sammenkalde en hastekonference og indføre et nyt Bretton Woods-system, der realiserer Franklin Roosevelts fulde intention ved at skabe et kreditsystem, som garanterer, en gang for alle, industrialiseringen af udviklingssektoren. Det må begynde med virkeliggørelsen af et verdenssundhedssystem, der opbygger et sundhedsvæsen i hvert eneste land på denne klode. Først og fremmest med et lynprogram for at bekæmpe coronaviruset, men derefter at opnå den samme standard, som fandtes under Hill-Burton-loven i USA, eller som den var i Tyskland og Frankrig, før privatiseringen i 1970'erne. Som Roosevelt formulerede det i sin Tale til Nationen i 1941, i sin berømte erklæring om de "Fire Friheder", hvor han sagde: "Den tredje [frihed] er friheden for mangel – hvilket oversat i globale vendinger betyder en økonomisk forståelse, der

garanterer enhver nations indbyggere et sundt og fredeligt liv – over alt i verden”. Førstedamen, Eleanor Roosevelt, gjorde det til sin personlige mission at sikre, at disse Fire Friheder blev indlemmet i FN’s Verdenserklæring om Menneskerettighederne.

I Lyndon LaRouches ”Udkast til Samarbejdsaftale mellem USA og Sovjetunionen” fra 1984, der definerede principperne og grundlaget for det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI), som han foreslog, og som blev erklæret for USA’s officielle politik af Præsident Reagan d. 23. marts, 1983, og som gentagne gange blev tilbudt Sovjetunionen for at samarbejde om et omfattende nedrustningsprogram, definerede LaRouche den overbevisning, der repræsenterede et absolut afgørende aspekt af hans livs arbejde og denne organisations mission. Den første del af dette skrift, hvis principper også gælder for samarbejdet mellem de fire nationer og alle andre, som beslutter sig for at deltage i dette nye partnerskab, lyder:

”Det politiske grundlag for varig fred må være: a) den uforbeholdne suverænitet for hver eneste og alle nationalstater, og b) samarbejde blandt suveræne nationalstater for at fremme ubegrænsede muligheder for at deltage i fordelene af teknologisk fremskridt, til fælles gavn for alle og enhver. Den mest afgørende del af en sådan permanent fredspolitik gennemførelse nu, er en dybtgående forandring i de monetære, økonomiske og politiske relationer mellem de dominerende nationer, og de relativt underordnede nationer, ofte klassificeret som ’udviklingslande.’ Medmindre de vedblivende uligheder i kølvandet på den moderne kolonialisme i stigende grad løses, vil ingen vedvarende fred på denne planet være mulig. Såfremt USA og Sovjetunionen anerkender, at fremskridt for de produktive arbejdskraften på hele planeten er i hver og begge parters vitale interesse, er de to stormagter forbundet i denne grad og på denne måde af en fælles interesse. Dette er kernen af den praktiserede politiske og økonomiske politik, uundværlig for at fostre en

vedvarende fred mellem disse to stormagter.”

I betragtning af den eskalerende anti-Kina-kampagne, igangsat af britisk efterretningsvæsen, som har folk i Præsident Trumps følge, der forsøger at overgå hinanden, nærmest time efter time, i deres anklager mod Kina, inklusive udenrigsminister Pompeo, [direktør for Handels- og Industripolitik] Peter Navarro, [senator] Lindsey Graham, og [FoxTV-værten] Tucker Carlson, mens diverse magtdemonstrationer af USA og NATO blot synes at være begrænsede af antallet af COVID-19-smittede blandt nogle af deres mandskaber, er det eksistentielle spørgsmål, hvordan verden kan komme fri af denne farlige optrapning. Er vi dømt til at genopleve hvordan den næststærkestes magtovertagelse af herredømmet fører til krig, som allerede er hændt tolv gange i historien?

Kombinationen af corona-pandemien, verdens hungersnødskrise, den kommende finansielle, hyperinflationære eksplosion og depressionen af den globale, reelle økonomi er så overvældende, at det burde være klart for ethvert tænkende menneske, at menneskeheden kun kan overvinde denne krise, hvis USA's og Kinas økonomiske potentiale – understøttet af andre industrielle lande – forenes i fælles indsats og forøges, således at de fornødne kapaciteter kan skabes for at sikre sundhedspleje, infrastruktur og industri- og fødevareproduktion. Det er den eksistentielle interesse af hvert individ og af hver nation på denne planet at arbejde hen imod dette mål. Vi bliver nødt til at skabe et globalt kor blandt alle andre nationer og mange millioner af mennesker for at kræve præcist dette!

Konflikten mellem USA og Kina eksisterer kun, hvis de kræfter i begge partier i USA sejrer, som er i traditionen fra H.G. Wells' "Åbne Konspiration", med den idé at USA accepterer det britiske imperiums model som grundlag for en anglo-amerikansk kontrolleret unipolær orden til at kontrollere verden. Denne vision af H.G. Wells blev videreført af William Yandell

Elliot, mentor til Kissinger, Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, og til og med de neokonservative fra Projektet for et Nyt Amerikansk Århundrede (PNAC). Hvis, på den anden side, USA vender tilbage til sin sande tradition fra Uafhængighedserklæringen imod det Britiske Imperium, og Alexander Hamiltons Amerikanske økonomiske System, da vil der være et stort åndsslægtskab med Kinas økonomiske model, som indeholder mange af Alexander Hamiltons, Friedrich Lists og Henry C. Careys principper. På samme måde var Sun Yat-sen, grundlæggeren af det moderne Kina, præget meget af det Amerikanske System.

På det presserende hastetopmøde med USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien, og på den dernæst umiddelbart nødvendige stiftende konference af et Nyt Bretton Woods-system, kan statslederne genoplive ånden fra den oprindelige Bretton Woods-konference, hvor lederen af den kinesiske delegation, H.H. Kung, indsendte Sun Yat-sens forslag for en "International Udviklingsorganisation." Kung, en af Sun Yat-sens svogre, sagde i sin tale i Bretton Woods:

"Kina ser frem til en periode med stor økonomisk udvikling og ekspansion efter krigen. Dette inkluderer et program for omfattende industrialisering, udover udviklingen og moderniseringen af landbruget. Det er min faste overbevisning, at et økonomisk stærkt Kina er en uundværlig betingelse for fredens bevarelse og en forbedring af verdens trivsel. Efter den 1. Verdenskrig foreslog Dr. Sun Yat-sen en plan for det han kaldte 'den internationale udvikling af Kina.' Han understregede princippet for samarbejde med venligsindede nationer og brugen af udenlandsk kapital til udviklingen af Kinas ressourcer. Dr. Suns lære udgjorde grundlaget for Kinas nationale politik. Amerika og andre i de Forenede Nationer, håber jeg, vil tage aktiv del i at medvirke til udviklingen af Kina i efterkrigstiden."

Som sagt støttede Roosevelt internationaliseringen af denne

udviklingspolitik under forhandlingerne, og han betragtede forhøjelsen af levestandarden over hele verden som nøglen til global stabilitet. Og han så internationaliseringen af New Deal-politikken som vejen til at gøre det.

De fire vigtigste nationer i verden – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – må nu etablere et nyt Bretton Woods-system, og sammen med alle nationer, der ønsker at tilslutte sig, et nyt paradigme for internationalt samarbejde mellem nationer, der styres af menneskehedens fælles mål. Den fjerde af Lyndon LaRouches fire love definerer den kvalitativt højere økonomiske platform, det højere niveau af fornuft, af 'Coincidentia Oppositorum' (modsætningernes sammenfald) som udviklet af Nicholas Cusanus (1401–1464, tysk filosof, teolog, jurist og astronom; nøglefigur i den europæiske renæssance –red.), hvorpå modsætningerne forbundet med geopolitisk konfrontation kan overvindes.

Internationalt samarbejde mellem videnskabsfolk, der udelukkende baserer sig på verificerbare universelle fysiske principper, må erstatte forrang for politik baseret på ideologi og interesser. Forskning i "livsvidenskaber", en bedre forståelse af hvad der forårsager livets egenskaber og dets oprindelse i universet, er forudsætningen for at bekæmpe coronavirus og alle andre potentielle virologiske, bakterielle og andre sygdomsprocesser. Som en del af verdenssundhedssystemet er vi nødt til at opbygge samarbejdende medicinske forskningscentre internationalt, hvor også unge forskere fra alle udviklingslande kan blive uddannet. Den dybtgående lære af coronavirus-pandemien er, at levering af sundhedspleje skal være et fælles gode og ikke tjene til at maksimere overskuddet for private interesser. Resultaterne af denne forskning skal derfor straks leveres til alle universiteter, hospitaler og medicinsk personale i alle nationer.

Et andet område, hvor internationalt samarbejde i retning af de fælles mål for menneskeheden er uundværlig, er opnåelsen af

energi- og råmaterialesikkerhed, hvilket vil være muligt med beherskelsen af termonuklear fusion og den tilhørende udvindingsproces for grundstoffer ('fusion torch'). Det internationale ITER-projekt på Cadarache-anlægget i det sydlige Frankrig, en tokamak-kernefusionsreaktor og internationalt forskningsprojekt, der allerede involverer samarbejde fra 34 lande, er en god start, men finansieringen af ITER og andre modeller for nuklear fusion må forøges massivt. En af LaRouches centrale opdagelser er sammenhængen mellem energi-gennemstrømningstæthed, som anvendt i produktionsprocessen, og den relative potentielle befolkningstæthed. Beherskelse af nuklear fusion er bydende nødvendigt, ikke kun for den levende befolkning, men især for bemanded rumfart.

Rumforskning i sig selv er et område, der er utænkeligt uden internationalt samarbejde, og som mere end nogen anden videnskabsgren på en positiv måde påviser, hvad pandemien demonstrerer negativt: At vi faktisk er den ene art, der er bestemt af dens fremtid, og hvis langsigtede overlevelsessevne afhænger af vores evne til at lære at forstå og beherske universets love – inklusive de mindst 2 billioner galakser, som Hubble-teleskopet har været i stand til at verificere. Forsvar mod asteroider, meteorer og kometer er kun et blandt mange vigtige elementer i dette. For udviklingslandene er ubegrænset deltagelse i forskningsprojekter den bedste måde – gennem videnskabelig og teknologisk 'kvantespring' – at skabe forudsætningerne for økonomier, der er i stand til at give alle borgere et godt og sikkert liv.

Nicholas fra Cusa skrev allerede tilbage i det 15. århundrede, at alle opdagelser inden for videnskab straks skulle stilles til rådighed for repræsentanter for alle lande, for ikke unødvendigt at holde udviklingen af nogen af dem tilbage. Han fandt også, at konkordans, harmoni, i makrokosmos kun er mulig, når alle mikrokosmos udvikler sig bedst muligt. Det nye paradigme, som vi er nødt til at forme for samarbejdet

mellem nationer, må tage udgangspunkt i hele menneskehedens fælles interesse, således at alle nationer og kulturer – som i kontrast, som i en fuga – er sammenflettet og stiger dynamisk til højere stadier af anti-entropisk udvikling.

Er vi, som menneskelig civilisation, på dette sene stadium af begivenhederne i stand til at afværge tsunamien af pandemier, hungersnød, finanskriser, depression og faren for en ny verdenskrig? I så fald har verden brug for dette topmøde mellem de fire nationer nu! Hvis et sådant topmøde ville bekendtgøre alle disse ændringer – et nyt Bretton Woods-system, at de fire stormagter står skulder ved skulder i opbygningen af et globalt udviklingsprogram i form af en "Ny Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen", et verdenssundhedssystem, et internationalt lynprogram for fusion og beslægtet forskning, en massiv opgradering af internationalt rumforskningssamarbejde, og sidst men ikke mindst, en dialog mellem alle nationers klassiske traditioner, med det formål at udløse en ny renæssance af klassiske kulturer på lignende, men endnu smukkere, vis, som den store italienske renæssance overvandt rædslerne fra den mørke tidsalder i det 14. århundrede – så kan en ny æra af menneskeheden fødes!

Er der et rimeligt håb om, at vi kan overvinde menneskehedens nuværende dybe krise? Absolut! vil jeg sige. Vi er den hidtil eneste kendte kreative art i universet, som har evnen til at opdage nye principper for vores univers igen og igen; hvilket indebærer, at der er et åndsslægtskab mellem vores kreative mentale processer og disse fysiske love.

En tanke, der belyser dette optimistiske perspektiv, vedrører et aspekt af rumforskningen; nemlig den tilsyneladende accelererede aldringsproces under betingelse af vægtløshed og ændringen af denne proces i hyper-tyngdekraft. En bedre forståelse af denne "rum-gerontologi" (alderdomsforskning –red.) er åbenlyst afgørende for fremtidig bemannet rumfart til Mars og i interstellart rum, og det forventes, at det

væsentligt vil øge menneskets evne til at have et længere, sundt liv.

Hvis man tager i betragtning, at Schubert kun blev 31 år gammel, Mozart 35, Dante 36, Schiller 45, Shakespeare 52 og Beethoven bare 56, har man en idé om, hvor meget fremtidens genier med en forventet levealder på 120 eller 150 år vil være i stand til at bidrage til menneskehedens udvikling!

Derfor, slut jer til os for at bringe det britiske imperium til ophør! Og lad os skabe en ægte menneskelig fremtid for hele menneskeheden! Tak.

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=xQlZ-2CcXiY>.

Panel 2 i Schiller Instituttets historiske konferences 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 SDJ-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 livscyklusser 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 Opfinders 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 "kultr eligion", 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 op 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 if 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 MTF, 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 flight 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 Pennachio 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 fødevarekrise, 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 geopolitikkens 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 korrupsion 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 videoptagelse, 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>. 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 a 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 portion 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 negatively: 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 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 Mabongo. 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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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 representatives 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 European 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-LAROCHE: 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 he was 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 *concordantia 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-LAROCHE: 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](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 Itegeboje, 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-LAROCHE: 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.