

Society Needs a New Paradigm, More Worthy of the Dignity of Man

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche gave this speech to the EIR Berlin seminar on Jan. 12.

I just want to, in a certain sense self-reflect, or initiate a process of reflection, because actually what we are trying to discuss here with this seminar, is a vision for the 21st Century. We are not talking just about geopolitics, financial crisis—all of this; but, in a very fundamental way, we are struggling with the question: How can we make mankind more human? How can we make the political order on this planet more worthy of the dignity of man? And that has gone completely awry.

Now, for me, even though I'm a full-blooded politician and I'm working on this perspective of what we are doing here in the LaRouche movement for more than 35 years, I still look at the world, and say, "How could we come to this point? What went wrong with this world, that we have come to a point, where two continents are dying—Africa and Latin

America; other countries are in a terrible condition; we are faced with the danger of a global fascism, again?" And, me being German, it is not so long ago that in 1945, after the last great, Nazi tragedy had happened, people were asking themselves, "How could this happen?" And they were saying, there was a very clear determination, "Never again. Never again can this happen."

Now, Mr. LaRouche, this morning, illuminated for us what was the reason, or how this whole commitment to never again have fascism, got subverted. I mean, obviously, the most important strategic dramatic thing, was that Franklin D. Roosevelt died at the wrong moment. And therefore, the commitment to have, after the Second World War, the end of colonialism, and to establish a world of sovereign republics did not function. And instead, you had practically—in Germany there was no "zero hour," there was no "new beginning." Because, not Franklin D. Roosevelt determined who did the re-education in Germany, but it was McCloy, the Dulles brothers.

And therefore—and this is what detonates the remarks I want to make here—the thing which really, for a German is so unbelievable, is that the re-education was done in large part by the same people *who had financed Hitler to come to power*: the Eugenics Society in America, Harriman, people who actually endorsed Hitler's race policies; and when the Nazis went West first, changed their view—what Lyn was talking about this morning.

These were the same people, who, during the Second World War, started to pick up Nazis already, to incorporate them into their system, in the famous operation with Walter Schellenberg, François Genoud, the people who then transported the Nazis, after the Second World War, all over the world, including to Latin America: These were the same people who organized the de-Nazification program—but with what perspective? With the perspective, to basically destroy the historical Classical roots of the German people in the Classical culture. The whole question of the Frankfurt School, the question of the Congress for Culture Freedom, put Germany—and not only Germany, also France, because John Train opened the *Paris Review* in France—the "Congress for Cultural Fascism" had, all over the world, influence in planting the seeds of this present world fascistic takeover.

However, just briefly, this was a mixed process. Because,



Helga Zepp-LaRouche: "We have to find a way how we make this world livable. We can not sit here, and see the world go to pieces, just because the powers-that-be decide that that should happen. We need a new paradigm."

on the one side, you had Truman; you had McCloy; you had the efforts to uproot the European population from their actual cultural roots. But, you had also another impulse: You had Adenauer, you had de Gaulle, you had a true commitment for Third World development.

Remember, that in the immediate post-war period, there was a completely different philosophy. You had the idea of the two Development Decades in the United Nations. A Development Decade was the idea that you would look at ten years of development, and you would expect that the life-expectancy, the living standard of the so-called Third World, would improve in a measurable way. That was normal. There was a normal understanding, that eventually, the underdevelopment of the so-called Third World would be overcome. That was the period in which you had the Non-Aligned Movement. You had outstanding leaders, like Nasser, Tito, Nehru, later Mrs. Gandhi. And even in the United Nations, under U Thant for example, you had a clear perspective of overcoming the underdevelopment of the Third World.

The Cultural Paradigm-Shift

And then, basically, what went wrong? Well, you had the consciously induced paradigm-shift. And when Mr. LaRouche, this morning, was saying that the “ecology idea” has to go, or there is no way how we come out of this world, I want to point to the fact, that if you look at why is the world in the present crisis, you have to understand, that on top of this mixed bag of the post-war period, there was a consciously induced paradigm-shift in the '60s. The '68 movement, which toppled de Gaulle; which started to subvert—I mean, these were the children of the Frankfurt School, all the '68ers. Also in the European governments: If you go to the government here in Berlin, they are all the pupils of the Frankfurt School. And therefore, we have a real problem, because they have the wrong ideas in their head.

In '68, there came the idea of the Cultural Revolution from China. Now, the Cultural Revolution in China . . . was the lowest point in Chinese history, and perceived so by every Chinese. But, the Chinese were smart, because they got rid of them. They had Deng Xiaoping; Deng Xiaoping completely eliminated—overnight—the ideas of the Gang of Four, and said, “No, this was the wrong way. China is a country of stability, of Confucian values, and we will go back to these ideas.” And he started off to go really back to a course of science and technology.

The result is known: China is, despite all the problems, a



German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (left) and French President Charles de Gaulle represented an impulse for national sovereignty in Europe, and for Third World development; but this was aborted by the Congress for Cultural Freedom operations.

tremendously prospering nation, which has made the *biggest jump* of any country in the world in these 25 years—well, 30 years, by now.

But, what was the problem? The problem was, that in the West, in Western Europe and the United States, we *did not* throw out the Cultural Revolution idea of the '68 movement, but these people said, “We will march through the institutions”—and there now, they have succeeded! They have succeeded in occupying the institutions, and they are sitting there, with what kinds of ideas?

Now, what was the change? The idea of science and technology was, all of a sudden, “fascist.” Nuclear energy was called “fascist.” Theater, whatever was left from the Classical theater in the post-war period—and I’m from a generation which still had the fortune to have Humboldt’s thinking in education: the idea that the goal of education is not the specific skills you have, but the beauty of the character. That you have to become a state citizen; you have to take responsibility for the well-being of the state. This is much more important than the specific particulars you learn, because those you can always improve as you go on. But, that was then kicked out—through what? The *Regietheater*, the idea that you have to basically modernize all Classical culture (if you perform it, and Mr. LaRouche has, in these [recent] articles, really blasted this idea, which I don’t want to go into now).

Then, there was a conscious idea to eliminate education, “dumb down” the population, to moronize the people. Dr. Alexander King, in 1963, when he was the representative of the OECD countries in Paris, said, we need an education reform in all OECD countries—which was then implemented

in the 1970s by Willy Brandt, the “Brandt Reforms” which threw out the relics of Humboldt, by making education more “practical,” more “suitable” for the interests of industry and so forth. And as a result of that, you have, today in Germany, for example, a generation which knows nothing about Classical culture! They don’t know Heine; they don’t know Lessing; they don’t know Schiller—maybe they have heard the name, but it doesn’t mean anything to them.

‘Limits to Growth’

So then, the next phase came, that very consciously the ecology movement was created. And I think it is essential, that people understand that this is not a sociological phenomenon: MIT had two professors, Meadows and Forrester, who put out—with a gigantic propaganda effort and *millions* of dollars—this book *Limits to Growth*, in all languages. Later, these people admitted that this was a computer study with an implicit fraud, where they had fed the outcome of the computer study in such a way, to *prove* that the limits of growth have been reached, by assuming we have now reached a finite level of resources. And, that they basically had faked it, by leaving out, deliberately, the idea that what *is* a raw material is entirely defined by the level of science and technology with which you look at this resource. If you say, “This is a stone” or “This is iron ore,” it depends on the level of technology.

But, that started then to build the green movement. All of a sudden, you had the spread of people being concerned more about trees than about people; the Rockefeller Foundation and others were instrumental in creating the *mythology* that there was an *overpopulation*—I remember when I attended the UN Population Conference in Bucharest in 1974, Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, who was an evil person, already a little bit senile, but he presented his idea that the world population had to be reduced. We intervened with our own conception of Third World development, and Mr. Rockefeller was, at that point, attacked by me very strongly for committing genocide worse than Adolf Hitler: At that point, all the NGOs, all the leftie groups, knew that “overpopulation” was a Rockefeller baby. People knew that the real problem of the Third World, was a lack of development, and not of overpopulation. But, that was another layer of creating the ecology movement.

And then you had various steps, like the New York Council on Foreign Relations, which, in 1975, produced 20 books on “controlled disintegration of the world economy,” which was the idea that the one thing which had to be prevented was that the “mercantilist tradition” of Europe would match with the so-called “socialist tradition” leading to Third World development. The idea was never to have a Japan again, a country which was completely isolated and backward for centuries, to all of a sudden, through the American System approach, make the jump from a developing country into one of the two or three most industrialized countries.

Then, in ’75, the IMF increased their conditionalities. They worsened them in such a way, that the debt became

In Commemoration of The Tsunami Victims

This statement was proposed to the seminar by Dr. M.K. Saini from New Delhi.

The enormous tragedy unleashed by the killer wave tsunami in Southeast Asia destroyed the lives and assets of millions of common men in Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, and India. All of them were citizens of the world.

In this hour of unbearable pain suffered by the helpless millions, we must stand by them. We express our deepest sympathies for the families of those who died and express our firm commitment to help their families. We must become the voice of hope for them.

The LaRouche International Movement has from the early 1970s worked out concrete development programs for Africa, South America, the Pacific Basin, India, Southwest Asia, and Eurasia. These programs, taken together, could provide a concrete basis for a New and Just World Order. The time has come to work in this direction immediately.

more expensive, and more expensive, and more expensive, so that it led to what we call “bankers’ arithmetic,” which is the idea that the so-called Third World paid back their debt 10 times, and they still have 10 times more debt than 20 years ago, simply by changing the conditionalities of the debt repayment, in such a way.

The LaRouche Intervention

Now, it should be noted that while this paradigm-shift was going on, there was a counter-movement, from the beginning, around the person of Lyn. Because Lyn had for the very first time, in 1958, forecast that the world, if it continued the then-already visible monetarist policies, would end up in the danger of a new fascism and a new depression. Then, in 1971, when Nixon, indeed, started the bubble economy—by decoupling the dollar from gold, by creating the private banking power over money creation in the offshore markets—Lyn said, this will lead to a new depression, the new danger of fascism, and the danger of a collapse of society—or, the just new world economic order.

And, the entire LaRouche movement, internationally, was built on that idea. You had always two tendencies: You had the increase of globalization, and you had the growing LaRouche movement, being absolutely certain, that the moment which we are seeing right now, would eventually come.

So, in 1975, Mr. LaRouche went to Iraq, to participate in

the celebrations of the Ba'ath Party. And he came back, and he made for the first time, the proposal to have the International Development Bank, as an instrument to replace the IMF, to be the vehicle for a \$400 billion credit per year for clearly defined development projects.

This idea, we then circulated for one year, among 85 countries, the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement. Many of these countries did feasibility studies, with the idea of Mr. LaRouche's work. Then, in Colombo, Sri Lanka, in '76, eighty-five nations accepted the idea of a new world economic order.

Then, all Hell broke loose! I remember this, because, when the resolution came from Sri Lanka, I called up DPA, the German news agency. I said, "Oh, this is great! When will you report about the fact that the majority of mankind has decided for a new world economic order?" And the officer of the day said, "What? Sri Lanka? That's not newsworthy."

So, then—a gigantic counter-attack by the neo-cons, by the same people Lyn was talking about earlier, started. They killed Bhutto, because Bhutto of Pakistan had dared to demand an international debt conference. They destabilized Indira Gandhi, because she, at that point—for various reasons having to do with her son, Rajiv, had made compromises with the World Bank, so it was relatively easy for them to destabilize her. They destabilized Mrs. Bandaranaike [in Sri Lanka], and every Third World leader who had dared to speak about the new world economic order.

Then, the next major thing, was when Lyn got the cooperation of López Portillo, to make a proposal—again, to have a new world economic order. This time coming from a debtors' cartel, from the Latin American debtor countries: Mexico, Brazil, Argentina. And Wall Street, at that point, was absolutely terrified, that if many countries have enough debt, they're powerful enough to dictate the terms to the creditors. But Lyn didn't want to bankrupt the banks, he just wanted to reduce their power to a normal means.

Then, the same year, he made the SDI proposal, which, again, was not what it was portrayed as, "Star Wars," but it was really the same thing as the Eurasian Land-Bridge: it was basically the idea that both superpowers would develop these modern [antiballistic-missile] weapons based on new physical principles, make nuclear weapons obsolete for the first time through the joint deployment; dissolve the Third World as proxy areas for superpower conflicts, and help the Soviet Union to use these modern technologies in the civilian economy as a science-driver, to then increase the productivity of the world economy, and have a gigantic technology and capital-goods transfer, from the industrialized world to the so-called Third World.

And this was on the verge of succeeding, because Lyn got President Reagan, for a short period of time, to go with this program. And, again, all Hell broke loose.

Now, Lyn, at that point, prophetically forecast that if the

Soviets would refuse this, they would collapse after five years. It took six years, and then, you had the '80s "Reaganomics," Thatcher economics, and eventually the Soviet Union started to collapse in 1989. And there, between '89 and 1991, you had what correctly can be called an historical chance of mankind to *completely* change the order on this planet! Because there was no opponent any more! You had the United States and the West; the Soviet Union, as the so-called "enemy," had just disintegrated. And there was the absolutely incredible possibility to totally re-create the relationship between the East and West on a completely new level.

But, as we know, at that point, the neo-cons emerged in the United States, and they talked about a "New American Century" doctrine, and the chance was lost.

We, however, knew that if you would make the mistake of imposing on the bankrupt Communist system, the equally bankrupt free-economic-market system, that eventually you would raise up an even bigger crisis. And that is the crisis which has arrived now.

Primitive Accumulation

Now, I know that one of the biggest difficulties in the contributions of the various speakers today, the point that people were not clear on, was that the system *is collapsing*. I mean, I think that this is conceptually debated, because everybody says, "Maybe, it collapses in 10 years"; "maybe it collapses some time, or even in 50 years, it will still be there." And I think that this is really, extremely important to understand, because the Soviet economist, Preobrazhensky, in the 1920s, developed the theory about why it is legitimate to have primitive accumulation against industry, labor power, and infrastructure, to build up the Soviet economy. And they did that. They did primitively accumulate, against agriculture, against industry, against infrastructure; and that was one of the inherent problems of why the Soviet Union collapsed.

Now, Mr. LaRouche wrote an extremely important article some years ago, where he described how the free-market economy model is using the same kind of primitive accumulation, in order to prop up the ever-increasing speculative bubble.

You know, first primitive accumulation against Africa: People think development aid was given, and these corrupt African leaders, they don't want development, they pocket their own money. Well, the reality is, that every African or other Third World leader, who was courageous enough to stand for the true interests of their people, got assassinated! And the people who were put in place, by the IMF, by the central banking system, got there only because it was opportune to have such people to fulfill the job of the system.

In reality, there was a net capital transfer *out of Africa*, of \$200 billion about every decade; so no development aid was given, but Africa was looted!

Latin America was looted, primitively accumulated

against; resources being taken out.

And then, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the so-called privatization was just another effort to primitively accumulate the resources of the Soviet Union and the Comecon countries, just by privatizing, just flattening the so-called “obsolete” parts of the economy, selling the so-called “filet” parts, and just looting the Soviet Union and the Comecon countries.

Now, that has come to an end—also because of internal developments in Russia, as a reaction to what was done against Russia.

And now the very last phase of primitive accumulation is the privatization of the Social Security system. What we see in the United States, with what Bush-Cheney are trying to do, by stealing \$2 trillion worth of private securities; what in France is done by Mr. Sarkozy; what is being done with Hartz IV in Germany; what Berlusconi does in Italy, and so forth.

But, it is coming to an end. And I think it’s really important that people take the intellectual effort to study deeply, the reasons why the system collapses absolutely at this point, and not just say, “Oh, maybe it goes on for another period of time.”

A New Paradigm

Now, I think that what the purpose of this seminar is, and similar discussion groups which we are planning to have in the next months: We have to find a way how we make this world livable. We can not sit here, and see the world go to pieces, just because the powers-that-be decide that that should happen. We need a new paradigm. We need a new basis for society, which defines, at a point where nobody can deny that mankind is at probably the worst point of danger *ever*—I mean, if you think how close we are sitting to the potential of asymmetric nuclear global warfare; with madmen having their finger on the button, I think anybody who is not crazy should not sleep well! Because we are sitting on a volcano, a complete powerkeg.

And, if you look at the level of governments: *What are they doing about it?* Do they think: How can we change a world order which *clearly* doesn’t function? How can we remedy something which does not allow the survival of the larger part of mankind? One-third of the entire human race is hungry, every day; one-third is barely nourished; and only one-third has enough food! Fifty thousand children die every day! This is a failed system!

I’m sorry: This present world system, is as failed and bankrupt as the D.D.R. was in the beginning days of November ’89, and it is going down in the same way.

Now, what we have to do—and I want to really say this—once we have an idea that mankind is in danger, we have to think, what are the common aims of mankind? How can we agree on principles, which mean that mankind is going to get in a condition which is *human*, worthwhile of the name of being human?

And I think there was another problem in some of the

remarks, which are understandable, but nevertheless I have to address them: The second, major conceptual problem I saw in the discussion was that people say, “Okay, you have the danger of unilateralism from the United States, and we don’t like that. And therefore, we have to have macro-regions; we have to have regional multipolar arrangements”—and I think this is a big mistake. And it will not work.

Because, what comes out, then, is a geopolitical thinking, which is visible among many Europeans; it’s visible among many of our Indian friends, among our Chinese friends: And geopolitics must go! Geopolitics is the *root* of future wars! It’s not a multipolar world, which is needed, but I think we have to go much deeper into that, which in my view—and we will hear from Dr. Köchler later, who is a specialist on the United Nations—but, as good as the UN Charter is, as a continuation of the Peace of Westphalia process, it lacks one extremely important idea, and that is, what you would have called “metaphysical” in the past. Now, “metaphysics” is old-fashioned, and you’re not supposed to use it any more, but, I think it lacks a metaphysical dimension.

In Indian philosophy, one would say, it lacks the connection to a “cosmic order.”

And since I’m a fan of Nicolaus of Cusa, who was the founder of the modern nation-state, who was the founder of modern science, a Cardinal from the 15th Century, I want to use his terminology to say what I mean:

Nicolaus of Cusa said, that the universe at large, you can call the macrocosm, and that all the different entities in it are microcosms: For example, all human beings are microcosms, all nations, all cultures, are microcosms. And he had the very beautiful idea, that *concordia*—concordance, peace—in the macrocosm, is only possible if all microcosms can develop in their utmost possible way. And this is again, an idea which re-appeared in the Peace of Westphalia principles: that peace can only be based on the interest of the other. In other words, each microcosm not only has the right to develop in the best possible way, itself, but it has to be the self-interest of each microcosm to make sure the other microcosm—the other nation, the other human being—is developing in the best possible way.

So that, basically, I think that the idea of a peaceful world, is not “geopolitical multipolarity,” but to establish a common interest of mankind, which is progression, which is the development of all to a higher level of human development; the absolute right of every human being on this planet, to develop its fullest potential, its fullest cognitive potential, to—as Mr. LaRouche was saying—his potential as a “Promethean man,” who is continuously bringing new levels of science to Earth for the benefit of mankind. And that, once you establish common aims of mankind, then you can have a full development of all microcosms, in this way.

Now, I believe that not only Nicolaus of Cusa has contributed extremely important ideas, but also Leibniz: And Leibniz



Nicolaus of Cusa's idea of peace provides a conceptual framework for today: that "each microcosm not only has the right to develop in the best possible way, itself, but it has to be the self-interest of each microcosm to make sure the other microcosm—the other nation, the other human being—is developing in the best possible way."

was of the conviction that we are living in the best of all possible worlds. Now, when you look at the world, you could say, "Oh, Leibniz was a utopian idealist, who totally missed the boat. Look at the condition of the world!" But, I think that man is made in such a way, that every great catastrophe *challenges* man to come forward with an even greater good. And, for me, in that way, since I'm thinking like that, when the tsunami catastrophe happened—which was the largest natural catastrophe for mankind, ever—I immediately said, "Well, look, this must be the reason why we take back the idea of a new world economic order." Which, after the Soviet Union collapsed, and the word was, "there is no alternative to globalization; globalization is here to stay, forever"—well, maybe not!

Maybe this is now the opportunity to put the idea of a just new world economic order, back on the agenda: Because, why should we accept poverty? Why should we accept that the majority of the human race is living in a condition which none of the people in Western Europe or the United States who are well-to-do, would ever accept?

I was disgusted, when these tourists who got hit by this

tsunami, said, "Oh! We were running together with the natives through the same street. (The same natives, who otherwise, are our cheap servants)." You know? We have slavery on this planet! And that slavery has to go!

So, the reason why I'm optimistic that we can win this fight: First of all, the help, the tremendous outpouring of willingness to help the victims of the tsunami catastrophe, shows that the people who normally are crippled, they're brutally indifferent, they are selfish swine and pigs—normally. But, when they saw—this catastrophe is, indeed, changing everything—there was a little step in the right direction. And the people who Schiller would call "crippled plants"—"*verkriip-pelten Pflanzen*"—people who have no heart any more, they are totally *dead*: They started to bloom again a little bit. And see? "Maybe our lifestyle was not the right one."

So, why am I optimistic? Because, the dollar collapse will continue. It is the thinking among certain banking circles in Europe, that if Bush does not successfully privatize Social Security—meaning stealing \$10 trillion, in order to save and bail out the dollar, and save Wall Street—then the dollar will collapse very quickly. However, if he succeeds—and Lyn obviously doesn't want him to succeed, but that's the talk among banking circles—if he succeeds, and steals \$10 trillion, he may be able to stabilize the dollar for a very short period of time. But that [moment] will then be taken by the Asians, by the Japanese, who have \$820 *billion* foreign reserves; by the Chinese, by the Russians, the Arab states—to dump the dollar, then, quickly, because that's the last moment they can get out of it without major losses. And then, that will be the downfall.

So, the classical Catch-22 situation.

Prepare for the New World Economic Order

And I think what we have to do, also, with this discussion group, and similar circles, is to prepare: What can be put on the table, in the moment of the maximum crisis? Which *is* the New Bretton Woods idea, combined with the proposal which Lyn made this morning, which is an addition to the old-standing New Bretton Woods idea of Lyn, namely, to have, as part of this package, a rational agreement about the raw material distribution of mankind for the next 50 or more years to come, so that there is no war over raw materials, as part of the picture.

And each government should be induced and encouraged, to make feasibility studies about this soon-to-come eventuality. Very soon, you will see, the dollar collapse will continue, all the bubbles will start to bust, and there will come a moment of utmost crisis, but also of utmost chance.

Now, obviously, we want to combine that with the idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. And I think, that—people were talking about an implosion in the United States; we could have implosions in Europe as well. Because, you can not destroy the social fabric of the social state, which took over a hundred years to develop! I mean, this is one of the absolute, fundamental contributions of European civilization, to *have*



"Why not take the beautiful architecture of China? Of India? And make new cities along the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and in Africa, and Latin America, using the beautiful architecture? Making them modern, with maglev trains, connected with module construction underground, so that they are totally modern, but you can make them beautiful!" Here: India's Taj Mahal and the Transrapid maglev.

a social state—and now, you're all of a sudden, ripping it away. You tell the old people, the sick, "Die earlier. Go home—": euthanasia, "useless eaters."

Okay, maybe people right now are in shock, and paralyzed! But, this will not be forever. Because, when people really are confronted with existential questions, I think you will have a social explosion, coming very soon.

And then, the question is, to have full employment: We proposed 200 billion euros investment *every year*, in addition, to create full jobs, in the context of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. And I think this will be—it's the only rational way. The Eurasian Land-Bridge will either be implemented in the next year, this year; or in 200 years from now, people will crawl out of the rubble—and then they will build the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

So, since I'm an optimist, and I love life, and I love human beings, I would like that we do it now, and not 200 years from now. Because I think the human carnage would be just unacceptable.

A Sublime Idea

Now, let me just say, one last thing: I think—and even if this is not the usual kind of discussion at seminars and strategic discussions and so forth—but, I think we will not get out of this without love. Look: If you want to have a just new world economic order, it's not a technocratic question; it's not a question of a new financial system, a new economic system: It's a question of a *passionate idea, of the idea of the international community of people*. That you have to not be able to stomach it, one more day, that the world is in this wretched condition! And you have to have a vision of how the world could look like, once we make it human. Blooming

gardens in places where there are deserts right now. People living decent human lives. Africa being totally, infrastructurally developed. Eurasia infrastructurally developed. Thousands of new cities we want to build—*beautiful cities!*

Not just Houston models, but why not take the beautiful architecture of China? Of India? And make new cities along the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and in Africa, and Latin America, using the beautiful architecture? Making them modern, with maglev trains, connected with module construction underground, so that they are totally modern, but you can make them beautiful!

I think that what is needed, is really a vision. And a love of people for mankind.

Now, Lyn has written, many times, that we will not get out of this crisis, if we don't return to Classical culture; each country, each culture, must revive their high culture, their Classical culture. China has a beautiful Classical tradition. There are beautiful things in other cultures, which are right now endangered by the culture of globalization, moronization, imposition of flatness, stupidity, and so forth. So, we have to make an effort to revive the Classical culture.

And, we have to have leaders *who are not cowards!* Because, I mean, look—when John Perkins wrote this book about the "Economic Hit Men,"¹ where he described how the present system is functioning on the basis of knocking out, country by country, to make Third World countries slaves, to kill leaders who have the courage to stand up for the well-being of their people. Well, when we started to discuss this, who killed Herrhausen, who killed Rohwedder—people said, "We know that! We know that!" Who made the assassination attempts on de Gaulle? So, once you start to talk to people, it comes out, well, it's really true that the system is such, that either you defend it completely, and you profit from it; or, if you oppose it, you risk being killed.

I think what is needed therefore, is the Sublime quality in the way Schiller describes this question: that, if you have fear, if you are controlled by fear, you are a slave. And therefore, you have to have this quality of locating your identity in a different plane, which Schiller calls, the Sublime.

So, I think we need to have the discussion on this level, and put the new world economic order, back on the agenda.

1. *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man: How the U.S. Uses Globalization To Cheat Poor Countries Out of Trillions* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004).