

Panel 1 Discussion

This is the edited transcript of the Discussion Session immediately following Panel 1, “A Decoupling of the Two Systems or a New Paradigm for Humanity?” of the Schiller Institute’s June 18-19 Conference, “There Can Be No Peace Without the Bankruptcy Reorganization of the Dying Trans-Atlantic Financial System.” Participating in the discussion were Dennis Speed, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Andrey Kortunov and Sam Pitroda.

Dennis Speed (moderator): Before going to any questions—and we have a lot of questions coming in—I’d like to first ask you, Helga, if you have any remarks, and then we’ll see if the panel has any reflections on what they’ve heard.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: First of all, I want to thank all speakers who were all incredibly powerful. We will make sure that the speeches get out internationally as widely as possible. I would ask the viewers and listeners to help us in doing that, because I think the views represented here are an absolutely necessary counter pole to the synchronized media which we have in the United States and Europe, for the most part. I think we have to really arouse the population, because there is such a discrepancy between what the official policies of the Western governments are doing, and the reality.

I want to thank Senator Black for having pointed us to the fact that the evidence actually is that Ukraine has lost the war, which has been confirmed by several Russian and other commentators. I think that we should really redouble our efforts to press for a diplomatic solution. I also want to thank all speakers.

If there is an agreement that the pending financial collapse and the hyperinflation going out of control is one of the main motors for the increase of aggressivity in the military field, I was thinking that maybe over today and tomorrow, to revive an initiative which we already had in the 2000s, calling for a New Bretton Woods Committee. We collected at that time thousands of signatures of parliamentarians and other people demanding a new world economic order. Maybe between the speakers of this panel and other panels, we could agree on a text, because I think we absolutely must move to a New Paradigm before it’s too late. An unprecedented collapse of the financial system can only end in a catastrophe.

I just wanted to throw that idea out, and we can discuss it more, and maybe by the end of the conference, come up with such a proposal to go into an international mobilization for a New Bretton Woods system, and a New Paradigm in economics and international affairs.

Speed: I’m going to ask the other panelists who may have things to say, to do that in the context of some of the questions. We’ve got a lot of questions, and it’s actually best to try to go to those questions, because as you’ll see, there are questions for everybody on the panel.

The first question is directed to Dr. Kortunov and Helga. This is from Kynan. His question is:

“The speech given by President Vladimir Putin at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum yesterday is very important to note within the context of this panel. In that speech, Putin had declared that the unipolar world was dead, and that the majority of nations were moving away from the zero-sum game policies toward a new financial architecture. As Helga noted, the opportunity to cooperate with Russia in the development of the Eurasian continent was lost as a result of the short-sighted geopolitical policies of the trans-Atlantic. Now, the West is in the middle of a hyperinflationary blow-out. How can this opportunity be presented to people in the West who have become so deluded that we have to now try to avoid a thermonuclear war?”

Zepp-LaRouche: It really takes an extraordinary action, because I think it was [Russian] Foreign Minister Lavrov who stated that the relationship between Russia and the West, Russia and Germany, has been completely destroyed by the recent events. I feel a terrible need to reconstruct that. We have a long history together. I only want to reference Napoleon, Hitler, the Second World War, the Great Patriotic War. German unification, where Russia behaved incredibly generously, and I would really ask people to help to start a public debate that we do need to resume a dialogue with Russia.

This idea that a relationship with Russia is out forever, as this unspeakable Foreign Minister of Germany is saying, cannot be tolerated. So, I would suggest that we start to have a public debate, and break through this uniform, synchronized—in German you would say



Schiller Institute

Participants in the discussion session of Panel 1. Clockwise from upper left: Dennis Speed (moderator), Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Andrey Kortunov, Dr. Clifford A. Kiracofe, Dr. Wolfgang Bittner, and Sam Pitroda.

Gleichschaltung—with the media with [Nazi Minister of Propaganda, Joseph] Goebbels. So, we don’t need to repeat that, but we need to have a dialogue where people can express their views, and that we try to get a mass movement for a New Paradigm. I really think that is the only way how to go about it.

Andrey Kortunov: Frankly, I’m a little bit more cautious in stating that the unipolar world is over. I think that in certain ways we still live in the unipolar world, especially if we are talking about the current financial system. The dollar still constitutes more than half of international currency reserves, and the dollar is still the major currency which all of us use. SWIFT remains the major international exchange system that exists in the world.

I think that the current crisis will probably accelerate the move away from the dollar. We see it in the recent decisions by the China Central Bank [People’s Bank of China—ed.], which is selling its dollar reserves, but I think it’s a long process. Definitely we should do what we can to make it gradual, to make it incremental, to avoid major crises on the way toward a

more balanced system of a basket of currencies that might probably replace the dollar as the main reserve currency in the world.

Maybe today the time has come to think creatively about international financial institutions, including reforms within the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [World Bank], institutions like that, because if we do not reform them, then the odds are that parallel institutions will emerge and will compete with the old system.

I think it’s critically important to avoid fragmentation of the global financial system and fragmentation of the global economic system, because this is unfortunately the direction in which the global finance and the global trade is moving. I think that the next two or three years will be critical in our ability or inability to reverse this movement, but I do hope that it is possible to maintain the global economic system and its integrity, and to make it more fair to everybody and more inclusive than it is right now. It will not be easy, but I think with concerted efforts by major players, it is not impossible.

Speed: Although we have questions for everybody, I don't want to stop any panelist from making any statement or reflection that they'd like to make now, either about what they've heard from others, and otherwise.

Sam Pitroda: My main concern is, who is listening to us? Are we talking to ourselves? I know there are hundreds of such organizations in the world, who are having these kinds of conversations right now. I know many in the U.S., India, Europe. The point is, are we getting any traction? I'm worried that irrespective of what we say, those in power are doing whatever they feel like doing anyway. I find that in India, the head of state decides to do whatever he or she wants to do, and they can get away with it. I think that's what is going on today in the world. Very few people are listening to a sane voice. Unless we bring all of these different organizations together—if not all, some of them—and really raise a collective voice, it may have some impact, because we all agree with what the situation is.

I participate in many organizations like this, where people say, yes, this is the need of the hour; but then, what? Nothing happens. My concern is, how do we reach out to people who are in a position of power, touch their heart, touch their mind, and say, "Hey, it's time to stop, and move on with a new idea." That's the challenge for all of us.

Cliff Kiracofe: I would just re-emphasize my point that we need to preplan, we need to be active now, and get ideas out now, prior to the hurricane that Jamie Dimon is talking about, or other financial experts are talking about. I think conferences like this are very important, and they need to be inclusive of course. But we need to, like Franklin Roosevelt, we need to be thinking about concepts and ideas now for when the storm really hits, and then for planning for after the storm. That would be again a New Bretton Woods kind of an idea, sort of an update or reform of present-day international financial architecture, but much more inclusive. And taking into account ideas from Russia, China, India, etc. So, more inclusive cooperation globally by major powers and others that have ideas to contribute.

Dr. Wolfgang Bittner: Helga Zepp-LaRouche did talk about the German-Russian relations. There were the Napoleonic Wars, and there were the First and Second World Wars. At other times, we had very good relations to Russia, cultural and scientific. I want to ad-

dress the cultural relations. Painting in Russia—I think about music, the Nutcracker Suite of Tchaikovsky, I see many musicians, artists, painters whom we know, and the fact that we have cut off those relations because of this conflict is a tragedy of a century. I fear this will not easily be repaired. The view of Western Europe and Russia, especially after 1990, has been destroyed, and it will be very much work to pick that up again. What happens in this moment is really a tragedy.

Speed: I'm going to return to questions, though a couple of the questions are general enough that there may be various people who want to answer. This one is directed at you, Helga, first, and again I know that perhaps Andrey would like to say something about it as well. This is from Renata in Brazil. She asks a two-part question:

"I would like to know if there would be a role for the United Nations in this new security and development architecture, and why and what?" "And how can the West manage its relations with China, considering the human rights positions, lack of freedom of speech, so forth and so on?"

Zepp-LaRouche: I think that the Schiller Institute could play a role as a rallying point for all individuals who would want to constructively work in the New Paradigm. At a previous conference, we already had an idea which unfortunately didn't get fully realized simply because events were so much that we got distracted. But one idea would be that out of this circle and other participants in previous conferences, we have an enormous amount of experts in all fields—military, economic, science, diplomacy, culture. We could work out a proposal for such a conference with joint efforts, and then present it to the appropriate institution in the United Nations, because the United Nations is actually an institution which could launch such an initiative. That could go along with what Cliff Kiracofe also pointed to. I think the warnings that we are in front of a hurricane, we're sitting on a complete powder keg in terms of the potential explosion of the system.

We are now between a rock and a hard place if no interest rates occur, you have galloping inflation, but if the central banks are increasing the interest rates you are looking at a potential sudden collapse. And for that, we could also move very quickly. I will make sure that we publish after this conference, or maybe even during the conference, the list of signatures which we had. I

think we collected in 2005 to 2007—[a call for] a New Bretton Woods Committee, which was signed by thousands of important people around the world. We could restart that and update it in light of what is going on.

But the main response I want to say is, I actually want to invite speakers, but also others listening and watching, to help to work out a platform for such an international security and development architecture. We had also many important diplomats in past conferences who could probably help us to find the appropriate place in the United Nations. Because if these governments are not making what they should do, then we have to do it. I think it has reached the point where that is absolutely doable.

Speed: Actually, there's a question that I will pose now that is related to this, and it was to you, Cliff. This was from Mir:

“Is there a procedure to use internal institutions of nations so that they could punish political decisions being made against each country's interest?”

Like, if you have a country that's imposing sanctions on another country, is there some way, they're asking, to use internal institutions from those nations to actually oppose those sanctions? That's kind of what the question is. I think probably in the case of this UN issue, maybe this is one of these things you might want to take up.

Kiracofe: The United States has launched these sanctions all over the planet. The internal institution in the United States, the United States Congress, is fully supportive. So, with respect to the United States, Congress is fully supportive of sanctions against China, Russia, and all of that; sanctions being a form of economic warfare. So, what we're really talking about is the Congress in full support. Maybe a handful of members in either house oppose, but the U.S. Congress as an internal institution is fully supportive of the U.S. economic warfare strategy against Russia and China, figuring that Russia was going to be easier to break down, and then once Russia breaks down, China loses a friend. Then, we can go after China. That's kind of the strategy of the Washington Beltway, or swamp—however you want to phrase it, the deep state crowd.

In terms of the United Nations, of course, the United Nations has only imposed a few sanctions here and there. Unilateral sanctions by a country such as the United States without a UN sanction is actually not legal; it doesn't have standing in international law. It's

a unilateral sanction, so the United States is most of the time here imposing unilateral sanctions, which is a form of economic warfare.

But, the fact is, it completely sanctions as a tool, so-called, completely disrupts the functioning of the international economy, as we see, and as we will see when Jamie Dimon's hurricane hits. So, sanctions are not, as a form of economic warfare, sanctions are certainly not a way to go. They're not really effective, and they blow back; they're counterproductive. So, what we should try to be doing in the United States is, stopping Congress from supporting all of these Executive Branch sanctions. I mean, gasoline here for cars, is well over \$5 a gallon, and I know it's \$7-8 out in California. There are hardships, and this is just the start. I think internally in the United States, as the public starts to realize it's not Putin, it's Biden and it's the Congress, maybe the politics will change a bit between now and November.

Pitroda: I'd like to follow up on the last conversation. That is, how can we convince U.S. Senators to listen to this idea of redesigning the world? The idea of restructuring, networking, getting off this command-and-control architecture to collaboration, cooperation, coordination, co-creation? Maybe that's the starting point, because if they listen, the U.S. will listen. If the U.S. listens, the world will listen.

Speed: This question is directed to Helga from Boris Friedel, CCTV Berlin. He asks:

“Two of the five BRICS countries—South Africa and India—are attending the G7 meeting as guests. Is this a possible sign of a negotiating role for these two countries in order to keep communications going with Russia?”

Zepp-LaRouche: It could be. I think the inclination of both President Ramaphosa and Prime Minister Modi [is] to do that; I would think there is a very good likelihood, because India is a country of 1.4 billion people. The Indian Foreign Minister Jaishankar, recently at a conference in Bratislava, said that India is one-fifth of the world's population, and represents I forget how much of the GDP, and that they have the right to pursue their own interests. India has withstood enormous efforts by Ursula von der Leyen and all kinds of other people to put India into the camp of “democracies.” India has maintained a neutral position, or a non-aligned position, and I think the same is true for South Africa,

where President Ramaphosa even said that the West and NATO are responsible for the Ukraine crisis.

So, I think both of these countries, which are representative of the Global South and are the countries which suffer the most of these sanctions and the whole collapse of the economy, have a right to speak out at this summit. They are also part of what Duma President Volodin called the G8 [China, India, Russia, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, Iran and Turkey], which is emerging, which already all together have a larger GDP than the G7.

So, the miracle which we have to accomplish, Mission Impossible, is to get the G7 countries, or at least some of them, to stop the confrontation and say, “We need to address these issues together.” I think that is what this organization and all the others—and I agree with you, Sam—we should try to reach out to as many of these organizations and try to really create a mass movement who demand that the world is not being blown up. If there is enough mobilization around the world, it can happen, and they will have to listen.

I’m a little bit more optimistic about the ability to have idea impact politics. That has a lot to do with the work of my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and our movement for the last decades, because we have done that repeatedly. I know that in a moment of crisis, it is not power, it is not money which counts. It is the question of do you have an adequate idea which is needed at that moment? Then, you can actually shape history. So, I would say we should absolutely encourage India and South Africa in whatever way we can, to play such a role, because I think that is what the G7 urgently needs.

Speed: There’s a question we have which is directed to Dr. Kortunov and to Helga. It’s a question from *Chengdu Economic Daily*:

“What is the expected impact of the Ukraine crisis on global food security, and refugee health and energy issues related to food supply, both in Europe and the developing world, and how are countries and regions such as India and Africa preparing themselves for it?”

Kortunov: If I might, first of all, I think we should keep in mind that the food crisis started to unravel long before the conflict in Ukraine. We saw food prices rising for at least two years, and definitely there were many reasons for that. We do need a new system of food security, including some reserves, and better statistics and exchange of information on harvest expectations.

If you take the Ukrainian crisis in particular, we are talking about the exports of Ukraine proper, it is about

20 million metric tonnes of wheat, going primarily to the Middle East and some African countries. It’s also about the Russian wheat exports, and also the export of other food stocks like sunflower oil and other. On top of that, we have the issue of Russian and Belarussian fertilizers. It’s about 20% of the global output, and many countries in Africa, the Middle East, and even Latin America depend on these fertilizers. So, the prices are likely to remain high.

The issue of deliveries from Russia is not likely to be resolved, because it’s not just about sanctions, it’s about access to European ports. It’s also about the payment systems, and insurances. Of course, many companies are in the business of over compliance, so I think there will be some not physical shortages of food, but definitely some negative impact on the structure of food consumption in many countries around the world.

I think that this issue has to be addressed in a more systematic way, and definitely it would be great to have some sanctions waivers in order to allow the Russian wheat and fertilizers to go to international markets. But essentially what we need is more than that. We need something that I would call the [agricultural] Green Revolution to point zero. Something similar to what the world was able to initiate back in the 1960s, and something which made quite a dramatic change of the productivity of agriculture in many developing countries, like India and some African nations are right now. We need a second revolution like that to make sure that the agricultural production is in plenty, and that we know how not only to harvest the food, but also how to preserve it and deliver it and how to process it. These are big issues.

Finally, let me also say that many countries imposed restrictions on the food exports, like India for instance. But I think that it is understandable, given the current situation in the world. I hope that already in the next couple of months, we will have some stabilization of prices on basic food exports. The question is, not to waste this crisis, but to think strategically about food security in years to come.

Speed: Helga, do you want to add anything to that?

Zepp-LaRouche: Only one sentence, because this subject will be taken up in the second panel today. We have a whole group of farmers who are absolutely motivated to double food production, and therefore, I would really suggest that we discuss this more in the second panel.

Speed: Here's a question from Gerry Belsky:

"Dr. Bittner's characterization of post-World War II U.S. imperial policy of keeping Germany and Russia separated and in conflict, as a continuation of American policy from the beginning of its history, is more a characterization of British geopolitical imperial policy than the traditional American policy as understood by Lincoln and other followers of the American System."

Then he asks, Helga, if you would like to comment on the conflict between the American and British systems, and the difference between them. He suggests that the China Belt and Road and other things—he goes on like that—[be] brought into Germany and Russia.

Zepp-LaRouche: I think if you look at the present Ukraine crisis, you can see again that it is always the British that egg on the Americans. If the U.S. is not aggressive enough, then for sure you will have somebody from the think tank I mentioned—RUSI—but you could also take the various ministers. The role of the British has been to basically perpetuate the British Empire. Just because it has taken a different shape, it doesn't mean it doesn't exist.

Historically, very briefly, because this is a very long story. America made the Revolution against the British Empire, and the British Empire never forgave the American colonies for that. They tried to undo that with the War of 1812; they did it with the Civil War, in which the British Empire allied with the Confederacy against Lincoln. When they realized that they could not win America back militarily, they started to say, "Let's manipulate the American establishment elite to adopt the British model of empire as the common platform."

That started after the assassination of President McKinley with Teddy Roosevelt, and it was throughout the 20th Century with only a few exceptions like FDR and John F Kennedy. Especially in the last period, you had a complete coincidence. After the Soviet Union disintegrated, where there would have been the chance for a totally new peace order in the world, the neo-cons, the Project for a New American Century, deliberately said, "Let's build a unipolar world based on the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain."

Economically, I can only advise our viewers and listeners to read Alexander Hamilton, Friedrich List, Henry C. Carey, and Wilhelm von Kardorff—very important; he wrote a beautiful little book *Gegen dem Strom (Against the Stream)*, where he describes the difference between the British system and the American

System. The American System basically being in the tradition of Leibniz, of the Cameralists, of the idea that the only source of wealth is the creativity of the people, and that therefore it is the task of the state to encourage the creative potential of all citizens, because that is the wealth of the state. As compared to the British system, which is a system of controlling the trade—buy cheap, sell expensive, and manipulate and control everything in between. That is the key conflict right now.

What people don't know is that the Chinese government, the Chinese model of economy, is much closer to the American System, to Hamiltonian banking. Friedrich List is the most famous foreign economist in China. Therefore, if the United States goes back to its own best tradition, which is the Hamiltonian economics, the idea of the American Revolution, of Lincoln, of Roosevelt, of Kennedy, then cooperation with China would be very easy. It is the fact that the present politics in the United States has become British, that is the key conflict.

We have published an enormous amount about these things, and I think for people to understand that difference is an absolute precondition not to fall into the trap. Because if you just say, "Down with America!" which a lot of people nowadays are saying, because they are completely fed up, that does not solve the problem. If it would be enough that all these other countries are building a new economic system, I think that's wonderful, but it will not solve the problem. Because if the financial collapse escalates, and we really reach a real crash, I don't think that the United States will dissolve peacefully as the Soviet Union did in 1991, and therefore the danger of war coming out of this is what we really should be concerned with.

But I think the difference between the British system and the American System as it was conceived by the Founding Fathers, by Benjamin Franklin, by the first Washington administration, Alexander Hamilton, and as I said, Lincoln, that is the tradition we have to get the United States back to.

Dr. Bittner: [via interpreter] I would like to say something about the British, but first to Joe Biden. I think he is the worst of the current politicians. He is responsible—most of the current wars, he was head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he was Vice President, and now he's President. He was active in Ukraine a lot. We know what was going on in terms of corruption there, in respect to the big company with his son, Hunter. And what happened in terms of the war and

trends of Ukraine, he was responsible, too.

So, the centrifugal forces in Western Europe increased in the last years, and that didn't change with the Brexit. Britain became closer and closer to the United States, and what we overlook, they also have collaborators in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; they have a big influence worldwide. And what Helga Zepp-Larouche already said is that the war policy comes from their think tanks. I see that exactly the same as she does.

If we think about how World War I became possible, we actually stumbled into it—no, no, no, it was systematically prepared years before that. And the Weimar Republic was destabilized by Hitler who already in the 1920s was financed by foreign countries, which I actually wrote about in my books, so there are indications of that. And World War II was basically in the pipeline already in 1919; it was in sight when the French Marshal said, “In 20 years, we'll have a new world war.”

Also, this Second World War was prepared in advance. I don't want to let Germany off the hook, you know, there was a big part of that in Germany. I don't want that to be missed. But because of the capitulation in 1945, the Allies worked differently than after the First World War, so they actually went into Berlin....

If one looks at this geopolitical situation from a different viewpoint, as it is characterized for example, in German textbooks, there's another outcome, and we have to take care that that historic truth comes more and more to the surface, and we have to explain to the world the current situations. Otherwise, we will not have a new and better world situation.

Kiracofe: I agree completely with what Helga was saying, and I commend your organization for delving into American history and finding the truth about the American System as it contrasted and contrasts with the British imperial system. So, I definitely would encourage people to follow Helga's advice and read some of the organization's literature and deep historical studies of that point.

With respect to U.S.-German relations, well, you know Friedrich List actually lived in the United States for a while and so List as an economist made observations in the United States that he could then apply to his own theoretical development and bring back to Europe with him when he returned.

U.S.-German relations have always been good, with the exception of the last century. But Bismarck, for example, was a great friend of the United States

and he actually went to university at Göttingen with several American students. It should be recollected, that back in that era of the early 19th century, the German universities were really considered the top ones, and many young American students went to German universities, particularly, for example, to Göttingen and were influenced by particularly the historical school there at Göttingen, which included some economics and anthropology, etc.

U.S.-German cultural relations were very strong and very good through the 19th century, and unfortunately, with the rise of Nietzschean thought in Europe, particularly in Germany, it's that Nietzschean trend—like the neocons today in the United States are essentially Nietzscheans—it's that Nietzschean trend in late 19th-century Germany that caused, that amplified or helped bring that militarism upwards, sort of an increasing militarism that I mentioned in my own talk earlier, the sort of pervasive militarism all around the planet today, particularly in NATO is what I meant.

With respect to U.S.-Russian relations, they've always been excellent, with some Cold War issues, of course. But from the very beginning, Catherine the Great helped us during our Revolution with her Armed Neutrality strategy, etc. During our Civil War, Russia dispatched its fleet to New York and San Francisco, to kind of deter or dissuade the British from getting too aggressive. Lincoln was a close friend of the Czar; U.S.-Russia relations throughout the 19th century were excellent. In the later part of the 19th century, the dean of the diplomatic corps in Washington, D.C., that is to say, the most senior member of the diplomatic corps in Washington, was actually the ambassador from Russia, who was extremely popular back in that day. So, we had excellent relations with Russia.

Of course, disrupted somewhat by the Revolution but nonetheless, when push came to shove in World War II, we worked closely with the Russian government and Stalin, and all of that—Soviet government, if you want to use that phrase—and were able to achieve victory. Unfortunately, the Cold War poured cold water on the relationship. But nonetheless, President Eisenhower had great respect for Marshal Zhukov, for example, and there were back-channel communications through academic circles, and diplomatic circles etc., so the Cold War never really got out of hand. It was managed.

In today's very tense situation, naturally there's a cooling, a frostiness in the relationship, but diplomacy goes on. Diplomacy will continue despite the Ukraine

situation, and as things cool down over the next several years, I expect U.S.-Russian relations to at least have some level of diplomatic contact. They're not going to be normal for a very long [time] in the future, a very, very long time, but I expect them to at least establish some good communications and hopefully not let things get out of hand; although for the time being, we are in a nuclear danger, let's put it that way. As it's been expressed by Colonel Black and others today.

So, I'm not pessimistic about U.S.-German relations; I'm not pessimistic about U.S.-Russia relations. I just think we have to maintain diplomacy. And, you know, there's a long history to diplomacy: The earliest records of diplomacy that we have are between ancient Egypt and the Hittites, for example. That's a long time ago. The role of diplomacy is very important and very ancient, between states, between civilizations. The ancient Chinese had their forms of diplomacy.

And then, of course, in the modern world, during the Renaissance era, we had Renaissance diplomacy, as historian Mattingly will describe. I'm always optimistic in terms of keeping diplomatic lines open, and going, even through third parties—even indirectly, through third parties—and I think ultimately, ultimately our relations will stabilize with Russia and hopefully get better.

The problem we have right now, is exactly what Helga said: There's a contradiction between our policy today and our traditional American policy. Why? Neocoinism is one excuse. It's that penetration of neocon thinking, which is Nietzschean, combined, let's say, with some of the British nostalgia for what was it, the Great Game, they used to call it. The British Empire competing with the Russians, and those two streams of thought have infected the American elite, the swamp you can say, or the deep state in Washington.

Until we get back to an American way of thinking, as Helga precisely points out, until we get back to an American way of thinking rather than thinking in terms of nostalgic British imperialism, or neocon Nietzscheanism, or whatever the heck it is, it's going to take some work. But I'm optimistic that the U.S. and Russia, down the road, will patch up their differences.

Speed: I want to now move to the conclusion. As we do that, this also gives you the opportunity to say anything you haven't said. Sam, you have at least two people who have directed questions to you. One of them is Jutta from Germany:

“Sam speaks to my heart, and my question goes in this same direction: How will this new architecture reach those people in responsible positions? And how do we get to the roots of this rotten system?”

And there's a second one—that's the positive one—from José:

“To Sam, my response to your question, as someone without authority, is that any action by any individual can cause an effect. I can't guarantee that world leaders are listening, but every day, people are listening, and I would say there's more power in them, now, because they listened to this panel, than they had beforehand. Imagine the people who will watch this conference years from now? Will your words still be true then? If so doesn't that give you real authority that supersedes those in power, now, because you use the truth, when they do not?”

Dr. Pitroda: Thanks for both comments. They're very positive, very well-articulated. I appreciate those comments.

My main concern still remains the same: We know that the world needs to be redesigned. We know that we need to focus on people and planet. We know that there are hungry, poor, people all over the world who need education, health—we know how to do it! Why aren't we doing it? We also know that we don't need to build military machines to fight with each other.

I hope that in a hyperconnected world, we have evolved to a point, we can settle our differences across the table, and we don't have to pick up guns, at this day—horrible!

How do we get people to listen to this? That power and profit should not be the ultimate motive for everybody. We need to worry about our planet and people. Again, we know how to do it. How do we change our existing structure, whether it is UN, World Bank, IMF, NATO, WTO, WHO, or whatever? Can we build new institutions to respond to the new reality of the world? Can we dismantle existing institutions that don't work, or modify them? Can we really build networks of nations, as opposed to borders, to fight?

We must celebrate humanity, irrespective of race, religion, caste, color! We have one life to live: Can we live with fulfillment, joy, concern for others? We can do it! I don't know why all of us don't come together, and say, look, for the first time, we are all connected in the human race, too. All 8 billion people are connected. What does this connectivity mean to human civiliza-

tion? Can we really redefine our priorities in a connected world?

And I think that's the challenge in front of us. Thank you.

Dr. Bittner: [via interpreter] Yes, I want to say that the situation is out of control, now. While I think that a revolution is illusory, it would be blocked. The governments of the West have now blocked this possibility because their control mechanisms are so strong, so the needed revolution will be very hard. So, we know that the internet for us is being forbidden and restricted, and that certain individuals get certain problems when they speak out. But we have to continue. I understand younger people, which I also have said in a presentation when young journalists asked me, and when they said they have to think of their family, they have to go along, even though they don't want to. So, we are independent. That means we have to lead the way and we have to inform the people, which is I think the only way how we can make a change.

Dr. Kiracofe: Thank you very much for inviting me. Thank you, Helga, and thank you all to the panel, my colleagues. You've been great colleagues.

I just would leave with a couple thoughts: Number one, diplomacy. Think diplomacy. Diplomacy not war! Think internationalism, not militarism. Think international organizations, that certainly can be reformed. We don't have to destroy the United Nations, but we can reform it! Or other parts of the global economic architecture. So, think positively and optimistically about that.

Also, I would say to folks who have tuned in, there are English translations of the speeches of world leaders, such as President Putin and President Xi, in English on the appropriate websites. So, I would recommend checking out the speeches of President Putin on his [website](#) and also President Xi on his [website](#). And I would recommend everyone to take a look at the English text of the February 4th Xi-Putin [Joint Statement](#), which gives their vision of a future.

And in final conclusion, I really like the work that's being done in China by academics on the theme of a "community with a shared future." So, thinking in terms of an international community "with a shared future," sort of a positive, cooperative, inclusive vision of the future, and what we can be doing now to

bring that about.

So, in conclusion, think positively: Diplomacy, not war.

Zepp-LaRouche: I think that people should prepare mentally that we are in all likelihood heading for the perfect storm, because, as I said before, I think the reason why the war danger is becoming so acute, it really only has to do marginally with Ukraine and things like that. It has to do with the fact that the Western, neo-liberal financial system is hopelessly bankrupt, and that the point that Lyndon LaRouche made in 1971, that point has arrived, and there is absolutely *no way* how this system can be saved.

And that means that unless we can mobilize internationally forces to go for a New Bretton Woods system, with the four points I touched upon in my earlier presentation, I don't see that there is a way out. And that will become more clear to a lot of people: It's already clear to a lot of farmers around the world who are fighting for their survival, in the middle of a world famine "of Biblical proportions," as David Beasley is usually saying. And it's also clear to a lot of people who are on the lower end of income. It's clear to owners and entrepreneurs of small and medium-size firms.

And I think if all the people who are participating in this conference would join to help us to build this kind of network, link up with other organizations, get the study done of what are the right economic principles. Look at the difference between the British and the American system, and study the theory of physical economy of Lyndon LaRouche: The answers are all there. And we need to be prepared, because the worst thing which could happen is that we have the perfect storm hitting, and then you go into chaos. And chaos, for sure, will be another trigger of war danger.

So, I think we should really build this community of a shared future, by preparing to study the principles: How do we get the world in a better organizational form? And for that end, I want to invite you all to stay in touch with the Schiller Institute, beyond this conference.

Speed: Dr. Wolfgang Bittner, Dr. Cliff Kiracofe, Mr. Sam Pitroda, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, I want to thank you for being on this panel; and in addition, I want to thank Col. Richard Black, Dr. Andrey Kortunov, and Prof. Wang Wen for participating as well.