

Citizens Electoral Council of Australia conference
“The World Land-Bridge: Peace on Earth, Good Will towards All Men”,
28-29 March 2015, Melbourne, Australia

From Panel 1 The World Land-Bridge: It's Being Built!

Keynote Address

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and Chairman of the Schiller Institute

Craig Isherwood: I would now like to introduce to our conference our keynote speaker, Mrs Helga Zepp-LaRouche, addressing us by video-link via Google Hangouts from the United States.

Mrs LaRouche is the founder and chairman of the international Schiller Institute and also leads the Civil Rights Movement-Solidarity, her political party in Germany. She is one of the world's leading authorities on Friedrich Schiller and on Nicholas of Cusa, the man who contributed more than anyone else to the launching of the European Renaissance of the 15th century. Her scientific work extends from the German classical period to the humanist tradition of universal history, and Confucianism.

Mrs LaRouche, as a young freelance journalist in the 1970s was one of the first European journalists to spend several months travelling throughout China at the high point of the Cultural Revolution. More than two decades later in 1996 she spoke at one of the seminal conferences held in China on building what was then being called the new Euro-Asia Continental Bridge. Mrs LaRouche has since become widely known there as the Silk Road Lady for her advocacy of that Eurasian Land-Bridge as a cornerstone of China's development and a pathway to world peace.

Helga and her husband Lyndon LaRouche, over nearly 40 years, have together pursued political activities in many Asian nations, Europe, Latin America and practically all the states of the United States. She has met with numerous political leaders including Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo.

Given that today we are witnessing a new paradigm shift in global affairs with the formations around the BRICS countries, which of course includes China, we are very pleased to be able to welcome Mrs LaRouche to address our conference this morning. Please welcome Mrs LaRouche.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Ladies and gentlemen, I am extremely happy to be able to address you electronically from the United States, because I think right now, every thinking human being somehow feels that mankind has reached a point in history which would be called by the great poet of freedom, Friedrich Schiller, for whom, after all, the Schiller Institute is called, a true *punctum saliens*. Schiller gave this notion of a *punctum saliens* to that moment in a classical drama when a certain story comes to a point of exhaustion, and a decision is required. Everything depends on that moment: whether the main actor has the morality, wisdom and the vision, to be able to

leave the axiom of that story which brought about the point of crisis; and if they can leave the old habits, the old axioms behind, and put a new vision on the table and realise that. If the actors on the stage are moral people who have the wisdom to do so, then history goes into a more positive, more optimistic phase. If the key actors don't have that in themselves, then this drama ends as a tragedy. And I think that in history we are exactly at such a point, and it is not yet decided whether this present situation will go into a new renaissance, into a new, just, world economic order, or if it plunges into a dark age, or even worse than that.

Because right now we have two existential crises. One is that the signs are accumulating that we are in front of a new blowout of the financial system, whereby the crash around Lehmann Brothers in 2008 would only look like a little hiccup, because we have a banking crisis about to erode, which could bring down and evaporate the entire financial system. But, naturally, even more existential for the existence of mankind is the fact that we are extremely close to the danger of a global thermonuclear war. And if people knew how close this is, I can assure you people would not sleep well.

I could add other aspects—the cultural crisis, the absolute unbelievable degeneracy of the culture which goes along with the so-called globalisation, and the lack of trust in politics which you see in the entire so-called western world, and many other such things. All of this means, I think, that we have only one chance to overcome this present crisis. That is, we need a fundamental change in the axiomatic basis of everything. We need a new paradigm and I think that that new paradigm must be all-inclusive, it must be something completely new, something which has not existed in history before, but there is a comparison, and that is the transformation from the Middle Ages to modern times, because, if you remember, the 14th century was a dark age. You had witch-burning, you had flagellants, you had the Black Death, you had the scholastics, you had the Aristotelianism in the universities, and all of that meant that society had really reached a complete dead end, a dark age. And it was especially the ideas of Nicholas of Cusa, who then laid the foundations for everything which we associate with the modern times: modern natural science, great classical art and the whole idea of modern man, of the individual, the role of the individual in society, human creativity. All of that really came only after the Italian Renaissance as a generally accessible phenomenon. We need a new paradigm shift exactly like that, or even bigger. That is on the horizon.

The old paradigm which we absolutely have to get rid of, you can say starts with what we call, generally, globalisation. Because globalisation is really only another word for the Anglo-American-dominated financial system which expanded after the collapse of the Soviet Union; and which accelerated after the repeal of the banking separation of Glass-Steagall in 1999, where you had this absolute unlimited, unbridled speculation, where the rich became richer, the poor became poorer, and that system is basically now all dominant in the western world, in the trans-Atlantic sector.

Along with this globalisation you had the Project for the New American Century doctrine which was the idea that, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, there would be only one superpower left and that superpower would, based on the special

relationship with Great Britain, turn the world into an empire. And, obviously, that is the reason why we are right now on the verge of World War III. So that has to go, but also the alternative of a so-called "multi-polar" world, is no good because that also has the danger that geopolitical conflicts will erupt between one group of nations and another group of nations.

If you look at what happened at the end of the Soviet Union, when basically the Project for the New American Century doctrine became the basis for the eastward expansion of NATO, this was the idea of not keeping the promise which was made to Gorbachov and Kohl and Genscher at the time, and which the former American ambassador Matlock just reiterated; there was a promise not to expand NATO to the borders of Russia. That was violated. You had first Poland, Hungary, and then, in the second wave, more East European countries. And now, you have a situation where the troops of NATO are directly at the Russian border, in the Baltic states, in Poland, in Ukraine, and there is now even a motion to include Georgia and Ukraine into NATO, something which is completely unacceptable for Russian security interests.

What went along with that, is regime change of all governments that would oppose such a globalisation, such a world empire, and also a colour revolution, using NGOs financed by western institutions to topple these governments and both Russia and China have declared in the meantime that they regard colour revolution as a form of warfare, even if it's not military war, aimed to topple governments. Obviously, the real aim of all of this is to have regime change in Moscow and in Beijing. And that will not happen.

But, along with this change went the transformation of NATO from mutual assured destruction, which was the idea that you cannot use nuclear weapons, to the idea that you *can* win a nuclear first strike. Presently we have a situation where all of the military doctrines of NATO and the U.S., and the EU de facto, are based on a first strike. This is the global U.S. missile defence system, it's the Prompt Global Strike Doctrine, and it is the Air-Sea Battle Doctrine against China.

Both Russia and China have made crystal-clear that they have taken measures. If you listen to what President Putin declared over the Christmas period, the update of the Russian military doctrine, and if you look at what China has published many times, it is very clear that these two nuclear powers are completely prepared not to capitulate, but to work against a nuclear first strike. Russia has said, if need be, they will use nuclear weapons themselves, to prevent such a policy.

I don't want to elaborate this much more, but I would urge people: Please read the relevant articles, become aware of how close we are to WWIII, because the most shocking about this is that, when you had the Cuba crisis or when you had the middle-range missile crisis in the beginning of the 80s, people were talking about it and they were protesting in the streets; they were discussing what would happen if nuclear weapons would ever be used. Now we are much, much closer than ever before in history to the complete annihilation of mankind, and nobody talks about it, or almost nobody and that has to urgently change.

The second crisis, and it is immediately related to that, is the too-big-to-fail banks are completely overextended in the derivatives markets. Most of these banks are 40 or more per cent larger than in 2008. The BIS, the Bank for International Settlements, just published figures that the indebtedness of these big banks, is \$600 trillion overextended in the derivatives markets. Our estimate is that that figure must be doubled, so 80 per cent of these derivatives concern interest rates. If the Federal Reserve, which is trying to get out of the quantitative easing, because they have pumped money and they have now let the ECB and Japan do that—if they intend to go for even a slight interest rate increase, the danger is that this will then evaporate and lead to a chain reaction [collapse] of the whole system.

Now, the problem with derivatives is that people say you need derivatives. This is complete bunk. We don't need derivatives; actually they don't exist, and the proof that they don't exist, is that at the moment you call them in, you will realise they were virtual the whole time. The danger is if that happens, then the whole system will evaporate completely.

The same thing could happen over the crisis of the euro because, the Troika austerity policy, which has turned all of southern Europe—Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal—into totally collapsing economies, shrinking them by one-third, increasing the death rate, causing misery in these countries, has now found an answer in Greece. The Syriza government, in a coalition with the Independent Greeks, has rejected this policy, and now the battle between the ECB, the EU Commission and the German government, and the Greek government, has reached the point where you could see either the chaotic Grexit from Greece or you could see a capitulation on the side of the ECB, which I don't think would happen, where they would lower the austerity conditions and that, in each case, would then lead to the end of the euro, which, if it is disorderly, could have the same effect as a derivative blowout, namely bringing the whole banking system down.

I am just touching on these things, because this is the background to why the AIIB, the new Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank of China, had become so extremely attractive. Xi Jinping's announcing the revival of the New Silk Road, in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, in September 2013 in Kazakhstan, was followed then by the announcement [of plans] to rebuild the Maritime Silk Road, and then last year in Brazil the BRICS countries formed a new alliance. The next day they added the Latin American countries, and in the meantime they had many conferences of ASEAN, they have new deals with many countries in Africa. And what has emerged in the last one and a half years, unbeknownst to the western media who are completely blocking this out, is a real economic alternative. These countries are engaged in projects that are unbelievable. They are building a new Nicaragua Canal, a second Panama Canal. China is helping Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, Chile and Peru to build a trans-continental railway across Latin America. They are cooperating in nuclear research, in nuclear energy production, in joint space projects, and numerous other projects, water projects, greening the desert, new industrialisation for many third world countries. Many fantastic projects which have been on the shelf for years which are now being realised.

And they have created a banking system. It's not just the AIIB, it's the New Development Bank of the BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Bank is being built, the SAC Bank—the bank for the South Asian countries, the new Silk Road Development Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund. All of these banks are not any longer a part of the casino economy, but they are there to fund real investment and that has become much more attractive, especially in light of the pending collapse of the financial system of the trans-Atlantic sector.

The United States made enormous pressure that these countries should not join the AIIB, but as Craig [Isherwood] mentioned earlier, starting with Great Britain, in the last week seven European countries joined as founding members: Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Austria and Switzerland. And also some Asian countries joined, namely Turkey, South Korea, and as I heard last, Australia has still not decided and Canada also not.

The fact that these European countries have basically told the United States to leave them alone, that they would cooperate with this new financial institution, has caused the Obama administration to go completely haywire, and they just lost it. *Figaro* magazine, a French newspaper, compared this to a little Pearl Harbour. They said it was complete stupidity to turn something that was supposed to be a regional infrastructure bank, into a showdown between the United States and China, and then lose it. The *Financial Times* said that this is complete folly, they should not say that the World Bank has such a high standard, because look at what the World Bank did in financing Mobutu. This is not such a great record. The *Wall Street Journal* had a lying article saying China had to give up its veto power so that the other countries would join, which is a complete lie, because China made clear from the beginning that they want to build this bank on a consensus of all participating countries and not on the veto power of one.

The French ambassador to China, [Maurice] Gourdault-Montagne, said this is a strategic vision for the future, which France will absolutely be a part of. There are presently tons of articles which say that this is completely stupid, why did Obama do this, he is now isolated.

So this is really good news. And we are especially happy about this because, as Robbie [Barwick] mentioned and I think Craig [Isherwood] also, this is really our baby. When the Soviet Union collapsed, or even before, when the Berlin Wall came down in 1989, we immediately proposed what we called the Productive Triangle at that time, which was the idea to unify the territory between France, Paris, Berlin and Vienna, which is a triangle the size of Japan, and then expand development into the East through development corridors. And when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, we immediately extended that to become the Eurasian Land-bridge, to connect the population and industrial centres of Europe with those of Asia, and not only have economic integration that way, but to have a peace order for the 21st century.

We have campaigned since that time and held literally hundreds of conferences and seminars, and so we were extremely happy when President Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road, almost two years ago. This is now becoming the real alternative.

Naturally, people have trouble with that because they say, "Yes, but is that not the same thing like U.S. imperialism before? Does China now as a rising power, not have evil imperial designs? Are they not planning to take over the world?" Well, as was mentioned, I had the luck to be in China in 1971. That was during the height of the Cultural Revolution, and I can assure you the people of China were extremely distraught. They were unhappy, they felt harassed by the Red Guards, who would take them out of bed in the night, and throw them into prison. All the beautiful buildings in Beijing were painted over with the colour red, so this was terrible.

When I went back to China for the first time after 25 years, with the idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge/New Silk Road, the country had completely transformed. People were happy, they were optimistic. When I recently went back, last year, when I went to China two times, I can assure you the mood of the population had completely changed. For me, on the question whether a government is good or bad, there is a very good litmus test, and that is if the people are happy. And the people right now are optimistic; they say China has undergone an economic development which most industrialised nations needed a hundred years, 150 years or longer [to achieve], and the Chinese economic miracle is a model, which we now want to give to all countries who want to participate in the New Silk Road, and this will be a win-win policy where everybody will benefit and it will not be the interest of only one.

Now, I want to look briefly at the philosophical principles on which the BRICS countries are built, because I know that people in Europe or the United States, and probably also Australia, are so used to being governed by oligarchs, by countries, by governments which have not the common good in their interest, but the interest of a privileged class, so that we cannot imagine that there are governments that are ruled by completely different principles. But look at Narendra Modi, the new Prime Minister of India, although he is not that new anymore, but relatively. He said the BRICS countries are the first alliance in history, which is not governed by the present capacities, but by their potential of the future. And India has a great potential in its youth, 60 per cent are younger than 30 years, and when these people are educated well, they will be the greatest gift of India for all the other nations who have demographic problems, because we can send nurses, doctors, and scientists around the world, and help these other countries to develop.

Xi Jinping made many beautiful speeches which you can read, and also Modi's speeches, and I advise you to do so. He said that what is China's intention is to realise the Chinese dream, a vision of a beautiful future. He said we have an obligation and a dream for mankind which we have to fulfil. For that we need trust and unity. The old methods are not suitable for the 21st century. Each country represents a small light, but if you bring them together, we brighten up the nightly sky.

Remember that China is one of the greatest of human civilisations, and it is more than 5000 years old. It had several periods of high culture, and several periods in history when China was the most advanced country in the world. That actually lasted until the 15th century when Europe, through the Italian Renaissance, started sort of to pass ahead. But, for example, during the Han Dynasty, China was the place where new technologies were invented: silk-making, porcelain-making, book-printing and

many other things that were exchanged during the ancient Silk Road. They were extremely advanced in astronomy. When Leibniz, who lived from 1646 - 1716, was acquainted with China, he became totally fascinated, and he said that, especially in Europe after the 30 Years War which was destroying Europe by half, that in light of the increasing moral decadence, it seems almost necessary that the Chinese send missionaries to Europe so that they can teach us the practice of natural theology. He said, "I believe that if a wise man be made the judge, not on the beauty of goddesses, but on the excellence of peoples", he would give the golden apple to the Chinese.

Leibniz was also extremely excited about the fact that the Emperor Kangxi who was a contemporary, came to the same mathematical conclusions as he, Leibniz. He concluded from that, that if in Germany and in China you can come to the same universal conceptions, then there must be a universal truth which is applicable and knowable for all of mankind.

This was obviously very important. Leibniz also thought that the best way to develop the world would be that the advanced European culture shake hands with China and develop the region in between. That is exactly what is happening today.

China today is much more Confucian than Communist. The Chinese communist always had Chinese characteristics, and China never really got rid of Confucianism, despite the fact that during the Cultural Revolution there was an explicit attempt to destroy Confucianism. But China has completely swung back.

Basically, Confucius developed a system, which has been in the Chinese culture for 2500 years. He lived from 551-479 BC, and tried to find a solution for a period of utmost chaos, war and destruction. He wanted to bring order and harmony to the political situation, so he pursued mainly five principles: human development, justice, morality, wisdom and reliability.

He said, "If one rules with decrees and laws and punishment, the people may omit what is forbidden, but they will not have a sense of shamefulness. But if the people are following morality and ethical behaviour, not only will they have shamefulness, but they will strive for perfection." He also assumed, which was already previously in Chinese philosophy, that government had to have the mandate of the heavens, that they had the task to create harmony based on unity and promoting science, progress, and the common good for the people. And if the government lost the mandate of heaven because of bad government, then it would be the task of the so-called *junzi*, the noble people, to basically replace it and overcome the destruction of the state.

Confucius thought that there are four kinds of people: those who are born knowledgeable, and he did not regard himself as one of those people; second, those who acquire knowledge through learning. He thought that he belonged to that group. Those who only start to learn when they run into difficulties; and the fourth, who refuse to learn for their entire life.

He put the challenge to people, that it is morally important to improve yourself, and that people should be valued for, first, their characteristic moral qualities, and not for their social position or wealth. He called those who are striving

for knowledge and perfection *junzi* and those who are bad, the *xiaoren*. He also said that in the first group you have people who are knowledgeable and good; you have, secondly, people who are knowledgeable and bad; you have, third, people who are stupid but have a good heart; and, fourth, you have people who are both stupid and evil. Now you find many of such around today.

But he said the aim of education is not to learn facts, but to develop character and creativity. That is exactly what Friedrich Schiller and Wilhelm von Humboldt also defined as the aim of education: a beautiful character and a beautiful soul. He also wanted people to learn from paradoxes, because he wanted people not just to learn like monkeys or dogs, but he wanted to evoke a desire, a passion for learning, and thoughtfulness, not teaching dogma, but the struggle for truth; and the most perfect people are the truth-seeking people, because these are the only people who have the potential to become geniuses.

He also said that beautiful music is extremely important for the well-being of the state, and great music strengthens the harmony in the universe. Beautiful songs elevate man, but destructive music destroys the State, and one can recognise, actually, the quality of the State, by the music which is performed. Now if you apply that Confucian principle to Europe, to the United States, and, I'm afraid, also to Australia, then that gives you a very bad picture.

The two most fundamental conceptions of Confucianism, is on the one side *ren*, which means benevolent government, which Confucius says means to love people. In the Christian philosophy it is called *agape*, which means politics has to be based on love. That was also, by the way, the idea of the Peace of Westphalia: that you have to act in the interest of the other, if you want to have peace.

The second, equally important principle of Confucianism, is *li*. *Li* means that each person and each thing must take its place in the universe, and develop in the best possible way, and if all people and all things do that, and develop the potential which is embedded in them, then you have harmony in the system.

That is exactly what Xi Jinping means, when he says we have to have a "win-win" policy. The new paradigm therefore, must assume one humanity, the common interest of the human species as it is defined by the ontological order of the physical order of creation, of the physical universe, or the cosmos, as the Indians would say.

All order is in the multiplicity, based on the higher principle of the power of the Oneness which is unfolding in a contrapuntal fugue. This is the idea of Nicholas of Cusa.

The Chinese Foreign Minister, Wang Yi, recently said the new Silk Road nations must work together like instruments in a symphony, where not just one instrument plays one melody, but they all play together. I am adding that this symphony or orchestra is not just playing one chord, or a series of chords, but they are unfolding together the whole composition, which is basically the developed idea of a musical idea, and that is a very beautiful concept of how harmonious nations can work together.

Just a couple of days ago there was a conference in China where the scholar Yuan Peng, who is the Vice President of the Chinese Institute of Contemporary International Relations in Beijing, said China, and especially Xi Jinping, is not only offering a win-win policy, but a win-win-win policy. What he meant by that is that China and the United States should work together in a triangular form, in the development of Latin America, and that China could be a bridge in the development of Cuba, together with countries like Brazil, the United States and all of Latin America. And then he said we can even expand that to have a quadrangular relationship including Russia. He said Europe also needs to work with China because they are not yet out of their crisis.

So, what I am trying to tell you is that there is actually evolving in front of our eyes, with us as being time-witnesses and hopefully active players, a completely new model of relations among nations. It's based on avoiding tragedy, no conflict, no confrontation, mutual respect, and also mutual respect for the other social system that the other nation has adopted. And it's not supposed to be just for agreements, said this scholar Peng, but it is basically meant to have an attitude and a common spirit, and we have to focus on the common aims of mankind, such as the joint development of Mars.

China, India and Russia are all great space nations already, and we should reflect upon the fact of why space travel is so exciting for everybody—for young people, for old people—because it broadens the imagination. Most people, when they go shopping, just look at the floor so that they don't step in something unpleasant, or they look in the windows to see how the new clothes look, but they never, or very seldom, raise their eyes to the stars. But if you start to engage yourself in space travel and you look, for example, at how China, in its recent lunar missions, is preparing to mine helium-3 on the Moon for future fusion production, a fusion economy on the Earth, this is not only entering a new era. Once you have fusion power on Earth, you have energy security, because helium-3 will give us energy for tens of thousands of years, at least, and you will have raw materials security because through the torch method, you can turn waste into isotopes and reconstruct completely new raw materials as you wish.

So it will totally end the fight for scarce resources, and battles and wars for these resources, but it will also bring mankind into a new phase. Remember that when the astronauts, cosmonauts or taikonauts come back from space travel, they all report the same thing. When you are looking at our little blue planet from outer space, you realise we are just a tiny planet in a huge solar system, in an even huger galaxy, and within billions of galaxies. Therefore [there is] the idea of man developing together as one mankind, and starting to colonise nearby space with the idea of preserving mankind as an immortal species, because it cannot be the case, as some geologists say, that mankind appeared in the history of the universe one second before midnight and it will disappear one second after midnight. I don't think that that is acceptable. Mankind is the only truly creative species; we are the only species which can, again and again, come up with new ideas on a higher level, have new insights into the laws of the universe, and we can guarantee that our species will leave its present embryonic

condition, that war and conflict will be a question of the past, and that we will become the true creative species, which has predominantly geniuses who work together for the common good of all.

And that is what I wanted to tell you.

Question, Robert Barwick: Helga, a few weeks ago two German statesmen made an intervention into the war danger: Steinmeier and of course Helmut Schmidt, the friend of Malcolm Fraser. Could you please comment on the impact that's had since.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Steinmeier, who is very much involved in the Minsk II agreement with Hollande, Merkel, Poroshenko and Putin who are the heads of state, but the Foreign Ministers naturally do a lot of the actual preparatory work, actually went to Washington, to a conference of the CSIS and very powerfully stated that the idea of military solutions, including sending weapons to Ukraine, is completely unacceptable. At the same time, Helmut Schmidt, who is the former Chancellor who is now 95 years old, gave an interview where he warned of WWIII coming out of the Ukraine crisis, and also said a military solution is absolutely out of the question, and, very importantly, he said that responsible for the Ukraine crisis is not Russia, but the EU, and their decision at the Maastricht conference in 1992 to expand the EU eastward. Now this is very remarkable, because it goes completely against the demonisation of Putin.

It is very unusual for German politicians to not stick with the so-called "Washington Consensus", but it comes from the realisation of many Europeans, especially in Germany, France, Italy, but also other countries, that the present course of the United States and NATO is threatening to cause WWIII. Therefore they are conducting now an independent policy. This has not happened in the entire post-war period, but now it is happening. So I think it has a tremendous effect. I mean the danger is not yet over, because as long as Ukraine is in its present condition, and Breedlove, the U.S. commander in Europe, who is the actual head of NATO, and not Stoltenberg, just invited Ukraine to join NATO, which again is completely unacceptable for the German position and also the French.

I am not saying that this intervention has already completely eliminated the war danger, but I think there is a tremendous trend, where Europe starts to take care of its own interests, and the mass joining of the AIIB is the best reflection of it. And there is a lot of discussion in the background in France, in Italy, and in Germany, about the New Silk Road and this idea is becoming more attractive by the day. Modi will be the featured guest at the Hanover Fair, which is the largest industrial fair in the world, and I can assure you, this will have a big impact, because German industry is suffering more than Russia from the sanctions, and they are looking for an alternative. If Europe joins with the BRICS, then the Russia problem can be solved, because Russia is part of the BRICS. Russia takes over the chairmanship on the 1st of April and they will have the big summit of the BRICS in July and also of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, and they are preparing a completely new architecture of the BRICS, [and] the SCO. There is right now a huge conference in China, in Boao,

and they are also presenting hundreds of infrastructure projects and other such plans, and that will get more and more attractive.

So, I am not saying the danger is over. As a matter of fact, it is still there, but if we succeed to get the change in the U.S. which is now visible with the candidacy of O'Malley, who is campaigning for Glass-Steagall, together with these developments in Europe, I think we are on a more optimistic track, than in a very, very long time, [and] that we actually may find a solution and really get rid of this present war danger and start a completely new system. It is fully under way.

Question: My name is Vali. If Britain has joined BRICS [sic; the UK has joined the AIIB –ed. note], what is holding Australia and Canada back? In your view, what possible reasons [are there] for hesitation on the part of Australia for instance?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I think that in the past Australia really had only the function of being an aircraft carrier for the future war with China, and it was part of the military agreements of the Asia Pivot, and basically accepted that condition. But I think right now it requires a mobilisation on the part of you, not only you personally, but everybody in the audience and beyond, because I think we can really change that, because we have launched a petition drive, which you probably know about. This is a petition calling for Europe and the United States, and Australia, to join the BRICS and presently already several hundred signatures of important institutional people and many thousands of so-called ordinary citizens, and it is a perfect outreach. I can assure you, that we have daily meetings with people who know nothing about the BRICS because the media don't report about it, but once we tell them what a tremendous opportunity for a change in human history this is, people get it! They get the idea of a new paradigm.

In the beginning they have arguments that say, "But isn't China this? Isn't Russia this?" But once they get the dynamic of it, and once they see that these are completely different axiomatic conceptions, different principles, they get so excited and then it spreads. So the best thing you can do, is go into a rapid mobilisation. It may not be sufficient for Australia to be a founding member, because that date runs out on Tuesday [March 31]. I mean, you can go into a massive mobilisation before Tuesday, but China has already said there are several countries who will be in the second round, like Iran and many others, who may not be founding members—I think there are presently 37 or so founding members—but you can join it afterwards. And China has said almost every day now, the AIIB is open for everybody who wants to cooperate. So I wouldn't give up on Wednesday, and on Thursday, and just escalate your drive to get Australia on the side of the BRICS, because given the geographical position, or location of Australia, it is the most natural partner. I think that recognition can become the majority view in Australia, especially when Great Britain is already part of it. I don't think there is any good reason anybody could make for Australia not to do so.

Craig Isherwood: Thank you, Helga. Thank you very much for being part of our conference.