

position.

Subsequently, as an opposition parliamentary group (and, naturally, an opposition party), we have introduced our own document on the basis for Ukraine's domestic and foreign policies, and our own versions of solutions for the most important social problems—draft legislation on the poverty level and minimum wage, on labor compensation, on the payment of pensions, on utilities payments, and on labor collectives. We initiated a comprehensive parliamentary review of the question of the Memorandum with the IMF.

Our struggle has produced certain results. No matter how hard Ukrainian President Kuchma and the Pustovoitenko government, which is obedient to him, tried during the summer of 1998 to raise utility fees by 20%, they did not succeed. Only after the Constitutional Court intervened in February 1999, were the fees raised, effective April 1, 1999. We did, however, manage to pass a parliamentary resolution, banning evictions from apartments and turning off the lights, heat, water, or gas for reasons of non-payment, if payments for these services exceed 15% of a family's total income actually received.

Although it was only by a few hryvni, we succeeded in raising the poverty line and the minimum wage in the country, and we stimulated closer attention to the problem of pensions. We managed to block the adoption of numerous anti-popular pieces of legislation and to stop the ratification of some treaties that were disadvantageous for Ukraine.

On March 24, 1999, a review of the question of the Memorandum with the IMF did take place in the Parliament. We forced the Communists, who constantly lay claim to the role of defenders of the people, to introduce a draft resolution to recall the Memorandum. In our own resolution, our parliamentary group presented a principled evaluation of what is happening, and proposed to abrogate the agreement with the IMF. At the same time, we supported both the Communists, and "Hromada," with its still softer assessment of the IMF. Our tactic was successful, as the Parliament voted to condemn the actions of the government in signing the Memorandum with the IMF, as a gross violation of the Constitution of Ukraine.

There were certain intrigues around this formulation. Speaker A. Tkachenko, grovelling before the IMF and President Kuchma, became a spokesman for the Fund's ideas in Ukraine and tried to force the resolution through, without the critical reference to the activity of the government. Although both the Communists and "Hromada" (the parliamentary group of P. Lazarenko) raised no objection to this gross flouting of the Rules of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the process of condemning this policy cannot be stopped.

The people of Ukraine are opening their eyes. The authority of our party is rising steadily. I am convinced that we shall unite all the progressive forces in our society and radically change the policy of economic, as well as political reforms in Ukraine.

Discussion

How to bring about a just world order

Anno Hellenbroich: *I propose that we now take another 20 minutes or so for discussion. Before I open the floor to discussion, let me say that I have here a note from the Foreign Ministry of the Slovak Republic, where the Department of International Economic Relations sends best wishes. . . . Now, I invite questions. I see here Prof. Taras Muranivsky, president of the Schiller Institute in Moscow.*

Taras Muranivsky of Russia

I am from Russia, and Russia has been discussed today very actively. It is very good that we are having such an interesting discussion and such an interesting conference. I can say that I like the reports from everybody here today, in general. Each has spoken his own truth, despite some different points of view among these people.

But, I will say one thing. Our thoughts and our approach to the difficult and very complicated problems of the contemporary situation in the world must be known to more people, and more circles, than those represented in our audience. I propose to prepare a short letter to the governments of all NATO countries, in the name of our conference, to condemn the bombing and this aggression that we have in Europe today. I think that not only we, but many circles of people and scientists, are sending such letters now, and maybe they will hear and they will think over what to do. . . .

But, I think that Russia's first step is a good step: humanitarian help—food, clothes, and so on. Bear in mind, that they send these supplies not to Serbians, but to Albanians, Serbians, Hungarians, and all the people who live there and are refugees, and need this help. This is a very important thing.

Now, the second step ought to be, I think, what we discussed with one of our good friends, my friend and Lyn's friend, Pobisk Kuznetsov. Our Patriarch was in Serbia yesterday, but it would be better for the Russian Orthodox Patriarch, the Roman Catholic Pope, and maybe somebody from the Muslim side to meet, and to hold a big, multi-confessional conference. Not like Nicolaus of Cusa in 1438, and for several years thereafter, and then several years, but a conference of three days' duration. They would have there different people, the representatives of different people. It would be another influence in the situation. Maybe our conference can initiate this idea. You have contact with the Vatican, and we can do something through Russia, through our Patriarch, and the

Muslim people. It is necessary for people not to kill each other, but to find a way to get peace.

I'd like to say something else of interest. Everybody should know it. During the last period, the last two or three months, Lyn and the concept of physical economy have gained authority in Russia. You know my publications in the *EIR*; you have information, when I publish some material. But now, Lyn has been invited to comment on some important events in Russia. In the weekly *Kommersant-Vlast*, there was a discussion page, as they call it, on the problem of the Russian budget and the role of the IMF and IMF loans. They asked me, and Lyn prepared the material, and we published a so-called "Commentator's Column." It was a very interesting commentary; in it Lyn proposed to scrap the aid package from the IMF.

But, they haven't scrapped it. Maybe [First Deputy Premier Yuri] Maslyukov has changed, because now he is asking for the \$4.8 billion that the IMF promised during the past five or six months, and maybe they will give it in five or six months.

Lyndon LaRouche: Declare the IMF in sovereign default on its payments of promised money to Russia!

Muranivsky: We also have *Kommersant-daily*, a wide-circulation newspaper. They called me twice, the first time when our Russian economist, who worked and lived in the United States, Wassily Leontieff, died. They published the views of different foreign and Russian economists. They wanted to know Lyn's point of view on Wassily Leontieff and his theory.

The very last time, before I left, they called me to give a commentary on one internal Russian economic situation, to predict who can save the Russian ruble against the dollar. They published material from different economists, and Lyn gave his own approach to it. This is very important for us, because of the ideas of physical economy. After the discrimination by the IMF and "shock therapy" and other approaches that prevailed in the last years, the conditions are good in Russia to use the ideas of physical economy.

So, that's my recommendation.

Hellenbroich: *Next question, there.*

Hoeschst engineer, Germany

First, thanks to the podium for this extraordinarily interesting discussion. I am a chemical engineer. My question is, first, how can we implement what we have heard here, in actual politics? In Germany, our political parties are like clubs, and anyone who comes up with an idea is attacked as an extremist, left or right.

Secondly, I learned in school about America, and, for example, about President Monroe, who was opposed to imperialism. But why is it that America in two world wars, intervened in an imperialist fashion? The Kosovo crisis today, I think, derives from the actions of the Americans, the French, and the British in 1919.

Lyndon LaRouche

First of all, it is not really difficult to do politics in Germany. It only seems so. It merely appears to be difficult. If you're doing anything serious in politics, you're going to get into trouble. Therefore, if you're going to get into trouble, you must be doing something good. Maybe not, but I'd suspect in your case it was good.

On the question of this Russia business, and also this question of imperialism. Look, the problem is very simple, or can be made simple, because it comes down to simple decisions on practice. The policy of the United States toward Germany and toward Russia, and toward some other countries, was changed radically through the assassination of the President of the United States, McKinley, in the year 1901. With this change in the Presidency, from McKinley to Roosevelt—and McKinley was assassinated by the British for the benefit of bringing Teddy Roosevelt into the government—U.S. foreign policy changed fundamentally against Germany and also against Russia. You have the Russia Revolution of 1905—this is a product of British reaction to this, following up on the British-instigated Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95. All of these changes were made. The power which is now on the top in Wall Street, was actually brought to power in this form, as a result of the Teddy Roosevelt Presidency and the Woodrow Wilson, etc., and Mellon after that in the 1920s.

So, these are facts which should be understood. You don't react necessarily just against that. You have to find, this is the enemy, how do we defeat him? In this case, what I have done is to say, going back to my experience in World War II and afterward, and what Roosevelt had promised and what many of us believed before the war ended, that the United States would act with its great power at that point to end the free-trade globally, as a policy, and to end all forms of British-Dutch-French-Portuguese colonialism in every part of the world, instantly at the end of the war. That was not done. Therefore, the positive ideas of Roosevelt, which are typical of the American patriotic tradition, including Monroe, those positive ideas were not carried out fully. We had positive aspects to the postwar reconstruction up to 1958 and beyond. That was good. The postwar reconstruction here [in Germany] was good. We did not get a just economic system.

My view is to change the correlation of power in the world, to bring a correlation of forces which matches the requirements of world history. To me, at this point, the fact that Russia, China, India, and other countries, are coming into cooperation, the fact that Germany's vital interest, as well as the interest of continental Europe, is in those markets and the interests of those markets, the fact that the vital interest of the United States is to have these peaceful relations with Eurasia, with the help of countries such as possibly Germany, hopefully. Let us concentrate on winning the power, the kind of power that is needed to shape the kinds

of policies to bring a more just world about.

It's the same principle that's called, in military history, the principle of the flank. If you face a sea of troubles, a sea of armies, remember the greatest Persian host ever assembled on the plains outside Arbela, over a million from every type of satrapy that Persia could muster—and a relatively modest military force commanded by Alexander the Great and advised by people who had been trained by the Platonic Academy of sciences, came up with the Macedonian cavalry and the largely Greek infantry. These two forces, amounting to less than 100,000 people, demolished, obliterated not only an army of over 1 million host, but in that day, in that instant, destroyed the entire Persian Empire forever! Now that's called the principle of the flank. When, facing a sea of troubles and you're totally outnumbered, instead of wasting your time running around trying to fight every battle—which you're going to lose, if you do that—find a way to outflank the enemy, pick the one course of action in which the concentration of the least effort will produce the most benefit.

My view is that, since the establishment of a New Bretton Woods, along the lines I've indicated, is probably the only realistic force which can compel an otherwise successfully reluctant world to do what it must do, that I'd concentrate my energies on that. And on education.

Hassan Abdul Wahab of Sudan

Thank you very much for this very precious occasion. I'm a journalist from the Sudan, and we as Africans have very little chance to speak our mind. This is one of them. I see the problem now in Yugoslavia as a continuation of the problems in Africa. The only thing that makes the problem in Yugoslavia so intensive is not only the bombing and the killing, because there are other killings in Africa, in other ways. The Africans are taking part in it, definitely, in Burundi, in Uganda, in Sudan, in Liberia, in Ethiopia, but isn't the rest of the world having a part to play in this? At least we are not producing weapons. We don't have the way to manipulate other races. I think the problem is that the media have played a big role to disclose what happened in Africa, but now the problem has moved and they have come, and the problems are right here, at our door. That's why you see Yugoslavia so magnified, and you don't see the killings in Africa in the millions. There is now a total hegemony in the world. This total hegemony isolates everyone. It isolates persons as well as institutions. There are now millions of institutions. The United Nations has been isolated, the Organization of African Unity has been isolated, the Arab League has been isolated, any other organization has been isolated. There is only one voice. The voice of those who win power and have power.

The other thing is the personification of the conflict: Milosevic, Saddam Hussein. . . . I cannot imagine the whole world listening to a conflict caused by Milosevic. The personification of the conflict is just unfair, just as personifica-

tion of the distances, and the waste. The United States against Sudan. Bombing a factory which produces only medicines for a very poor country, which has not got a penny from the outside world. Let us compare two situations. The United States has bombed our country. It has cost us \$50 million and lives, and the United States, when there are demonstrations in Syria against the embassy, which cost only \$15,000 in damages, the United States is now demanding this \$15,000, and they do not want to reimburse the Sudan for a factory which produces 60% of the medicines of the Sudan. This is totally unfair. I cannot understand such measures. I cannot understand such measures like, for example: Sudan demands that the United States send an investigation committee to see if this factory has produced chemical weapons or has produced medicines, and the United States has refused that. The United States has spent 10 years in Iraq looking for what it calls weapons of mass destruction. This is very unfair treatment, and it will lead eventually to a disaster, because

Greetings to the conference

From Sen. Ombretta Fumagalli Carulli, president of the International Committee "Parliamentarians for the Jubilee" (whose task is to implement the Pope's call for economic and social justice), and Senate chairwoman of the parliamentary group of the party Rinnovamento Italiano Liberal Democratici, created by the Italian Foreign Minister Lamberto Dini.

Dear friends,

I would like to send my greetings to the conference in Bonn Bad-Godesberg. In his repeated calls for peace, to reduce the foreign debt of poorer countries and to safeguard the dignity and inalienable rights of each man, Pope John Paul II made clear that "war is an adventure without return." He committed Vatican diplomacy to an unprecedented mediation action (an effort which has been charged and encouraged also by the Italian government) and came to the point of formulating personally, during a liturgical celebration, a ceasefire proposal. At this point, while bombs continue to fall, there seems to be no way out. Yet John Paul II is right. There are no alternatives to peace, and war, as the air strikes in the last days demonstrated, is only a dangerous adventure without turning back, which will affect also those who believe they will come out of it as winners. That's why we have to stick to any hope for peace. Only in this way shall the population of Kosovo be able to go back safely to its homes and start again to live

if you isolate everybody, and you make all the decisions, this can only be done by God. Only God can make decisions from one place, because He is God. But if someone, or some country, or some President thinks that he can control the whole world, and looks at problems all over the world and then decides what is good for Sudan, what is good for Kenya, what is good for Zambia, I don't think this can work.

I have only one proposal to make. Let us try to make intensive efforts to create a new world public opinion, that can protest in the streets, in the media, everywhere. Because now public opinion is totally isolated. Compare the situation now in Yugoslavia, with about 20 years ago in Vietnam, how strong public opinion was at that time, and how weak it is now. Let us try to create a public opinion which stands against these injustices. I think this is very important. A platform like this is one of them. Let us write in the media, let us demonstrate in the streets, and in the end, our voices will be heard.

Lyndon LaRouche

I must say that I'm extremely happy with these events today. I'm very happy because, first of all, we had a forum of representative participation, which presented different views, or from different aspects, on what in point of fact is a common problem.

I think that, by looking at what I see in the media, in particular, in various parts of the world, that such conferences, such seminars, are fairly rare, and they are intensely valuable in my experience. Because, when you bring people together, sometimes over a proposal which may seem improbable to the participants at the outset, the chemistry of that discussion may, in its own way, find its own pathway to a fruitful result. I smell, shall we say, in today's proceedings, something auspicious of that sort.

I think we have probably done something good today. How it will become good, I don't know, but I'm sure it will become good.

together with the enemies of today. With this hope, I formulate my best wishes for your work.

From Roberto Formigoni, president of the Lombardy Region of Italy, greetings to the seminar, "The Way out of the Crisis—Europe, the World Financial Crisis and the 'New Cold War' " in Bonn-Bad Godesberg.

Dear friends,

I want to express my best wishes to you and your prestigious guests, for the seminar on "Europe, the Financial Crisis and the New Cold War." Unfortunately, recent events confirm that the specter of war—and not only cold war—is lying in wait in old Europe, and that the hopes raised ten years ago by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of communism, risk being swept away by the arrogance of new dictators and the adventurism of those who, through expressing the best of intentions, end up increasing insecurity and suffering,

What is required is to promote a policy of dialogue and economic relations, of comprehension and economic infrastructure investments in the countries of eastern Europe, so that the ghosts of the Cold War do not take shape again. We, as Europeans, cannot allow ourselves to encourage, with our errors and our failings, the consolidation and expansion of a national communism which undermines the hope for democracy and development of eastern Europe, and proposes a new atmosphere of confrontation and tension, which we thought had been overcome.

Powerful democratic action is required to immediately silence the arms that sow death and destruction in the Balkans, and therefore, we anxiously welcome the efforts of the Holy See, of Russia, and other diplomatic efforts for a

negotiated solution, which respects the rights and aspirations of all the peoples of the region.

We cannot, however, ignore the fact that, beyond the heinous crime of ethnic cleansing and the recent military adventures, part of the responsibility for the current conflicts falls—in indirect form, but none the less serious—on those who, in the last years, have decided on a rigidly monetarist and deflationary policy which has blocked European development and encouraged financial speculation. To give hope back to peace, to prevent a new Cold War, to put an end to the irregular warfare which has been tormenting the Balkans—and not only in the present—it is necessary for democracy and economic growth to begin walking hand in hand again. With this hope, I send you my best wishes for your work.

From Dep. Tullio Grimaldi, Communist parliamentary group, Chamber of Deputies.

I regret that I am unable to participate in the conference of the world financial crisis, in Bonn on April 21, due to commitments which necessitate my staying in Rome, related to the developments in the Balkans conflict.

I am carefully following the initiatives of your center, in particular Mr. LaRouche's stance regarding problems of world finances and their effects on monetary markets and on the economy.

I am convinced that, at present, more profound evaluations in Europe are required, as well as regarding the significance of the financial crisis in Asia.

I send you my best wishes for a fruitful conference and would be happy to receive material from the speeches and conclusions of the conference.