

PANEL I

Question and Answer Session

The Q&A session, on June 25, began with a comment on Panel I by Lyndon LaRouche. This is an edited transcript.

Lyndon LaRouche: The important thing here is, what is the thing that is most important? It's mankind; the life and accomplishments of mankind. That's the issue. People die; it's regrettable, but the thing that is really regrettable is the loss of a creative life, or a process of creativity in life.

So, the problem is, that people think in terms of how to measure economy. Well, you really can't; economy cannot really be measured as such. There has to be a vehicle which has a reciprocal relationship to the process as a whole. In the case now, what we're dealing with is that mankind appears to be running out of mankind's ability to produce; mankind's ability to maintain human life. All these things are there; and these are the kinds of thing for which we should be considered responsible. But the other thing is, how do we do something like that? How do we go into a field like building something, more productivity, and so forth? How do we do that? Well, you do that by discovering what man does in the process of being productive. If



Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

EIR

man is being productive, how does man become productive? By creating conditions of life for mankind which are possible to achieve.

Now this means that we are responsible essentially for what is going to happen to humanity. And we are running out of opportunity for continuing man's life under those conditions. Therefore, we have to understand what we have to do in order to control man's needs; and it's not man's needs. The product is what man needs, but the cause is not that. The point is that

in order for mankind to develop powers of scientific creativity per capita, per unit of operation,— how do we do that? We have to apply what we call real science; we have to put the emphasis on science, and increase the scientific concentration which the individual can contribute through different kinds of technologies.

This is a crucial issue; look at what we've lost so far. The United States, for example; the United States is made up of idiots. Why call them idiots? Because they don't take any account of the things that have to be done in order to create greater creativity useful for mankind per capita; it just doesn't exist for them. [applause] So therefore, the question is, mankind must change mankind! Mankind must understand how to change mankind's behavior! How do you create increased power of creativity? How do you improve all these powers? This is something which is not done; this is what, in general in the history now, is not done. We do not provide for the increment of the creative powers of mankind to create. To create what? To create the achievement of mankind; and that's what our chief failure has been.

How do we actually solve this problem? What you do is, you can go out and do some science. You apply science to create a method of creativity. Therefore, you base the whole thing not on mankind as such; you base it on the power of creativity. And that's what my responsibility is; that's what I do in the main. What I've done in general through most of my life, is that. You've got to increase the productive power of labor of the human mind. You have to give the individual human being a greater power of creative means for human life. That is where we fail. People talk about how *this* is going to be good, *that* is going to be good; that doesn't tell you anything. How do you develop the solar systems of the Universe? How do you do these things? You have to create something which is extremely creative for man's benefit, and this is essentially [inaudible].

First of all, we're looking at this issue of man as such. Man's ability to create higher levels of development of the human powers of mankind. The next thing is, how do we find things that are going to make mankind more successfully existent? And that's another question; and all these things are simple scientific questions. What we depend upon is driving what we call physical science, and driving it per capita to a

higher level, always. Then in that process, you have to define what the means is by which you're going to do this. That's the point. And we have an *ignorantia* operation in society, mostly today. Most people who are called scientists are ignorant. Why? Because they limit themselves to certain categories which they are proved on; and these categories are worse than worthless. What mankind has to go out and create is a new creativity, and bring that increase of creativity into power. And this is what mankind does not do; it doesn't do it in the United States, except for a few people. It doesn't do it in other parts of the world. It goes through a performance, and in general in the past century, this policy of management of man's development has been a failure—a profound failure. Mankind's condition of life, mankind's ability to protect life, has been a failure. The behavior of mankind has been a failure.

This is the point: When we develop new kinds of technologies which increase mankind's powers and ability to create, to make new discoveries, to advance,— these are the things on which mankind depends. For example, we go out into the Universe to find solutions for what are called scientific problems. That is a technology; so, it's the increase of the technologies in all senses of technologies. These are the things on which mankind's continued existence depends. You can't just use something; you can not just adopt something. You have to actually make discoveries, as I have done in much of my own work. You create a new technology which was not known before, enhance that technology, and apply it.

My concern is always to come up with a new technology—a more advanced technology, one which overturns and obviates the need for an existing technology. Without that ability to see the future of mankind, to see new technologies,— For example, what do you use? We use water in a galactic way; that's a very important technology. I would say, just to keep this as short as possible, my specialty is concentrating on the revolution in the applicable technologies; and that is the only device by which I know that mankind can improve the requirements for mankind now.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Now we have an open floor for discussion. You are welcome to address anyone on this panel on issues which were raised.

Leona Meyer-Kasai: I have one question for Mr. LaRouche. You have emphasized a lot the Manhattan



MARWIKO AG

Partial view of attendees at the conference.

Project and the music work, singing in the chorus. And the question is, we have the danger of World War III, and you emphasize now that we need to have now advancement in science. How does it go together with the chorus work? Maybe you can elaborate what it does for mankind?

LaRouche: I think first of all, you have to go to a corrected approach to the question as such. Mankind has to create creativities; that's the function. Mankind, as a scientist, must create new creativities which are not just forms, but are actually revolutionary physical changes, physical improvements in what mankind can do; and the ability to develop that. The average citizen in society has no idea of what science is; that's the real difficulty in trying to deal with this problem. They don't know what science is, they have no concept of what science is. You will find that most Russians will do that; you will find that the China population is developing these powers very strongly. China is progressing at a very high rate of development; beyond the attention of most people. It's a difficult problem to solve and to manage, but it works. So, the question is essentially, mankind has to discover what the means are by which mankind can make a change in the way the individual

thinks, which brings an improvement in the development of the human situation.

Yada Molla: Hello. I would like to thank you very much for the first session; it was really interesting. My name is Yada Molla [as heard], and I am from Syria. I am here in Berlin doing my PhD in international relations and cultural diplomacy and trying to figure out the cultural heritage for bringing peace and reconciliation in post-conflict Syria. My question is actually on the link between all the presentations that we had, and the last speech from Mr. LaRouche. Because as a Syrian, yes we were kind of on the right track towards a real development; maybe small steps towards democracy. And we were looking at creativity, we were looking at the potential of cultural heritage in engaging with the society, engaging with the people. We were trying to work on really shaping our identity in a modern way, although with a strong basis in our heritage, the heritage that gave us values to live together all those years since the 10,000 years before crisis.

And there were a lot of other projects that have been done by civil society in terms of discovery centers for children, to bring science into the main ideas of the

children and to bring it in the basis of their thinking and development. But, how can we, in a way with another — OK, now [war] is happening in Syria, but next we don't know where it's going to happen. How can we stop the interruption of such a development? There are nations which have a destiny; a destiny to not develop, a destiny not to go into democracy and not to go into real life simply because there are other agendas that are already set for such regions. And that's the most suitable solution for such countries,— the chaos. Syria was with zero debt, with a very good agenda towards engaging cultural heritage and creativity and science. There was a big change happening in the last ten years before the crisis, so in the last 15 years onwards, until the boom of Syria in 2009-2010. And then all of a sudden, everything has collapsed. Of course, there are problems in Syrian society that maybe we have to raise our voices for; but the main big problem was more of an influence of geopolitical interests. So, my question is, how can we really make the balance? Yes, we need to create things for our future, we need to create diversity, we need to create creativity plus infrastructure, or a possibility to build that. But how can we stop that interruption?

LaRouche: What I would recommend is to turn attention to the question of science as such; and I would talk about what has been done by [inaudible]. The point is that the idea of science—mental science and so forth—is little understood. It's known in history, but it's very poorly represented, and therefore, people are given so-called “practical” kinds of methods of science. And these practical methods of science are not competent. The question is, can we find a characteristic in terms of any kind of function? Can we find a characteristic which is typical of mankind? Let's take something in space. Yes, we can. And what we should do, essentially, is take these kinds of things which we can explain in that way practically; and that will work. The issue is when you don't have the right kind of advice in terms of how to go at this thing and express it.

Chas Freeman: Can I offer a different answer? Respect for international law would be a good place to start. Syria is a sovereign nation; and foreign countries have no right to intervene, either directly or indirectly, in its internal affairs. I happened to be in Damascus at the end of March, beginning of April 2011, when the unrest in the Southwest began; and I therefore can say

that there were grave miscalculations on all sides. On the part of Bashar Assad and his government, there was the misjudgment that if Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, or Zine Ali in Tunisia could be easily overthrown, if Yemen could be cast into anarchy, that this could also happen to him. And that therefore, he had to act to preempt and prevent an unravelling of his own regime; and he over-reacted. Outside forces—the Saudis, the Israelis, the Qataris, the Americans, the Turks—made the equal and opposite miscalculation, that with a little push, the regime could change. All of these judgments were incorrect, and almost 400,000 dead Syrians later, with 11 million Syrians displaced from their homes, with 5 million Syrian children not receiving education, the war continues. And some of Syria's neighbors find the continuation of war more convenient than peace. But if we return to the principle of international law, and allow Syrians to settle their own problems, we would all be better off; that's my answer.

Question: Hello. I have a question for actually everyone. We talked recently about exiting NATO, but that's not enough. I would very much like to hear thoughts on the question of a new security order for the entire world, so that we get out of this entire NATO dynamic. We completely overhaul,— Just as we've been discussing for economics, the economic system is bankrupt, we need an overhaul. The BRICS have started; China has initiated the Silk Road policy. So, what would that be like for security? I think that's the next step.

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, I'm a strong proponent for a completely new international security architecture. Mankind has reached the point where, if we don't stop thinking in terms of blocs, we will not make it. Geopolitics must be completely banned from our thinking—and therefore I have a slightly different opinion than what was expressed by Chas—that we must move into a new domain where joint economic interests will be provided for by the World Land-Bridge. Where all continents work for the common good in a global development partnership, and therefore they have a common interest; and therefore you can have a joint international security architecture, which would be basically taking into account all the security interests of everybody. I think this is absolutely Possible. Nuclear disarmament would be one big step; but also other weapons of mass destruction would fall under that.

And in a certain sense, if we do not accomplish a world without war, and I fully agree with Mr. Scholz that war in times of thermonuclear weapons cannot be a means of solving conflict; or we don't exist. And that has to become a public debate; because if you don't move in this way, I don't think that you can construct any kind of regional security arrangement—trans-Atlantic, Pacific, whatever—without this thing going awfully wrong. We should have the alarm bells really ringing as loudly as possible; we are close to annihilation. If it goes wrong, we don't exist. During the time of Kennedy, people were aware of it; the Cuban Missile Crisis was understood. Kennedy said, if it comes to the use of thermonuclear weapons, the people who will be dead in the first hours will be happy compared to those who die a few weeks later. And that condition has not changed.

I think we have to have a complete revolution in thinking, with the idea of a win-win cooperation taking into account the interest of the other, which was one of the basic ideas of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, ending the Thirty Years' War. You can solve the problem, but how do you accomplish that in practice? How do you solve the problem of Israel, of Iran, of Pakistan? All these things are powder kegs, and therefore you need a global approach where the big powers—the United States, Russia, China, India, and others—are working together. If we don't get that, we will be dead; that is my firmest conviction.

Col. Ulrich Scholz: I think the United Nations is the only international organization we have, and we shouldn't just try to re-invent one; we should just make it effective. Which includes, for example, America accepting the International Criminal Court and international law for everybody. The Security Council should really be empowered to take care of peace in this world.

On NATO's part, I'd like to put a little warning out when it comes to dismantling the organization. From my technical experience with NATO across the nations, when you send NATO troops somewhere, they are standardized; they know how to work together. And this has developed over decades, so there is a treasure, really. If you send them somewhere, they know how to do things. What I would take away from NATO is the strategic ability to wage war, and I would open NATO up as a security system. I would introduce that Russia comes in there; that we have a military arm for the United Na-

tions which is capable. So I think this is for me the most practical step if we want to contain all these fires spreading in the world, come to a better understanding of each other, and solve problems peacefully. If we are all in the same system, we can work together and be more effective.

Col. Alain Corvez: [translated from French] I agree with what Col. Scholz just said, and I also agree with what Chas Freeman said in response to these two young women. I think—concerning the question of the Syrian young lady—that there are countries for which the great ideas are very far from their own preoccupations; they want a world where everybody will cooperate, but those populations are actually under the bombs. And I don't think it helps to give priority to great ideas which cannot be realized. Of course, humanity has to cooperate with all the populations on this planet to eliminate war; but man is man, and it's not by a kind of order that man is transformed into an angel. I want to approve what Chas Freeman said and what Col. Scholz said. We have an organization which is theoretically in charge of having law respected by all nations without going to war. So, we have to recall the United Nations to its mission, and we have to use this organization which still exists today.

But to propose that people who are suffering the worst—I just came back from Syria,—great ideas are good, but what those people want first of all is a solution to their immediate problems. And as the ambassador said, we have to respect the right of people to dispose of themselves; and it is not up to the strongest to decide what will be done to the weaker.

Chas Freeman: I would like to say that, if you want to get to a world free of geopolitics, ironically the only country that has the luxury to do that is my own. Bismarck correctly described us as having meek Canadian neighbors to the north, fun-filled Mexican neighbors to the south, and on the east and west, neighbors who are fish. So, we have a geopolitical position which gives us the luxury to disengage; and for most of our history we did. And in some sense, the debate that is going on in the United States now is about that. We can to some extent disengage. The question is, is that wise?

I'd like to buttress the point that Col. Scholz made. I was the American ambassador in Riyadh during the Gulf War of 1990-91. What we discovered was that the 32 nations that participated in that war to liberate

Kuwait, were forced to use NATO methodology and doctrine in order to be able to work together on the battlefield. There was no alternative; it is the only set of software that produces interoperability between nations with different military traditions. So it is something valuable in that sense. But we must also remember that in the 20th Century, the United States disengaged twice from Europe, and then found itself compelled to be drawn back in. So I think we need to find a balance here; and that balance probably begins in my mind with Europe taking responsibility for its own affairs.

Most Americans, by the way, regard foreign policy as a largely irrelevant annoyance. We don't have to have a foreign policy; we can afford not to have one. That is unique; but you better hope that we do have one that stresses cooperation with a European-led European order.

Ashraf Matar: Hello, first of all. My name is Ashraf Matar, and I am from Syria. I want to express first that I am happy that you exist, and this institute exists. I never heard of it until one year ago, and thanks to Toby and the branch of the institute in Essen, I knew about you and about this conference. I have many questions and many points to clear with Col. Scholz first. You defined three factors for any war, but I think we are missing the economic factor, which is the most important, and that's what's happening now in Syria. I was part of the revolution, and when the revolution started to be Islamic, I left and I was persecuted by both sides. We discovered then that this plan was set since 2005 and maybe before that.

And to Mr. Freeman, since you were the ambassador in Saudi Arabia, actually I wonder about this friendship between Saudi Arabia and the United States. You are friends with the people who are the most founding jihadists, founding terrorism. The second thing is that the interference in the nations, this is not something new. [applause] Even when you visited Syria, all of you, I doubt that any of you had an idea of what was happening about that before. Even in Iraq, the democracy and the freedom—they can feel it now I think, and in Syria also. And this program, or this plan which has been in Iraq, my mother read about it 10 years before it started, in 1981, exactly like it happened in 1991 when Iraq invaded Kuwait; and it was a surprise for everyone. So, please, if you have some answers, since you are responsible for many years.

Zepp-LaRouche: I have to ask you to be relatively concise, because we have to stop at one o'clock.

Scholz: About adding economics to the list of the causes of war, I have included economics in the political aims, because all politics, all wars are about economics in the end. So I don't want to make a differentiation there; war is just for me useless. It's the wrong way, and that was my argument—for any reason.

Freeman: I agree with Col. Scholz's analysis. I would add one other question to the three that he mentioned, or maybe two questions. One, before you start a war, ask, "And then what?" We don't ask; we use violence for its own sake. And finally, ask how you are going to make a peace at the end. What is your war termination strategy? If you don't have one, don't go to war.

With respect to Saudi Arabia, I will simply say that the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia has never been based on common values. It has been based on common interests. And until very recently, the Saudis did not pursue independent policies in the Middle East; they looked to the United States to tend their interests. They have no confidence in the United States now, and therefore, they are striking out on their own; and that is causing a lot of problems, I agree. Syria is very much a proxy war between many forces, including Saudi Arabia, Iran, Turkey, ourselves, the Israelis—who, by the way, say openly that they hope the war goes on forever, because it serves their interests for Syria to be in a state of anarchy. So there are many people responsible for the tragedy in Syria, not just some Syrians. Many foreigners as well.

Zepp-LaRouche: I would like to add that the truth about September 11, which is now about to come out in the U.S. Congress, will shed light on the true character of the wrong people in the United States and the Saudi regime. And that has to be cleared up, because if you don't get to the root of that, there will be no end to the financing of jihad, of ISIS, al-Qaeda, and similar organizations. But the good news is that in the United States Congress, the new law will be debated, and in all likelihood the 28 pages will be released and published. Not only that, but also the 80,000 pages suppressed by the FBI about the Florida component of the planning for September 11. I think without such a catharsis, cleaning up the roots of what happened in the last 15 years, I don't think this thing can be resolved. But the news gives reason for optimism that this can be done.