

## Schiller Conference Dialogue, Panel 1

# To Solve the Global Crisis, Reason Must Prevail

*Dec. 12—The following is an edited transcript of the question-and-answer session from Panel 1 of the Dec. 7-8 Schiller Institute conference, “In the Spirit of Schiller and Beethoven: All Men, Become Brethren.” The panel was titled, “The Strategic Crisis: New and Final World War, or a New Paradigm of the One Humanity.” Participants included (in the order in which they spoke): Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute; Zhang Weiwei, Professor of International Relations, Fudan University, China; Colonel (ret.) Lawrence Wilkerson, former Chief of Staff to the U.S. Secretary of State; Dmitri Trenin, Professor and Academic Supervisor of the Institute of World Military Economy and Strategy at the Higher School of Economics University in Moscow, Russian Federation; Ambassador Chas W. Freeman, Jr., former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, 1993-1994; H.E. Ján Čarnogurský, former Prime Minister of Slovakia; and H.E. Donald Ramotar, former President of Guyana. H.E. Hossein Mousavian, former Ambassador of Iran to Germany, was present during the discussion period. The moderator was Dennis Speed of the Schiller Institute. The full video of that panel is available [here](#). Subheads have been added.*

**Dennis Speed:** Helga, I’m going to ask if you have any thoughts or reflections about anything that has transpired this morning?

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:** Yes. What struck me in the remarks of the different speakers—let me just briefly touch on that. I think the comment of Dr. Trenin that the West should learn the lessons from the collapse of the Soviet Union, if I understood him correctly, is that he referred to the non-emphasis on infrastructure and other civil economic questions. If you look at the United States and Europe—that is the driving problem; that this neglect is undermining even the military capability. But it’s also the reason why these countries are so hysterical.

I think what President Ramotar said, that we

have to find a way of getting rid of nuclear weapons, I fully agree. And I raised the proposal by my late husband in making them technologically obsolete as compared to only arms control; I think that is an issue to be hopefully discussed. And his emphasis that the problem could be solved if the West would join the BRI [Belt and Road initiative]; that’s the center of my whole discussion.

Prime Minister Čarnogurský raised the important question that it’s not clear who is ruling the United States. Obviously, President Joe Biden is not in that position. I fully agree with the disappointment about German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier; I could say a lot more about that, because Steinmeier was on the scene in the [Maidan](#), and he could have done something to undo the situation. Chas Freeman pointed correctly to the situation that the BRI could be a bridge for Ukraine and other regions.

Professor Zhang Weiwei talked about the blessing of geography, and indeed, that is a way to look at it, because Southwest Asia is the bridge between Asia, Africa, and Europe. Ukraine could be the bridge between Europe and Asia and the whole BRI.

Scott Ritter emphasized the same point, which I think is really outrageous; that Rear Admiral Thomas Buchanan [Director of the Plans and Policy Directorate, U.S. Strategic Command], was actually talking about the idea of winning a nuclear war, which is ludicrous. Colonel Wilkerson correctly pointed to the fact that the historic pendulum is swinging back to Asia, and the 5,000-year or 3,000-year history of China. And Ambassador Mousavian thankfully raised the issue of the [Oasis Plan](#) as the way to solve the problem. Obviously, the idea of not enriching uranium to the level of weapons grade is a way to allow Iran to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

We have an opportunity to lead this discussion to an urgent recommendation to the world as to what should be the next step to avoid the imminent danger of nuclear war.

**Speed:** The first question we have is from Belarus: “Dear panelists, I am Pavel Shidlovsky, Chief of Mission of the Embassy of Belarus in the United States. As you are probably aware, foreign ministers of Belarus and Russia have recently put forward an initiative to develop the Eurasian Charter of Diversity and Multipolarity in the 21st Century. The common vision of the Charter has been posted on the websites of the respective ministries. Initiators of the Charter see it as a non-confrontational document, not directed at anyone, which will lay down the concepts and principles of fair security for all states of the Eurasian continent. My question for you is: Do you think that this Charter, or even the interstate process to develop it, will help to defuse the current global crisis and pull the world away from the abyss? Thank you.”

### ‘Unite and Prosper’ *Not* ‘Divide and Rule’

**Prof. Zhang Weiwei:** This is a very good question. Actually, I have not actually read this particular text he mentioned between Russia and Belarus. Yet, I’ve been to Russia three times this year. I went to attend several forums. So, I think at least China, Russia, Belarus share many similarities on the whole idea of how to develop this whole Eurasian continent.

Actually, from our point of view, the very existence of NATO and this proxy war somehow in Ukraine, in many ways is an attempt by the United States, by the Biden administration to—as people say with regard to NATO—“keep America in; keep Russia out; keep Germany down.” And furthermore, keep this Eurasian integration impossible. So, what the United States or these particular liberals hate most is the idea of Europe, Russia, Central Asia, China, South Asia, being more united.

As I said in my speech, Chinese philosophy is “unite and prosper,” not “divide and rule.” And if you look at China’s BRI—Belt and Road Initiative—and also Russia’s Eurasian economic space, we share a lot. That’s why we support each other. China supports Russia’s ideas; Russia supports Chinese ideas. There is a lot of cooperation and engagement. The idea is that this whole Eurasian continent should be a land of peace, development, and prosperity. If we simply focus on the BRI alone, already \$1 trillion has been invested; over 4,000 projects. Because of this—as I said in my speech—South Asia has already gone from the curse of geography to the blessing of geography. In many ways, Central Asia is now coming from the

curse of geography to the blessing of geography.

So, from the Chinese point of view, we prefer to build this economic structure. We are somehow influenced by Marxism: Economics, economic structure; that’s fundamental; that will change the landscape. With economic structure available, there are good ideas put forward by Russia, Belarus, China, by others that will come to fruition; I’m pretty sure about this. That’s my brief answer to your question. Thank you.

**Speed:** Thank you very much. Would anybody else care to answer that? If not, I’ll go to the next question. OK, Larry?

**Col. Lawrence Wilkerson:** I just want to say, that makes my point that I was making about the humongous geopolitical, geostrategic shift of power that’s taking place. But the power from the other end, as it were, is benign power for the most part, because it is focused on economics and prosperity and development. Whereas the power opposing it, and angry that it’s happening and peeling perhaps Europe away from its hegemony, is us.

**Speed:** The next question is from Sergey Yumatov, senior correspondent of TASS Washington. He asks, “Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov said in the recent interview with Tucker Carlson, that Russia does not consider the resolution of the Ukrainian crisis to be the sole purview of Moscow and Washington. Lavrov said, ‘The Europeans whisper to each other that it is not for Volodymyr Zelensky to dictate the terms of the deal; it’s for the United States and Russia. I don’t think we should be presenting our relations as two guys deciding for everybody; not at all. It is not our style.’ According to Lavrov, Russia prefers the manners which dominate in the BRICS and Shanghai Cooperation Organization, where the UN Charter principle of sovereign equality of states is really embodied, while the United States is not used to respecting the sovereign equality of states. Do you have a comment on this statement by the head of the Russian Foreign Ministry? Which parties do you think should take part in settling the crisis in Ukraine? Thank you.”

That is the question, and I think I’d like to ask—there are several people now who have put their hands up. Let me go to Professor Trenin first, and then we’ll come to Professor Zhang; and Chas, I’m going to ask you to respond to that.

## Russian Roulette with Nuclear Weapons

**Prof. Dmitri Trenin:** Thank you very much for this question. I think that there are diplomatic ways of answering the question, and let's say more pragmatic, more let's say realistic ways.

In Russia, what's happening in Ukraine is seen—and I think this is pretty widely seen—as a proxy war between the United States and the combined West on the one hand, and Russia on the other. Ukraine in that sense is an instrument that the West is using to defeat Russia, or at least do as much harm as possible to Russia.

Now, of course, the situation at this point is reaching an extremely dangerous moment. I think that the use of ATACMS and the changes in the Russian nuclear doctrine and the combat test of the Oreshnik missile actually are taking us pretty close to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe. So, the first thing on the order, the first issue on the agenda should be to walk back from the brink of a nuclear catastrophe. I think this has been said during the discussion, and I would support that. The most important point at this time is to step back from provoking Russia. Because there is certainly an analogy that can be drawn between the U.S./Western policy in the Ukraine crisis and the game of Russian roulette; only that same revolver is armed with a nuclear weapon. People have been speculating where Russia's red lines are, and I think there's certainly a wide margin of error. People can just overstep that line unwittingly, and take us to somewhere where none of us would want to be.

With regard to negotiations, I think it's still too early to talk about what format negotiations could take, and when they might begin. But I think that all these nice things about sovereignty of states and equality of states being very correct, it is also important to look at the realities on the ground. As I said, without U.S. support, without U.S./Western support, without U.S./Western derailment of a peace deal that was almost ready in 2022 between Ukraine and Russia, the war would be over by now. It actually would have been over a long time ago. So, I believe that some sort of a U.S.-Russian dialogue, which is likely to open—maybe it's already happening at some level; at least a pre-dialogue or something that leads to dialogue between the incoming administration in Washington and the Kremlin. The Kremlin is certainly open to that dialogue, and I think that Lavrov's interview is one piece of evidence for that. That is the way to go at this point.

I do not see, for example, Russia or Russian President Vladimir Putin sitting down with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky right now to discuss what? A ceasefire that is likely to bide time for preparations for another war? That's something that Russia would probably not take, having had the bad experience of two Minsk agreements and one Eastern World War. Let me stop here.

**Speed:** OK. Professor Zhang?

## Transition to a Multipolar World

**Prof. Zhang:** It's a very important question in the sense that from my point of view, China and Russia share one objective: that is, we should change this unipolarity or unipolar world order into a multipolar world order. Indeed, the Ukraine war per se is controversial. It's even controversial within China. Yet, there is broad consensus among Chinese about the Global South; that Russia's objective to change the current American-led unipolarity into multipolarity, this objective is understood and even supported by most countries. This is also why most countries do not join in these so-called sanctions against Russia.

There are some differences between China and Russia with regard to this particular unipolar world order. I would say Russia is revolutionary; and China is a reformer. Revolutionary means we try to overthrow the system; reformer means we look at the system. There are certain positive things and many negative things we should fix here and there. And now, the interesting thing is this revolution and reform; these two forces are somehow merged together. That is facilitating this transformation of the global political or diplomatic international affairs landscape.

I remember not long ago, the EU foreign policy representative Josep Borrell said candidly, today the Global South has all the alternatives—ideologically, economically, technologically, militarily—to replace whatever Western institutions it wishes. So, this is revolutionary. China alone can offer a lot of alternatives; Russia can also offer some. So, the point is, with this working together of the Global South, Global Majority, I think the system is changing fast.

In many ways, the rising to power of President-elect Donald Trump is in one way a recognition that perhaps the United States has already over-reached itself. It's really hurting the fundamental interests of the United States. Hopefully though, with Donald Trump

in power, rather than keeping this expansionist policy, the United States should understand its own limits and gradually work out some pragmatism; work out something more or less in the way of global multipolarity.

Of course, Donald Trump is not yet exercising his power. We'll have to wait for January. But I think Chairman Mao said famously a long time ago, "We like to deal with the rightists in the United States." Old story; thank you.

**Speed:** All right. We'll go to Ambassador Freeman, who has some experience in that field and also may have a view of the issue of Ukraine itself.

**Amb. Chas Freeman:** Many important points have been made. I think there's a clear recognition of the danger of nuclear escalation. And that is a beginning.

I'd like to answer the question in three stages. First dealing with the question of, do we recognize the problem? Second, what are the tactical steps that might lead to escalation or reverse it? And third, what is the strategic objective?

I think there's been enough said about the danger of nuclear escalation that I don't need to go on to speak more. I note that after the firing of the Oreshnik missile, there was a conversation which hadn't taken place for a long time between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, C.Q. Brown, on the U.S. side, and Valery Gerasimov, Chief of the General Staff on the Russian side. Following this discussion, it appears that ATACMS assaults on Russia have halted. I think this is a positive step, and I hope it represents some understanding. I think the development of the Oreshnik missile is also a positive development in the sense that it provides Russia with an alternative to escalation to the nuclear level.

### Three Issues for Negotiations

So, not everything that is happening is negative. But we still face the strategic challenges and the issue that Dmitri Trenin talked about; namely how to structure negotiations and when and how they might occur, is something I would like to speak about briefly. There are three issues primarily that have been embedded in the war in Ukraine. The first is the status and rights of Russian speakers in the Ukrainian state. This began as a civil war among Ukrainians; between those who insisted on forced assimilation of the Russian-speaking population and denial of the Russians and the Hungar-

ians and Romanians and others in Ukraine of the right to use their own language to teach their children or to communicate with local government. That issue was resolved in the seizure of territory by Russia. And that issue is going to have to be addressed in a broader European context, because what is at stake is the rights of people guaranteed by the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe, by the former Ukrainian Constitution, and by general standards of international human rights.

So, the parties that could negotiate on that issue are different than those that must negotiate on the second issue, which is, where is the border between Ukraine and Russia? That can be settled only by Ukrainians and Russians. Maybe others will give advice, but there has to be a bilateral discussion, which is at the moment impossible, as many people have pointed out, in large measure because of Ukrainian barriers to negotiation.

The third issue, and by far the most important in my mind, is the issue of Eurasian or European security architecture. How can we come up with a system that reassures all concerned—Russians, Western Europeans, Chinese for that matter—that they do not face an intolerable threat from their neighbors? This is a negotiation that's going to have to take place between the United States and Russia in the first instance, with participation by major European powers. Maybe China will later join this discussion. But we need to come up with a cooperative security system that can manage security in Europe.

And finally, I'll just make one point, and that is, we have been paralyzed in multiple contexts, whether in West Asia or in Ukraine or in other issues that could lead to a disastrous war, by the paralysis of the United Nations, and the theory that everything that is done must be done through that universal organization. But there is nothing in international law or practice to prevent the ad hoc making of rules between willing partners and coalitions. The BRICS grouping represents a grouping which can begin to take on a rules-making function between its members, not imposing those rules on anyone else. Here I come back to something I think Dmitri referred to: namely that in the new world order, the importance of regional coalitions and geographic places is rising. I think we don't need to wait to deal with all of the problems; deal with some of them. I would invite ad hoc coalitions to begin to do that.

Hopefully, we can build on that and come at last to some broader understanding among the participants in all these conflicts.

### **A Shared Community of the One Humanity**

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I would like to address Professor Zhang; that in my view, the only comprehensive approach to the strategic situation has actually been formulated by Chinese President Xi Jinping, who has formulated this conception of the shared community of the one humanity. And that actually fulfills the requirement I had mentioned earlier, that you have to think about the one humanity as being of a higher order than the many—the many being the nations. And that the Three Initiatives of Xi Jinping: the Global Security, Development and Civilizational Initiatives together actually represent in my view the kind of framework which equals what happened in the Peace of Westphalia, where the warring parties were coming to the conclusion that they had to end the war by first coming up with principles, the principles being that any peace order has to be in the interest of the other—all others; or else there will be no peace. And that in foreign policy, hatred has to be replaced with what you would call *ren* in Chinese, or *agapē* in Western civilization.

And I think that that kind of a principled agreement—and this is a little bit different, Chas, from what you have just proposed with your ad hoc regional report—I think one needs to put the three initiatives on the strategic agenda. Because unless you address the existential danger to all of humanity, which is the nuclear extinction, I do not think you can solve all the regional problems, because the whole conflict is driven by this geopolitical fight between the collapsing empire of the West and the rising China and the Global South on the other side.

So, I would strongly make the point that one needs to have an approach to put the Three Initiatives on the strategic agenda as a starting point. What do you think about that?

**Prof. Zhang:** I agree with you, Helga. I think it's important to see these three global initiatives put forward by Chinese leader Xi Jinping as something very serious. This afternoon, three hours ago in Doha, Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov had a dialogue with a reporter here and we were present. He made a point; he said among the good-willed countries like China,

Brazil, and others, they have raised very interesting proposals for resolving the Ukrainian crisis. All these are very well-intentioned, but there's one thing missing in all these proposals: that is Xi Jinping's Initiative on Global Security, in which Xi Jinping mentioned that it's necessary to take on the root cause of global conflicts. He said that if these proposals from different friendly countries can contain this element, Russia will be very happy to embrace it. Roughly, that was his message he conveyed. In other words, these ideas put forward by Xi Jinping have been supported by what we have seen in China-ASEAN, these three structures. And also, it has, perhaps, broad implications.

### **What China Can Contribute**

Before I leave, I want to mention two facts to elaborate on what China can contribute to these grand projects put forward by the Schiller Institute. For one thing, China has just completed encircling, with huge ring-belts for reforestation, the world's second largest desert [Taklamakan Desert in northwest China's Xinjiang region—ed.]. It is almost twice the size of the United Kingdom—a bit more than 1.5 times—that's completely encircled. So, technically, we can turn this huge land area, deserts, into the platform for renewable energy and for farming. This is revolutionary. China has good first-rate technologies today, to turn deserts into production of renewable energy. So, the implication is, indeed, this Oasis Plan for West Africa and the Middle East technically, technologically, can be achieved if there is peace and stability. China has this technology. It's already big; it's the second largest desert in which we see this transformation. It's really a miracle in human history.

The second is, in Europe there was a lot of talk about the so-called Green Deal, five, six, ten years back. But China is the only country that has done it; that has achieved this Green Deal. We use more Green energy than traditional energy. The renewable energy today in China is already cheaper, less costly, than traditional energy. So, this is also revolutionary. And this can also help a lot of Global South countries. To be honest, if we talk about the prevention of climate change or this objective to have carbon reduction, China's technological progress and practices have proven that we can do this. That will be immensely positive for mankind.

I think these facts will be very encouraging for this

whole discussion on big and grand projects for mankind.

**Speed:** We have a question from a master's degree student of international regionalism from Cameroon. It's a question to Helga, but I think it also will apply to others: "Africa in all spheres remains a huge market in search of investments, while the nuclear field is left out. So, my question to you is, how urgent is the need for the construction of nuclear power plants in Cameroon and West Africa generally?" Let me simply indicate there are two other questions—and I can keep these separate, but I just want to indicate because you may be interested Helga—that ask about peaceful nuclear energy, specifically with respect to nations like Iran, or various of the nations of Southwest Asia and otherwise; because yes, there's talk about no nuclear weapons in Iran, but what about nuclear power? So, there have been three or four questions that came in that also brought that consideration up; so, I'll also, after you answer Helga, extend it to any other guest who would like to say something about that.

### **Nuclear Power Is an Urgent Necessity**

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I think nuclear power is absolutely essential and urgent simply because it has a much higher energy-flux density than even the best functioning alternative energies. One of the revolutionary breakthroughs of my late husband was to point out and actually discover the correlation between energy-flux density and the relative potential population density, which can be maintained with that kind of energy.

Now that means if you want to have a world population of not only eight billion, but eventually 10 or 20 billion and even beyond that, you need to have the higher energy-flux densities to do that. We have produced a [brochure](#) which will be the topic of discussion tomorrow morning in the first panel for a crash program for the electrification of Africa; because 600 million people in Africa still have no access to electricity. We have proposed a crash program to do that, but using especially existing technologies, but also fossil fuels, but, starting at the same time with nuclear energy, because it takes several years to complete. That is our approach to address the migrant question. We have a migrant crisis both in the United States and in Europe. Trump wants to build a wall along the Mexican border; the European Union wants to beef up the para-

military Frontex organization to push back refugees, giving them the fate of drowning in the Mediterranean or being miserable in a refugee camp around the Mediterranean.

The alternative would be to have the kind of cooperation between the Western nations and the Belt and Road Initiative countries, the Global South, to cooperate in the crash program for the electrification of Africa, starting with turbines on the northern coast of Africa; but then especially start nuclear power plants right away. And in addition, start certain game-changer projects like the building of the Grand Inga Hydroelectric Complex in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the Transaqua, bringing the water from the Congo River all the way up through a system of canals to Lake Chad; and in that way, creating electricity for the 12 countries along the way, which opens the possibility of industrialization of the heart of Africa.

So, my emphatic answer is yes, absolutely. It is those kinds of joint ventures between the BRICS and Western countries which could solve the geopolitical confrontation and at the same time find a human solution to the migrant question rather than building walls.

**Speed:** Thank you. This is a question that came in from a well-known person to me, Sean Stone. He was talking about how he had done a documentary on nuclear power several years ago. "It's clear that the idea of peaceful nuclear power should be the right of all nations. We hear about Iran or other nations, we also know about the situation with Israel not acknowledging that it possesses nuclear weapons, so that this has become a very complicated issue. But it's clear that if there's going to be economic development of nations and security among nations, this is a feature that has to be discussed." He would like to have Ambassador Freeman—and also you, Helga, and if anyone else would like to—speak to that.

### **Israel Must Acknowledge Its Nuclear Weapons**

**Amb. Freeman:** I think the issue of nuclear non-proliferation has become once again a major issue. I note that I listened carefully to Ambassador Mousavian and his discussion of the Iranian issue. One thing that I think needs to be acknowledged is that the Iranian nuclear crisis began with an American effort to force Iran out of a multilateral reprocessing agreement in France. The issue of how to provide fuel in a safe

way to countries that need nuclear power remains unresolved.

As for the nuclear issues in West Asia, I do not see an answer to them unless and until Israel acknowledges that it has nuclear weapons and is prepared to deal with that fact on a reciprocal basis with others. It is, I think, a minor miracle that others have not gone nuclear following Israel so far. But this is only a matter of time, especially given the threats that Israel poses to Iran, the state of Turkish relations with Israel, and the collapse of warmth between Israel and Egypt and other members of the Arab world. So, I myself note that in China—and Professor Zhang has left now—but I believe there are 55 nuclear reactors under construction. Another 70 are planned. This is a major part of the effort to address the issue of the energy revolution and to avoid the use of fossil fuels as well as to reduce dependence on imports of fuel.

So, that is my comment; thank you.

**Speed:** Helga, do you have anything you'd like to add?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** No, but I think that the question of the use of peaceful nuclear energy is something which can be absolutely worked out if there is a general agreement to uplift civilization out of this present danger. I can only say that what China is doing and Russia, also Japan, India—even Japan is going back to nuclear energy. So, I think it's definitely something which will be resolved in the near future.

**Speed:** All right. What I think we'd better do, because we are way over on time already—and I want to say this to anybody who has questions or submitted questions: please direct them to particular individuals on the panel. We will forward these questions, and some of them may be able to be answered in the course of the other upcoming panels. I want to give the people who are with us an opportunity for closing remarks, or to respond to anything that you've heard that you haven't had a chance to respond to. Let me ask first whether Prime Minister Čarnogurský might have something to say; anything that you'd like at this point to express.

**Prime Minister Ján Čarnogurský:** I would like to say that countries are now in front of a crisis that they

should solve in days or weeks. But this crisis rose from the distrust of the collective West and the East, especially Russia, from distrust that lasts decades of years. To overcome the distrust that was created in decades of years, in days maybe weeks, would need a dramatic gesture of some size. And such dramatic gesture I don't see. That's our problem.

**Speed:** Thank you. President Ramotar, how about you?

### The Question of Principle

**President Donald Ramotar:** Just very quickly, some points. I think some of the things we have to deal with have to be on the question of principle in some ways. Even the supreme international organization of the United Nations doesn't act in a very principled way. We see, for instance, they have said nothing at all about how Kosovo was ripped away from Serbia and turned into a military base for the United States. But Russia is condemned, even though they had a big referendum in Crimea and other Russian-speaking parts of Ukraine, where Russia took the very clear position to be on the side of law and order, and had a referendum done in all of these places based on the principles of the rights of nations and self-determination. And yet, Russia has been condemned, and nothing is being said about the rights of Russia to have security. This is why this war in Ukraine is so tragic in my view. It was totally avoidable.

Look at this lady, Francesca Albanese, the Special Rapporteur for human rights [UN Special Rapporteur on the occupied Palestinian territories], who takes a very brave and principled position, not based on any power, not accepting any pressure. I'm sure she came under a lot of pressure, but she took a very principled position. This is the quality of the national public servant that we need to have in all the areas.

Look at how the International Criminal Court has procrastinated to issue a warrant against Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, and how quickly they did against Putin. They tried to issue an order on Putin when all Putin was trying to do was to move children out of harm's way. They have issued an arrest warrant for him. But Netanyahu, who has killed more than 100,000 people already in Gaza and the West Bank, they procrastinated for a year before they became so embarrassed that they had to issue an arrest warrant.



I think there's a subjective aspect to it, where our top bureau of national public servants must act in a more principled and bold way. Because they are in a position that can really upset a lot of what is taking place in the world.

The other thing I would like to say is that one of the failures of many of us who have similar ideas of world peace and so on and so forth, is that we have not been able to bring our views to masses of people in a big way. The control of the media by the Western powers is admirable in a way, but it is being used in such a devastating way that you have a lot of almost international mind control, controlling information, and controlling the forming of people's ideas. That I believe is a big thing, allowing them to get away with it. It even seems to be correct for many in their position. I believe that's another area we have to study.

How can we get some of these facts and some of our other views, our own analyses and viewpoints out? I know that we're trying a lot, but I still don't think that we can compete with the corporate media that still dominates the spreading of news and ideas around the world. That would be my quick comment for the time being.

**Speed:** Thank you, President Ramotar. Ambassador Freeman?

**Amb. Freeman:** I very much appreciate being part of this conference. I commend the Schiller Institute for convening it. I think the time has come for action. Some of us have proposed actions; I hope we will continue the dialogue and actually take those actions. And I thank you.

**Speed:** Thank you very much for being with us; we know what it means for you to be here, and I think everybody heard that you're speaking on behalf of the America that we wish to exist.

I believe Helga, we're now at you.

### **Does Humanity Have the 'Moral Fiber' To Survive?**

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Well, I think it is clear that the time left for the discussion of such a very complex

strategic situation is too short. I can only say, we have three more panels, and I would urge all the listeners to engage with us. Take the proceedings of this conference—there were so many rich ideas presented in the comments of each of the speakers, that I think it does warrant— Maybe you can organize events in your living room; invite your friends, invite your neighbors, colleagues, and get a discussion going.

What is most horrifying, is that those people who have studied the matter closely, many of them, are convinced that we are on the verge of the abyss. Nuclear war could happen in the short term. Then, if you look at the large masses of people who are unaware of it—that is actually the frightening thing. Because in the 1980s, when we had the intermediate-range missile crisis, the SS-20, the Pershing II, being also at launch-on-warning status, you had hundreds of thousands of people in the streets in Germany. Now, people are not really up to it, even though the situation is in many people's view, much more dangerous than then.

I think what we should do is take this discussion of today as a starting point to mobilize the population towards the idea that we need a new security and development architecture. The Chinese proposal of the Three Initiatives is one approach. My proposal to have a [new strategic global security and development architecture](#) is another proposal going back to the Peace of Westphalia. But let's have a discussion, because we cannot have a situation where humanity is marching into its demise without even a discussion and the mobilization of every moral fiber we have in us to prevent this from happening. That would be my wish to you.

**Speed:** President Ramotar, Prime Minister Čarnogurský, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, we want to thank you for being with us. We want to also thank Ambassador Hossein Mousavian of Iran, Colonel Larry Wilkerson of the United States, Scott Ritter of the United States, and Chas Freeman of the United States, Professor Zhang Weiwei of China, and Professor Dmitri Trenin of Russia, for all being with us for this panel. We also obviously want to thank all of you for listening and participating.