

The turning around of China, from being a deeply impoverished country, into being an economic superpower is one of the most beautiful stories in the 20th and 21st century. And it is deeply, deeply mistaken on the part of our leaders to set up a situation of hostility with China. Joe Biden's recent speech, where he talked about the need to "win against China in the 21st century," made me think, the 21st century is not a horserace. We need to stop viewing politics in terms of a zero-sum game, in terms of one country can only win at the expense of another. It is certainly not in the interest of the United States, with so much mass unemployment, with so much crumbling infrastructure, to cut itself off from the massive amount of growth that China is leading.

China is not only helping itself to expand, but all across the world, China is building power plants, it's building hospitals, it's building roads, it's building infrastructure. China is trading with countries throughout Asia, throughout Africa, all with the aim of raising them up out of poverty: win-win cooperation.

### **The Hope and Promise of America**

My hope is that U.S. leaders will abandon their policy of trying to destabilize Syria, and that U.S. leaders will also abandon the policy of trying to escalate tensions with China. There's only one human family. There's only one global community. And the more we are cooperating with each other, around things like technological development, poverty alleviation, eliminating the scourge of drug addiction and terrorism, the

better the world will be. U.S. policy toward Syria, U.S. policy toward Russia, toward Venezuela, toward Iran, toward China, toward many countries, is deeply problematic. The road to peace, the road to raising countries out of poverty, the road to a better world for all, the road toward eliminating terrorism and narco-gangs, is the road of international cooperation.

So, this is the message that we largely need to communicate, to our friends, to our coworkers, to everyone we know. We need to explain that sanctions are economic warfare, they destroy people's lives, they prevent people from getting access to medical care, they hurt ordinary people, and the human rights rhetoric used to justify them is often laced with hypocrisy!

The U.S. government claims to be a supporter of democracy, but we see them aligned with the government of Colombia that is shooting people down in the streets, we see them aligned with the austerity regime of Haiti, we see them aligned with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, with its public beheadings and its autocratic monarchy; human rights rhetoric should not be used to wage economic warfare against independent countries, no matter where they are in the world.

So, let's hope that our conference today can play an important role, not only in educating people, but also, in perhaps changing the tone of discourse and setting the stage for a new direction in U.S. policy, where, instead of tearing down countries with sanctions, we are cooperating with them, to do what's necessary as we look ahead toward a brighter future.

## **Discussion**

*This is an edited transcript of the dialogue among panelists and conference participants following the presentations of the first panel, "The March of Folly: Can Mankind Still Extinguish the Now-Lit Fuse of Thermo-nuclear War?" of the May 8, 2021 Schiller Institute conference, "The Moral Collapse of the Trans-Atlantic World Cries Out for a New Paradigm." Participating were Harley Schlanger (moderator), Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Prof. Dr. Wilfried Schreiber, Prof. Dr. Hans Köchler, Sayed Mujtiba Ahmadi, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Afghanistan in Canada, and Caleb Maupin.*

**Moderator:** We have a number of questions, actually a flood of questions coming in. The first question

comes from someone from France, who asks Helga, but others as well: "Why does it seem as though the West wants to destroy the world which does not agree with American ideas? Where is the concern for the human factor?" Helga, why don't we start with you, and then anyone else who wants to say something about that can jump in.

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I would not say "the West." Because, if you look at the people in the United States, or in Germany, France, other countries, if they would have the real choice for what was discussed here, most people would say, "That is completely insane. We shouldn't be doing this." I think what has happened is that the trans-

Atlantic elite has basically become like a mafia. Basically, they're greedy for money. The reason why I referenced the statement by Lyn from 1971, when he said, when Nixon decoupled the Bretton Woods system and eliminated the fixed exchange rates, he said, if you go on that road of total deregulation of the markets, of monetarist values, it will lead to war, fascism, and a new depression.

The problem is, the paradigm shift which has taken place in the last 50 years, basically since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, was to favor the speculators. And people have become more and more fixated on money, money, money, on stocks. Ordinary people who have no money, they go and buy two or three silly stocks, and then they think they're the big gainers of the system. I think it has completely—you know, the fact that in Germany, you hear before the news program on TV, you get the report from the stock exchange. Why should I watch this news?

Anyway, so I'm saying it's not the West. I think it's the oligarchical elite which appreciates their speculative gain higher than the common good, and that has become a self-automatism. And that system is now collapsing, as I mentioned, with the arrival of hyperinflation. But in order to save the situation, we have to get enough people to become thinking people again and reject these policies. What Professor Köchler said, it's the court of public opinion where the decision will be made, because legally there's no recourse, which is a tragedy, but it's also true. So, let's have this court of public opinion change the course of history, which means we have to mobilize the population, and that's the only hope.

**Moderator:** The next question I think is for Dr. Köchler, but anyone else can take it up also. There have been a couple of people who wrote and asked, "What avenues are there to relieve unilateral coercive sanctions? Are there any international institutions which can be moved to intervene?"

**Köchler:** The problem is related first of all to the statutes. As long as the statutes are as they are, not much, unfortunately, can be done. Just take the Charter of the United Nations Organization: The Security Council is, on paper, the most powerful authority globally. The Security Council would have the authority to take coercive measures in situations where the Council

declares a threat to peace and security. Unilateral sanctions in the way they have been conducted in the Middle East have been one of the major causes of destabilization, of war and of suffering, so it would be a clear-cut case: The Council could take coercive measures, including even the use of force.

But it is illusory if we expect anything to happen, because those countries, and first and foremost, the United States, that engage in this unilateral sanctions policy, have the status of permanent members—that means, they can veto any decision. And that further means that the Council will forever be paralyzed on such issues.

The other avenue would be that of the international criminal law. On paper, also, that looks quite promising. There is such an institution, called the International Criminal Court, and this court would have jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity in particular. Comprehensive or also sectoral sanctions as those against Syria certainly give rise to questions of the commission of war crimes or crimes against humanity. Again, the problem is that this is not really an international court, because the most powerful players—again, first and foremost the United States of America—are not members of the court, so there is no jurisdiction.

And the only hope that remains is twofold: One, in regard to the development of an international system in the direction of a multipolar balance of power—but this will take some considerably more time. I think here of a situation in which the United States, as for the time being, militarily at least, is the strongest country, would have to recalculate its actions if situations would arise in which the price to act unilaterally would simply be too high for the United States, because there are other powerful players who might act together against the interests of the United States. In such a new multipolar constellation, even the United States might think twice about going ahead with a unilateral sanctions policy, as it did against Iraq earlier, or against Iran, in fact, in the name of the UN, but also acting unilaterally; and recently, against Syria.

And the other aspect is that which Mrs. LaRouche also mentioned, and which I suggested at the end of my presentation: That there will be increasing pressure in international public opinion. What that means, also, through so-called new social media and so on, we have seen in particular areas, especially in United States how

strong that pressure can be. If such pressure could build up for a good cause, such as the cause against the weaponizing of sanctions, and against destabilization of entire regions of the globe, if that potential could be mobilized for such a purpose, that may be another aspect of hope. But again, this is not even medium term, again this will be long term.

**Moderator:** As somewhat of a follow-up to that—there were a couple of questions about whether or not the European Union would stick with the United States on these sanctions, especially given what we see now with the Nord Stream 2, that the United States is intervening in German economic policy. So, Helga, Professor Schreiber, Professor Köchler, any thoughts on what could happen—is it possible that the EU would be moving away from these unilateral sanctions from the United States in response to the attempt to sanction Germany and European countries over Nord Stream 2?

Professor Schreiber, why don't you answer?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I can step in to translate.

**Schreiber:** [in German, via interpreter] OK. The answer is very difficult because there are many imponderables. I want to start with a quote from the Clinton administration: "It's the economy, stupid!" So, a lot will depend on how the economy in China is going to develop. A lot will depend on China being able to develop without hindrance from the U.S. China already has made quantitative steps by bypassing the United States in terms of buying power, but in very important areas, it's still behind the United States. That is why the United States is trying to contain mainly China and also Russia, and put roadblocks in the way of progress. But this is very difficult in respect to China, because China has a very large domestic market.

The fight will be decided in the spheres of economics, but I have good hope that China, in the future, and also in the alliance with Russia, will be able to free itself from the present, still, dependency, and reach a new quality to get rid of the effects of the sanctions on its own economy.

**Moderator:** There's a follow-up question to that, which is: Given the attacks coming from the West, trying to break Russia from China, is there any way

that can succeed? Is the rapprochement between Russia and China strong enough to survive the attacks coming from the United States? Professor Schreiber? Or Helga.

**Schreiber:** [via interpreter] The aim of the Western sanctions policy is to drive Russia all the more into the arms of China. The trans-Atlantic West wants to prevent that a Eurasian bloc is building itself and that especially a close relationship develops between Russia and Germany, and Russia and the EU. That is their aim.

**Moderator:** Helga you wanted to say something.

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I just personally think, having watched the rapprochement between Russia and China, they know that the whole game is to either work with Russia to get rid of China, or vice versa, depending on the faction. But I don't think that the chances to sabotage the present, very close collaboration is there, because both of them are very much aware that together there is the chance to define a completely new set of international relations, which in the best case includes the United States, and that if they're divided then all of them are looking—and the whole world—looks much worse. I'm confident that this alliance will not be able to be sabotaged.

**Moderator:** Caleb, you wanted to say something on that?

**Caleb Maupin:** Well, it's interesting, because in one of the first interviews that Donald Trump gave during his presidential campaign when he was running, with Bill O'Reilly, he said that you can't have Russia and China together and Barack Obama has done that. And he criticized the Obama administration for driving Russia and China closer together.

But at this point, I think the reason it's going to be impossible to divide Russia and China against each other, is because they're really an economic match. You know, the way Putin rescued the economy of Russia from the disaster following the fall of the Soviet Union, was by recentering the economy around Gazprom and Rosneft, two state-controlled energy companies, a natural gas company and an oil company.

And China has become a booming center of industry, the world's top producer of steel. Half the steel in

the world is made in China. The world's top producer of copper, etc. China needs lots of natural gas, and lots of oil, to run its economy. Meanwhile, Russia needs to sell lots of oil and lots of natural gas. So, pulling the two countries apart would be very difficult.

During the Cold War, the United States was very much able to manipulate the differences between the Soviet Union and China, and it was largely—there were political-ideological differences, etc. But this is not the Cold War. This isn't an ideological fight between capitalism and communism: This is rather about economics, and Russia and China are closely tied together economically, and the more sanctions and the more hostility that the United States pours onto both countries, the more that they are going to be tied together economically.

And you could say the same for Iran; you could say the same for Venezuela. The more sanctions that are imposed on these countries, the more close-knit they become with each other.

And so, you have to ask the question: Are these sanctions really benefitting the long-term policy of the United States? Because at the end of the day, it's driving the countries that are targetted closer together, it's building more and more of an alternative on the global, international economy, and it's simply leaving the United States being locked out of a lot of the growth and development that's happening in the world.

**Moderator:** I have a question again for Professor Köchler. Let me ask the question, and then you can say if you want to comment on this previous question.

Someone asks, "Please explain the history of the 'rules-based order,' which the governing figures of the U.K., U.S., and other powers insist hold sway over sovereign nations, as well as over the UN and international bodies?"

**Köchler:** That is a long and complicated story, so, to make it as short as possible, the origin of this "rules-based order," according to how it is being discussed now in a kind of polemical sense, is almost the foundation of the United Nations Organization after the Second World War. And the core of that "rules-based order" would be a joint authority at the global level to enforce the basic rule of the non-use of force. And this principle, namely the ban on the use of force, was already agreed-upon in the so-called Briand-Kellogg Act during

the 1920s, and in the United Nations Charter it is definitely formulated.

But the big problem of such a rules-based order, which now the U.S. and her allies propagate, is that the U.S.—her, itself, together with other founders of the United Nations Organization—has effectively undermined any chances of creating a rules-based order for the simple reason, an act of aggression by a member-state of the United Nations is a violation of international law. The Security Council has the authority to take action against this act of aggression through coercive means, including the use of force. There is even a military staff committee within the framework of the United Nations Security Council.

But the big problem is that the United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council, has the right, in case it commits an aggression, to veto that resolution, because it is written into the Charter, that the obligation to abstain from voting by parties to a dispute does not apply to decisions on peace and security! I mean, one of the basic principles of law, that a party to a dispute cannot decide about that dispute—that I cannot be the judge in my own cause, so to speak—that basic principle is being negated through the rules of the United Nations Charter. So, there is no obligation to abstain from voting if a country is the aggressor itself. And if such a country is a permanent member-state of the United Nations [Security Council], that means it can block any act of aggression which is committed by itself. And that further means there is lawlessness, there is impunity in terms of international law.

And that also means, according to the principles which are in place now, there can be no international rule of law within the present system of the United Nations. And so, the entire [demand to follow] a "rules-based order" is totally dishonest. And for me, it's really always quite strange, that in the Western world, those colleagues in the departments of international law, or in the legal departments of the foreign affairs ministries, never raised that issue. One just has to read the fine print of the United Nations Charter.

And it might be of interest, also, just to recall what one of the Secretaries of State of the U.S. said, shortly after the foundation of the United Nations: that the U.S. would never have considered to join that organization if it would not have been granted that particular privilege which I just mentioned.



**Moderator:** I'll just add on that, you have to look at the period from 1999 to 2004, when [U.K. Prime Minister] Tony Blair asserted the end of the Westphalian system, to be replaced by the idea of the so-called "Responsibility to Protect," which was, I think, the modern impetus for the whole idea of the rules-based order.

Let's move on to another question to come back to the specifics on how to overcome these policies of the sanctions. I'd like to hear from Counsellor Ahmadi on this, but also Helga—I think this one is for you in particular: "What can be done right now for the Middle East, Southwest Asia, as part of your worldwide health infrastructure proposal?"

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I would have hoped that the recognition that a pandemic is a worldwide phenomenon, and that therefore any idea that you can make a Limes [wall] around the United States or around Europe and completely ignore what happens in Africa, Asia, Latin America—that should have been obvious from the very beginning. And I had hoped that that recognition would have caused people to become reasonable, much earlier. It did not take place—that's a whole long story why "America First," the idea that Europe is somehow—I don't even want to go into all the reasons for it.

But now I think it is clear, you have these strains, you have the mutations, and I can only hope that that shock, that we are in a race against time, that if we don't do that for every country in the world, even the vaccinations which we have now may not be sufficient for future variants, that that may change the attitude.

A first tiny step in this direction is that the United States agreed to lift the patents for the time of the pandemic for the vaccines. This has been opposed immediately by the EU, but that is not something which cannot be remedied, because the governments could pay the pharmaceutical firms which have developed those vaccines, and that way the encouragement to go for new research would not be dampened, so that's a phony argument.

But I think if there is a public outcry, to say that every single country on this planet needs that kind of modern health system, well, then, why not start in Southwest Asia, with Syria, with Yemen, with Iraq, with Afghanistan, and let's take the fact that every country needs that urgently. The reason why we wanted to feature so much Syria and Yemen in this

conference, is we want to create a public moral outcry. I think the problem is—and that's the title of this whole conference—that the West finds itself in such a moral collapse, that most people are so indifferent. I told somebody a couple of days ago about the situation in India, which is horrendous; and this person said, "Oh yeah, this is really terrible," and then turned and changed the subject. That that is what we really have to cut through.

Also, on the question of nuclear war, by the way, which I would have liked that some people raised that, because that's part of the problem: We are sleepwalking into a situation—if the Strategic Command of the United States, the commander, says nuclear war is now in the category of "very likely," there should be a public outcry. And that, in a certain sense, we must force this public debate, or else, it may be very soon too late.

So, I would urge all of you to help to distribute the program of this conference as widely as possible, and since this will not be the last conference, but we see this conference as a continuous sort of dialogue, a platform where these issues can be raised. But it is very urgent that we broaden the outreach, that we get millions and millions of people who get morally completely outraged about what was discussed at this conference. And then we have a leverage. So that my hope is that we can accomplish that in the short term.

**Moderator:** I have to say, Helga, you're absolutely right about the questions coming in: There's not a single one about this question of the nuclear war danger, and I think that's indicative of the unwillingness of people to confront this, as a serious problem.

I want to give Counsellor Ahmadi a chance, if you want to say something about the health situation in Afghanistan, and also the potential importance of Afghanistan's relationship to this Belt and Road process in terms of improving your economic situation.

**Ahmadi:** Thank you, so much. It's my pleasure to be here, and I present my respect to all of you, to Mrs. LaRouche for inviting me to this important conference.

I believe South Asia, or Asia, offers so much economic opportunities in the region and also beyond. For example, if we work on the Silk Route, we could work with the regional countries to evolve the Silk Route, and also the Lapis Lazuli routes, will contribute to im-

provement of Central Asia, South Asia, China, Turkey, Europe, the Middle East, and the rest of the world. Also, if we work on, like TAPI—it's called, Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India gas pipeline—it's an enormous project. It will create a lot of jobs, a lot of opportunities for the people in the region, and beyond. And CASA-1000 is another big project—transmission of electricity, that could transfer electricity from Tajikistan to Pakistan. And also, the Chabahar port [in Iran]. We could do business via this port from Central Asia to South Asia, and also to the East and to the West Asia. But this opens up trade, transport, transit cooperation among the regional countries.

I also believe we should open up the region for trade, business, culture, people-to-people relations and state [relations]. We should work with regional countries, with the international allies to make a situation of economic interdependency. Afghanistan could act as a bridge between South Asia and Central Asia.

We offer so much, in terms of minerals, resources, energy, and also, we could act as a transit hub. And the health situation currently—of course, the pandemic affected Afghanistan as badly as it has affected the rest of the world, and our government is working to tackle that. And we need peace in the region. As I mentioned, there are these projects, and all these opportunities—we need peace in the region. We should leave aside political differences. We should focus on economic opportunity, that will benefit all of us, and finally we will have a peaceful world.

Thank you, that's my comments. I hope it answers you.

**Moderator:** Helga, there's a question that came in which I think is an interesting one to ponder, given the blocking going on in the U.S. Congress, the support from both parties for the war party, the war hawks. But is there any way to get Cardinal Zenari in front of the U.S. Congress to raise this question of sanctions now that it's been decided to extend the sanctions against Syria for another year?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I think that's an excellent idea. Because—I don't know who said this, it may have been Professor Köchler, I think—that the churches have a very important role in fighting against the sanctions, especially when the governments of their own country are in favor of it. And after all, the Catholic

Church, I think they have 1 billion members: they're not insignificant in the United States. When Cardinal Zenari issued this call, I naturally immediately checked if there was a big publication of his call in Germany, for example, and I found that there was only a tiny grouping in Bavaria somewhere, some papers had it, but not from the general Catholic Church. And one of the bishops, the former head of the Bishops' Conference, even had endorsed the sanctions a couple of years earlier.

But I think that is something everybody can do. Everybody is either a member of a church or has some friends who are members: I think we have to make a mobilization—and later, in the second panel, we will fortunately have a representative of a major church. But I think this is exactly what we should be doing: We should reach out to the Catholic Church; they should reach out to all the other confessions, and then they should demand that the Congress should invite Cardinal Zenari to bring this issue in front of the U.S. Congress—and other parliaments.

I think this is an excellent idea, and we should absolutely follow up on it. I'm absolutely supporting it.

**Moderator:** We have a question for anyone on the panel, from someone who is living in Taiwan—so actually, someone is addressing the war question a little bit—but raises the issue: wouldn't it be better for Taiwan's long-term security to be less confrontational in its approach to China? And is there any reason why Taiwan has any internal reason for challenging the relationship with China? It's being challenged, of course, in the United States, with the sending of officials over there, breaking the One China policy. Does anyone have any thoughts on this question of Taiwan? Helga?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Foreign influence in Taiwan should not be underestimated. Historically, you know, Japan was one of the occupiers at a certain point, and I think it would be absolutely in the interest of Taiwan to be within the One China policy, [and] have relative autonomy. Because if not, if the present course is followed, the more likelihood is, for good or for bad, the military unification, which will be with definite losses for many people.

So, I think the best course of action would be to—I mean, there were people in Taiwan, also exiled Chinese

who want to have the peaceful reunification. They conducted conferences in the United States. My husband used to address all of them, and I think the mainland has nothing against such negotiations. But it should really be all cooled down because this present situation is extremely dangerous. And I think if the population of Taiwan would really think about the consequences, I think they probably would not support the independence of Taiwan, which can only lead to a disaster.

**Schlanger:** Anyone else with thoughts on that? Caleb?

**Maupin:** It appears to me that maybe part of the strategy of the anti-China faction in the United States, to try and provoke a military confrontation, the strategy may be to provoke a situation where China feels that it has to militarily retake Taiwan, so then China can be castigated as the aggressor. And this is something that Zbigniew Brzezinski and other foreign policy strategists in the United States have long tried to figure out, is, how can we create a situation where we accuse the country we're going after, and we can frame them as the aggressor? This is very similar to what was done with the situation with Ukraine and Crimea: They staged events in a way to make Russia look as if they were the aggressor in Crimea. And I think that is the aim.

I noticed *The Economist* magazine, the cover had "Taiwan" and it said, "The Most Dangerous Place in the World." They're already playing up this notion that aggressive, expansive China is ready to retake Taiwan, and this is part of the strategy: Make China look like the aggressor, so they can then escalate the sanctions and economic warfare.

**Moderator:** I have a question now for Professor Köchler, again, on the question of sovereignty of nations. "The undermining of sovereignty by supranational institutions, how do you see this? Much has been done in international law, there's a contrary affect to sovereignty. Could you comment on that?"

**Köchler:** There is an inbuilt contradiction in the system of international law, as we have it today. There are two basic principles which cannot so easily be reconciled. One is that of national sovereignty, or the concept of sovereignty—let's say it like this—which re-

lates to the state. And on the basis of this principle, any state has the right to decide, itself, without any interference from outside, from any other state, or from any other actors internationally, to decide on the conduct of its own affairs, to decide on the political system, and also to decide on whether the state wants to continue in the present form or to join another state or to cede certain territory, or whatever.

The other principle is that of self-determination. And the question is, how is it interpreted? Many interpret it as being related to peoples, to communities, or to communities of citizens, who then might be in conflict with the state to which they belong.

And so far, there is no method to reconcile these two principles—sovereignty, on the one hand, related to state, and self-determination, related to peoples. But as far as the relations between states are concerned, the big question, as far as I can see, is that of the emergence of new forms of international organization. Traditionally international organization meant a framework for inter-governmental cooperation—that means for the cooperation among states as sovereign entities on the basis of equality. And that was also, originally, that would have been, or that was the idea of the League of Nations, and that was the idea of the United Nations Organization.

In the years since the foundation of the UN, however, there was another development, in the direction of going beyond mere intergovernmental cooperation on the basis of equality among all sovereign states, namely, in the direction of some supranational structure, which would be placed above the state, and which would be a kind of new legal entity.

And that is, by the way, the big issue we now have also in the European Union, where many people in EU member states feel that one has already gone too far in that regard, and that, for instance, now the legislative authority in member states is effectively subordinated in many respects to decisions that have been previously taken at the EU level in Brussels, so that what remains to the national legislatures or parliaments is just to confirm the decision which has already been taken elsewhere, by a body that is really not democratically legitimized. And that is the big problem now.

And in my understanding, the situation in the United Nations, for the time being in terms of international rule of law and peaceful coexistence, can only

be attainable, so to speak, if one keeps the idea of the state as a sovereign actor on the basis of equality, and if one does not put some other institution above the state. That means one should not go in the direction of a world state or a world government which would more or less absorb the sovereign status of all the existing entities.

**Moderator:** Let me remind all our viewers that we will have a second panel coming up a little bit later, after we complete this panel, and we'll be taking up the question—a number of people are asking questions about the green policy and the world modern health system that Helga's been discussing. So that will be addressed primarily in the second panel.

I have a question here that maybe everyone would like to comment on. Some of you have mentioned the importance of bringing the public into the discussion over the war danger. There are a few people who are raising it, as we've mentioned at the beginning—Helga, in your presentation—but how do we create a broad public debate, on the danger of war. If you remember in the 1980s, you had the debate going on in Europe over the SS-20 missiles, the U.S. weapons in Germany; and then we had around the Strategic Defense Initiative, Lyndon LaRouche's proposal, quite a debate going on in the United States. But today it's mostly silent.

How can we bring more people into this, and give them an understanding, or create an understanding for the elected officials, that the population must be considered when you take up these questions of war and peace?

I'd like each of you to say something on that, starting with Caleb: You want to say something?

**Maupin:** Sure. The most disturbing thing about Joe Biden's joint address to the Congress was the fact that he framed his calls for infrastructure, and his calls for a jobs guarantee, and his repudiation of trickle-down economics—he lined it up with U.S. foreign policy being aggressive. He said we need to “win” against China in the 21st century. And somehow, the way politics is being shifted is this whole rise of leftwing folks on the internet and young people getting interested in leftwing ideas, but it's being framed out, that to be a good, little leftist, to be a good little socialist in the United States, you need to be

very, very hostile to China. You need to be very, very hostile to Russia. We need to be repeating the U.S. foreign policy talking points about whatever country we're supposed to be demonizing. And that is very disturbing.

You know, it used to be that leftists were known as the anti-war people, and it was the right that were considered to be the war-hawks. But now, things have gotten very confusing. And in Joe Biden's speech, he actually went as far as trying to link the events of Jan. 6 with countries around the world the U.S. is hostile to. He used the term “autocracy,” and “insurrection,” trying to link in people's minds the events of January 6 with governments around the world, and if you were going to be supportive of Joe Biden's economic agenda of supposedly building infrastructure—and let's wait to see what he actually does—that in order to be a good supporter of it, you should be a vicious war hawk and want to escalate tensions with countries around the world.

And that's very, very disturbing, and I think that needs to be challenged: I think there are many people that maybe voted for Biden or maybe have a leftwing persuasion, that don't buy into that logic. And that argument, that somehow wanting economic progressive policies at home, lines up with wanting war abroad, that needs to be broadly challenged.

**Moderator:** Professor Schreiber, in Germany, it seems as though virtually every party at this point is challenging an alliance with Russia, is hostile to Russia. Can you say something on that, in terms of the situation there?

**Schreiber:** [via interpreter] The left is confused. The policy of the media is directed to confuse people. It's a very difficult situation. I can only talk about Germany: There is a groundswell that is against war, and all the polls taken show that. And the polls show that the people think the policies of Russia and China as more trustworthy than the policies of the United States. And we can take up that anti-militarist and anti-war sentiment. I think that we have to really resist the creation of enemy-images in the case of Russia and China.

I think we have to be patient: There is a peace movement. There is a general rejection of war policy. People don't support nuclear war. And the peace movement is



confused, but I think we have to work on that.

OK, that's what I have to say.

**Moderator:** Thank you. Helga, I'm going to give you the last word on this. We do have a question about a video that's being shown on Italian television of U.S. troops landing in Estonia with parachutes, apparently as part of the Defender-Europe 21. And the question is: Do these kinds of maneuvers and exercises bring us closer to war? Is this another red line that's being crossed?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I think that every military person, and I don't want to speak now above the head of Professor Schreiber, is concerned that once you have a military maneuver, the transition to an actual military action is very smooth, it's almost incremental.

With the tension going on, around what's going on in Ukraine in particular, I think these things should be of concern, because there was all this talk about the Russians at the Ukrainian border. There was no discussion about Defender-Europe 21, but as Mrs. Zakharova, the Russian Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, correctly

noted: These Russian troops were on Russian territory, but the NATO troops from 30-plus countries were at the Russian border.

So, I think these things are highly dangerous. You know, war by accident—there are some people who say you can win a regional, limited nuclear war; that does exist. But there's also the danger of an accidental war, because you had in the last half-year many incidents where U.S. and Russian fighter jets came extremely close in pursuit, in part, in espionage operations; where, I said, if world peace depends on the ability of a pilot to avoid an accident in air, then we are not in very good shape.

I think the danger of an accidental development, or somebody losing their nerve, or a situation where somebody just misjudges the situation, is really too big. I think we have to really understand, we have to go back to a spirit of cooperation and stop this idea of driving the other country to the edge of permanent tension, by what I said earlier about the policy of the RAND Corporation to overextend Russia by just driving them to the edge all the time. This is dangerous!

I would really urge people, if they don't believe what I said in the beginning, please investigate some time and get on top of it yourself, because it's really big, and it's very serious.

**Moderator:** I'd like to thank all the panelists who participated. Let me just wrap it up by saying that this discussion should be causing people to rethink what they actually believe and what they think about the situation in the world today. It is dangerous, as we started at the beginning, identifying it. We're on the edge, in any number of crises, but as the Schiller Institute approach has always been, you address the problems from the higher standpoint. The way we're divided is to break things down into the smallest possible divisions, to turn people against each other, to keep people from looking at the big picture and recognizing that we do have common interests and common goals, that there is such a thing as the human race.

One of the ways you can participate in this is join the Schiller Institute and help us take this message out beyond this conference, to help us build for the next conference as well.

So, Helga, thank you, and to all the panelists, thank you for joining us.



**Executive Intelligence Review** now offers automatic monthly billing for its intelligence package. Receive *EIR's* weekly magazine and its *Daily Alert* in your inbox for \$50/month, billed monthly. Cancel anytime. Subscribe today!

**Details at:**  
<https://store.larouche.com/EIR-Daily-Alert-p/eirpk-0000-000-00-001-std.htm>

The image shows a blue cover of the Executive Intelligence Review magazine with the headline "There Are No Limits to Growth" and a picture of Earth. Behind it is a document titled "EIR Daily Alert Service" with a list of news items including "China Agenda for 2021: Work Economic Daily Agenda Meeting for January", "Farmers Must Prepare for Next Round of Talks", "Protecting the Earth: Strategy Calls Water to Citizens", "U.S. To Fire Missiles at Iran", "Parliament Votes Up Resolution To Join NATO", "ADD Hypersonic Weapons Capability To Its", "U.S. Full Production of Additive Manufacturing", "10 Global Health Issues to Tack in 2021", "China Annual CPC 'Democratic Life Meeting'", "U.S. and Iran Agree To Restart Regular Rail Service in 2021".