

John O'Sullivan:

Ladies and gentlemen, we have before us an extremely interesting panel, which is being provoked by an extremely powerful and interesting speech. And I don't need, I think, to introduce President Klaus, who has just spoken, or Lee who has spoken earlier, but perhaps I could just welcome in particular Anna Maria Anders. She represents her country as a senior diplomat, a kind of ministerial diplomat for dialogue throughout the world and throughout Europe. But she is also, I think, like Paula Dobriansky in the earlier panel. She represents something important as well, and that is that the end of the second World War, the trail of Poland, at Yalta, left a great number of pols in Western Europe and in the United States.

Just as the Hungarian Revolution in '56 meant the expulsion of a large number of Hungarians, who came to all over the world, but particularly to Western Europe and the United States. And the significance of these communities and in our countries, during the Cold War, in my view, can't really be overestimated.

I went to school with boys with Polish names, the sons of Polish soldiers and flyers. And it's true to say, I think, that in the 50's, the 60's and the 70's, and maybe later, if somebody on the left could not plausibly mount defense of the Soviet Union or its allies, if there was an Hungarian or a Pole or a Czech in the room, they were simply by being present as a dinner party or a conference a rebuke to appeasement or to a moral equivalent, and so I'd like to welcome you, particularly today.

Now, having said that, I think we have to begin our discussion by asking, first Anna Maria, and then Lee to respond to the remarks of President Klaus, because they were powerful, but they were pessimistic. They recognized great achievements but described a world in which those achievements were decaying or had been overthrown.

And I think we have to deal with that first. We'll go on to other questions, of course. But perhaps I could ask Anna Maria for a response.

Anna Maria:

Well, let me begin by saying how grateful I am to have this opportunity to be here today. I think the timing of this conference is particularly fruitful, since Poland is so much in the news, due to our president's visit here in Washington last week.

Ironically, the situation is similar as a time where we're talking about allies between the United States and Poland. We're thinking back on President Ronald Reagan and the Pope.

As John said, I was born in the U.K. when John Paul II was elected. I was in Paris, France when Ronald Reagan was elected. I was then only a British National. So many years later I am an American citizen. I married a U.S. colonel, and I'm also Polish citizen. In the last three years I am a Polish politician.

I think the situation is similar. I think the thing that for me is the most important, and I have heard very many important comments here, this time, is a lack of a knowledge of history.

I am appalled, traveling around the world, how little is known about history. I am appalled about the fact that so little is said about communism. We'll hear the words, "communism, communism," I don't know how many times here today. We're not hearing that. We're not hearing that, and it's not just about the young people. It is the older people. I am stunned the people in the United States, of a certain age, who don't even know that Germany invaded Poland in 1939, let alone the deportations from Poland. 1.3 million people were deported to Siberia.

And my father, I am honored to say, saved 120,000 people by taking them out of Siberia, many of whom are still alive. Their offspring is alive, all over the world.

I have taken this conference very seriously, because I'm my father's daughter. He was probably one of the most staunchly anti-communist people of note in latter years, and I feel it is my obligation to talk about that.

Moving forward, I think history, definitely we have to learn about history. But I think we also have to examine the two people who made such an impression on the world. Both had incredible charisma. I was amused to hear about the remark that they were both actors, and if you're on the stage, use that stage. I think unfortunately the world today does not have that kind of actor. I think we have people who are stronger politicians, less strong, but we do not have anybody with that charisma that is able to carry inspiration and the world with it.

How you can do it, I don't know. But I, as somebody in the Polish government, I am most concerned about the security of Poland. So, the concern is the same as it was. We talk about U.S. bases, NATO bases in Poland, we talk about Nord Stream 2 and we are trying to talk about it diplomatically. And I think the most important thing is the Transatlantic cooperation. I think moving forward that is the thing that we stand a chance to make the world go forward in the way that Ronald Reagan and John Paul II would like to have it go.

John O'Sullivan:

Thank you very much. Perhaps I could turn to Lee now and ask this question. Again, it's in the light of the remarks of President Klaus. Do you think Lee that the outcome of the post-Cold War world would have been different if Ronald Reagan's presidency had ended not in the end of 1988 but let us say in 1990, because the reward for Reagan's diplomacy and strategy towards the Soviet Union came later under George Bush. And though I think practically everybody admires the skill of the diplomacy that the Bush administration carried out, none the less, there was no sense that a great triumph of liberty and the freedom of Western society had been achieved. We played it down. Would it have been different?

Lee Edwards:

Well I think that even in America and certainly in Eastern and Central Europe there was jubilation. There was not just dancing and champagne toasts on the top of the Brandenburg gate and the Berlin Wall, but elsewhere as well. Who can forget Leonard Bernstein conducting Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and with that magnificent thing, "Ode to Freedom," not just "Ode to Joy."

So, I think that there was a very explicit celebration at that time. But getting to the question of how to respond to the president, let me put it to you this way. I think there were certain lessons to be learned from this partnership, this alliance that we've been talking about all day, and I'd like to set the modify will briefly.

Number one: ideas matter. They do matter. And that it's not just a question of power for power's sake, and it's not just a question of getting and bowing down to realpolitik. But that ideas matter, and that made a difference in the minds of both Ronald Reagan and also John Paul II.

Number two: friends and allies matter; you can't do it alone. And both Reagan and John Paul II realized that it cannot just be one single power, even the great, mighty, United States of America. Friends and allies matter.

Number three: this is almost been a day long mass, in one sense. With the very real presence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. In other words, God matters. That was certainly only one thing which came out very clearly in this. It mattered to Reagan, it mattered to John Paul II, it mattered to so many of the people around them.

Four: morality matters. Both Ronald Reagan and John Paul understood that what was involved here was a moral struggle, and that there was not a moral equivalence between east and west, between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the forces on democracy and the forces of communism.

Five: and I think perhaps this is the most important, leadership matters. You must have the right leaders. You must have men and women who dare to speak out against tyranny and big brother. You must have leaders who are charismatic and courageous. And who are driven by not just their own place in history, but trying to change history for everyone.

And I think those five lessons of ideas, friends, God, leadership and morality can lead us to a way forward and perhaps leaven the pessimism from President Klaus.

John O'Sullivan:

And I'm bound to ask the question. If that is the case, how have we reached our present condition, as described by President Klaus. In other words, do we not have those things now? Do we not have, for example, God? In the sense that when the European Union was drafting a constitution, there was a long debate about whether to include God, but not only God, but the contribution of

Christianity to European history in the preamble, and it was decided not to. Now, it turned out that the constitution was defeated in the election, so that never became a live issue, so to speak. But it's a very revealing moment, isn't it?

Lee Edwards: Yes it is, but I think also you recall what Vaclav Havel said, and I'm talking about in a parliament address to the UE Parliament. He was talking about looking back. "If we really want to talk about the right kind of Europe for the future," he said, "it must be a Europe which looks backwards to Western civilization. And that includes the Romans, the Greeks, the Jews. Antiquity as far back as we possibly can."

I think that we can learn lessons from that by looking all the way to Poland. Certainly there, the role of a transcendent being is very much apparent. If we look to Hungary, if we look to the Czech Republic, as I think you said earlier, Mr. President, that there is a very real religious presence there in the Czech Republic, and I think elsewhere as well. I think if you look and take a look, John, at these five conditions, these five lessons, that yes, some are weaker, some are stronger, but they do exist and they will come about with the right leadership. I think that's key, I think that's the most important thing. We must have the right leaders to make these come about.

John O'Sullivan: I have one point before we go to President Klaus, and that is at the end of the Cold War it was agreed in the United States that everyone had been responsible for the victory. Republicans and Democrats, left and right, now that was certainly true for the period of Truman to Kennedy, even arguably to LBJ, but it doesn't seem to have been, to me at least, quite so true for the period after 1968 when, along with other institutions, the democratic party fell under the sway of sixty-eighters and the same developments occurred in Europe. So, the end of the Cold War, people were claiming credit for a victory for freedom and liberty which many of them had been at the very least members of the peace movements, for example, ambiguous about the struggle, and didn't that agreement, in a sense, not to be honest about how the war had been won and by whom. Doesn't that disable some of the peace now? And isn't that part responsible for the disappointing developments that have occurred in Europe since then?

Lee Edwards: Well, I'm an optimist. I'm a Reagan optimist; I always have been, always will be. It that were the case we wouldn't have a memorial to the Victims of Communism just a couple of blocks from here. I worked at that for 20 years. And they said for 20 years it can't be done; and I said, "It can be done, and it will be done," with regard to a bi-partisan reproach. I'm happy to remind you, and I'm sure you know just as well as I do, Scoop Jackson and Jackson-Vanik made a tremendous difference.

Joe Lieberman was somebody who spoke out very much, and believe it or not ladies and gentlemen, the number two democrat in the House of Representatives, Steny Hoyer, is an anti-communist, and did accept our Truman-Reagan medal of freedom and spoke at our founding next year, after we

founded The Victims of Communism Memorial. So, I think there are bright spots there. I don't disagree with you that there are problems, that there are flaws, but there are many things to applaud.

Anna Maria:

I just wanted to say that everybody was so busy patting each other on the back for the victory over the Cold War, that nobody saw the next hurdle coming. was treated as you know somebody who was overreacting when we were talking about Russia, when we were talking about Putin. It was the Crimean War, not the war but the take-over of Crimea, that made the world wake up. And really in the United States, too, there was a reduction in arms. We're only now beginning to pick up from there. Everybody felt that the whole Cold War was over forever. Are we in a Cold War now? We're certainly not in a friendly situation. But I think we have not been able to prepare. I think that is the real problem.

John O'Sullivan:

President Klaus, an important moment in the post-war world occurred in 2009, when 22 distinguished European intellectuals and political leaders sent a message to the U.S. administration then under the control of President Obama, in a sense appealing for a greater US commitment to, not Europe as a whole only, but also particularly Central Europe where as they said America had some of its strongest allies. And that appeal was in effect ignored. Now, in your view, what should the American government have done, and particularly, do you see a gradually declining interest in Europe from the US. And particularly, how does your pessimism stand up against these optimists?

President Klaus:

First, I really don't accept the label of being a pessimist. This is absolutely untrue and I would strongly differentiate a pessimist from a realist, and I am absolutely sure that my approach is realistic. I am not an advocate of daydreaming; I am not an advocate of wishful thinking, and therefore, I always try to be realistic.

This is my first point which I would like to stress. Your last point was about what would be my recommendation to the United States. John, we understood that we should give advice to us, to ourselves; we shouldn't pretend to be clever enough to give advice all over the world. Therefore, I am not recommending anything to the United States of America. That's my point.

As Lee Edwards mentioned in his several preconditions, one of them is ideas; ideas matter. I fully agree, more than anything else, and in case of Ronald Reagan, John Paul II and Margaret Thatcher, it was just the case. They were not just pragmatists doing government jobs as daily business. They were idealists and they were optimists, and they had strong views and strong ideas. So, I fully agree that ideas matter, but what does it mean if we look at the world around us.

If you look at our politicians, most here in Western Europe, in Eastern Europe, are there any ideas among contemporary politicians? I don't see anyone with strong views, strong ideas, and if there are ideas, they are ideas that are, for me, totally unacceptable. The politicians say post-democracy, post-nationalism, post-I don't know what else, pro-Europeanism, and so on. So. I am absolutely

convinced that ideas matter. More than anything else, in this respect, I'm an idealist, definitely. But I am afraid that there are no great ideas among the current politicians.

So, that's my pessimism, and therefore, I don't see some hopeful tomorrows or days after tomorrow. Who will do it? Excuse me to be that realistic?

John O'Sullivan: Well, I want to come back to them to break that down into several areas. But Anna Maria, you wanted to come in.

Anna Maria: Let me put my American hat on for a minute. I am a Polish politician, but I'm a U.S. citizen. And I feel, since I'm a U.S. citizen, perhaps I can give some advice to the U.S. government.

I think that the U.S. government has to make sure that Europe is safe. An unsafe Europe is trouble for the United States, because Europe is unable to cope on its own. We've seen through history; we've seen it in 1995 in Bosnia. The United States had to step in, and we've seen it, obviously in the second World War. So, I think we cannot run the risk. The alliance between the United States and Poland is very good. The alliance between the United States and the rest of Europe, at the moment, is not that good. The relationship between Poland and the rest of Europe is not that good. I think we need another Ronald Reagan, we need another John Paul II, we need another Margaret Thatcher and another Gorbachev to make this happen, because we don't have the right players, at the moment.

We talked a lot about transatlantic alliance. I was at the SEPA conference the other day. Absolutely, but at this moment I have more faith in a transatlantic alliance than I have in a European alliance, because all the countries in Europe are divided. Until, Europe can work together, we cannot unite, and that's very, very important.

John O'Sullivan: I would like to come back to all of those points, quickly.

If we're talking about a lasting legacy, let's break it down into economics, religion – we're talking about the Pope as well as Reagan today – and politics, in particular, democracy. But let's deal with religion first, because no one on the panel here is a theologian. But I know at the end of his life, the pope was depressed by the extent to which central and Eastern Europe have not, in a sense, revived their belief in Christianity in Europe, as he had hoped, once communism had gone. In fact, one could argue that eastern and central Europe had been, so to speak, infected by the anomie and depressiveness of the West, rather than enjoying the prosperity to afford them and indeed not getting the prosperity.

So, the first question I would like to put to all three of you, quickly: Is the Pope's disappointment understandable or correct? And if so, how should we respond to it?

He felt that Christianity was decaying faster, rather than it had before, that maybe Christianity had been strengthened by the oppression of the Communist system. I doubt that myself, but it's an argument. But at the end of 15, 20, 25 years, how do we feel that Christianity in Europe is doing, after the great effort made for it by Pope John Paul II?

Anna Maria: Not great. Generally, not great. I think in Poland, religion was what kept Poland going during the Communist years. And the fact that St. John Paul II came along, it was definitely instrumental in solidarity movement. And the church in Poland it's still pretty strong, although not as strong as it used to be. But that doesn't go for the rest of Europe, and it certainly doesn't go for the rest of the world. And I think the problem is that we see Christianity suffering all over the world now with the rise of Islam. And really nobody is coming particularly to the rage, and I think if John Paul II was alive today, if he were depressed then, I think he would be even more depressed today.

John O'Sullivan: And it's fair to say, I think that most European governments, not all as we know, have not responded with enthusiasm to the cause of persecuted Christians, but rather wished it would go away.

Would you like to add anything Lee?

Lee Edwards: Well, I think one of the most touching things that I heard today was the story of the pope in Zaire. And I think that that is where one of the futures for, not the Catholic church – I happen to be Catholic myself – but for Christianity.

I think that there is a rising, there is an explosion, there is an awakening throughout all of Africa, in a belief in God, in both Protestant, Evangelical pursuits and also in terms of Roman Catholic. And so, I think the image which is remaining in my mind is not what you refer to as the pope's pessimism, but the pope reaching out to that little child in that hospital in Zaire and rocking it in his arms, loving it and caressing it. It seems to me that that is a more likely image.

Yes, we're in a crisis; yes, there are problems here in America and also elsewhere. It looks as though the bad guys are on the rise and are advancing, but history tells us that precisely at a critical time like this, in a time of crisis, leadership arises and the people come together. And I don't want to get into the politics and give you the specifics, but I can name several very charismatic, courageous, politicians, political leaders who are under 40, whom you will be hearing about in a very short period of time.

President Klaus: First, I am someone, compared to our lady here, who has spent two-thirds of his life in communism, so I would like to argue that fighting communism, at least in

our part of the world, was not done with the Catholic church ideology on our minds. That was only one of the aspects of the people who are opposing communism and who wanted to bring communism to an end. To expect the fall of communism would mean that their removal of Christianity and of the devotion to the Catholic Church was a naive assumption, and I think it's not worth discussing now.

Second, I am afraid that the Catholic Church with the popes created some problems as well. I think that Pope John Paul II was able to inspire all of us, not only true believers, in Catholic relation. I am afraid that the new pope is damaging all of that credibility. This is very leftist, very progressivist, very liberal views which he is defending all over the world. So, this is, for me, a fatal blow to Christianity and to the Catholic religion, so don't blame the people in central and Eastern Europe for not jumping on the Pope Francis band wagon.

Lee Edwards: Well I would just add this, John, that Jesus Christ left someone behind when he left, and he's still with us, called the Holy Spirit. And the Catholics believe that the Holy Spirit will be there and is there and is guiding. Now it may very well be that the outcome is not going to be one that we are going to like, but we do believe that there will be one, which in the end, will bring about a more believing world and that has been the case.

President Klaus: That's true, but I definitely have to blame the Catholic church itself as well. Some 15 years ago, as president of the country, I vetoed the new bill about the so called "registered partnership." The Catholic church was silent. I, as president, vetoed the bill, and then I met the Confederation of Czech Bishops and they were saying to me, "Thank you very much, you are so brave for doing that," and I said, "Excuse me, I expected that you would be loud enough to protest against this, not waiting for my veto in that bill." So, it's always more complicated.

Lee Edwards: I agree with Vaclav. And the problem is the bishops. The bishops were the problem that you were working with, and the bishops are the problem now. And unless they act, and I think they better act, then the people will rise up, and you will see a different kind of church in the years ahead.

John O'Sullivan: I think I'm going to try to sum up this particular bit of discussion by saying that there are times when the hand of providence is clearer than other times. The Reagan, Thatcher and John Paul II time, the hand of providence was, I think, much clearer than it is today.

Anna Maria: I just want one remark, I think what the president said was that John Paul II was able to inspire everybody. There was an exhibition yesterday in the shrine of St. John Paul II. I looked around, and even though I know the story, I must say that I was fascinated at the photographs of him with thousands and thousands of people. Now, you know I didn't live in the United States when Ronald Reagan was president, so I don't know what kind of divisions you had. But it seemed to me that the one thing that they had in common was the ability to work across



the aisles. And certainly, you see John Paul II working with religious leaders from all over the world, and you see Ronald Reagan working with leaders all over the world.

I think this is a problem which certainly exists in Poland; it exists here in the United States. So I think apart from the fact that we need a leader who is charismatic, I think we really do need a leader who is able to work with everybody.

John O'Sullivan:

Thank you. Now, we don't have a great deal of time left, so I'd like to sort of hurry the debate along, and bring the question of economics, in which, President Klaus, you have great experience as a man who is very successful of reviving and transforming and reviving the economy of Czechoslovakia.

Let me ask you this. At the moment, the record of growth of unemployment and generally of the economic initiative in Western Europe in particular is rather weak, and it doesn't seem to be doing particularly well. Furthermore, you have the problems associated first with the 2008 crash, and secondly with the Euro.

So, is the economic optimism of the first ten or fifteen years of the post-Cold War world now vanished, or not the optimism, but the prospects for a better economic future?

Anna Maria:

I feel very optimistic about Poland. I think that we don't have the positive narrative in Poland. The GDP is going up, mood is ranking it higher. We don't have a problem with the economy, we have a problem with the media. We have a problem with the message getting across.

I think in the last year or so, we really are going forward. I have been to several, it's not only that I visit Polish people around the world, but I travel with other ministers. And we have an awful lot going on in Poland, so as regards, in my country, I feel very optimistic.

President Klaus:

Well, I must say that in the moment of the fall of communism, in the moment of our Velvet Revolution, as we use to call it in Czechoslovakia, our dream was freedom, pluralistic parliamentary, democracy, and market economics, as I always stressed, market without objectives. That is what we've got now. At least in the last decade or two, it's definitely not freedom, not pluralistic parliament, not democracy, and not free markets in Europe. In many respects the European economy is as regulated as that in the late-communism, when communism was already soft. So, for me, the economic system in Europe is very far from our dreams and even dreamers as well. And the free markets are not there, and I'm afraid in the United States of America, also not. You mentioned the Euro. The Euro was a tragic mistake to introduce in Europe; it is a debilitating project. I wrote books about it; there's no time to develop those points. But this is the dream in our part of the world.

You mentioned the rate of unemployment growing; I must say that the Czech Republic has the lowest unemployment rate in Europe these days. Our almost crazy rate of unemployment is 2.6%, which is economically, for any economist, an unsound figure creating pressures in the labor market. But there are differences in countries. Poland is definitely very efficiently, very cleverly using all the European subsidies, and it helped very much for me. Our idea was not only to privatize, to deregulate, to desubsidize the economy.

We did it. We eliminated all kinds of subsidies, and to our great regret, subsidies are coming back through the European Union, something we don't want, which creates lots of problems. So that will be a different topic to speak about the economic system in Europe. My topic, I would be pleased to do it.

John O'Sullivan: I would like to now turn to the question of democracy, because as we know, this is now a subject of great debate and contestation on both sides of the Atlantic. I want to suggest very briefly that there seems to be two battles. One is the European Union, and particularly France and Germany, are critical of what is happening, in Poland and in Hungary, but elsewhere too, in which they allege that courts are restricted, the media is controlled, and democratic decisions, even though there may be elections, are not really true and free and fair.

On the other hand, the critics of the EU quote Ralf Dahrendorf a former Commissioner who said that if the EU tried to join the EU, it wouldn't be accepted because it didn't meet the democratic criteria. Therefore, the charges against Poland, Hungary and other countries fall by the wayside because they're not made by a democratic institution. So, I want to ask Anna Maria first to respond.

Anna Maria: Yes, I knew you were going to ask me first.

So, let me go back to a conversation that I had with Senator McCain when the government changed in Poland. He and a number of other Senators sent a letter to Poland saying they were worried about democracy, they were worried about the Supreme Court, and so on and so forth.

I met him several months after that letter and I said, "Well, Senator, why would you say this?" "Well," he says, "this and this and this and this." And I said, "Well, where are you getting your information from?" He says, "Well, I only ever get one-sided information."

I think we are still dealing with a problem of information. So, as President Obama liked to say, "Let me be clear." First of all, you can read any newspaper you like in Poland. They are certainly not all friendly. We have two tabloids that regularly bash us. And *Gazeta Wyborcza*, which is also not friendly, nobody writing on there on those papers ends up in jail. We have had, God knows how many, protests in the streets, and nobody ends up in jail. So, I was asked by a democratic Senator that same visit that I met with Senator McCain, what about

women's rights in Poland? And how many women are in the court? And I am flabbergasted that we get this bad press, and we still get this bad press. There are several people who write continuously in the United States who are always bashing the government. At the moment we are told they are not democratic because, well, we have several issues.

We have a problem with the migrants. We definitely have the problem with the courts, where we are told that we are now controlling the courts. That is a long subject and I don't want to get into that, that needs its own separate debate.

But I really honestly think that to accuse Poland of being a non-democratic country, it must be said we want to have our identity. We were under Communist rule for so many long years; we want to have our identity.

Let me go back to what Ronald Reagan said, "Let Poland be Poland." That's what we want; we want Poland to be Poland, and we do not want to be ruled by the EU.

Lee Edwards: You know, John, what is so hard for me to figure out is that people keep criticizing Hungary and Poland for all of these anti-democratic measures, which they're allegedly carrying out. And yet, the last time that I looked at it, I believe, that the present government in Hungary has been elected three elections in a row by 2/3rds majority, the people speaking out. And I believe in Poland, at least in the last election, at least the last several elections, the same way.

So, the people are voting democratically, providing majorities. The government is moving ahead, and isn't that democracy in action? So, perhaps we Americans shouldn't be quite so quick to criticize our friends and allies over there, and just let them go about their business as their people seem to want to do.

John O'Sullivan: Of course, one of the charges is that in these countries, great majorities of newspapers, particularly in Hungary, are said to be under all support of one party, which I think would never happen in the United States.

President Klaus: Talking about the EU, I have a real problem. Because it was me, as Prime Minister, who sent a letter to Brussels in January 1996 asking for a membership in the EU. And it was me in April 2004, as President of the country, who signed the entry into the EU.

There was no other chance for an ex-communist, or post-communist country; we had no chance to do it differently. We didn't have the luxury of being independent like Switzerland. And we didn't have the luxury of being an island close to Europe as Great Britain. So, we couldn't afford it; we were in the heart of Europe, surrounded on all sides by EU members. So, we had no other chance. Nevertheless, I am since the very beginning someone who opposes the wrong idea of European unification. I am very much in favor of European integration, which is the beginning of the European process. Unification is a post-democratic

concept which I can't agree with. So, I was applauding the Brexit decision. I think either the countries would leave the EU, or the EU would undergo radical systematic transformation, a real substantial change. Otherwise, the EU has no future. I'm sorry, there are two representatives of the Czech Embassy here so I am sure they are already now reporting with the Czech ministry for interference.

John O'Sullivan: I think we now have three minutes to go. I'm going to ask you a question about one of the issues today, populism. That is now a force in Europe which is growing in importance.

Is populism a dangerous threat to democracy on the one hand, or is populism instead a democratic response to the fact that remote elites have been imposing policies on European countries, which the people don't want, which they're now rebelling against and going to the Populist Parties for it? And, at the second half of that question, if Reagan and Thatcher were here today – it wouldn't really apply to the pope – would they be described as populists?

Lee Edwards: I think that you must make a distinction between historical populism and modern populism.

A Populist Party is a party which represents the people, the will of the people; I'm talking about modern populism. And here in America, we have had, particularly in the Republican side, a string of populism since Barry Goldwater, since Ronald Reagan, since the moral majority, since the Tea Party, since even President Trump. All of that is populist expression of the will of the people. And those populists are saying, "Limited government, free enterprise, strong national defense," classic American ideals.

John, let me say, just to throw in my two cents in terms of taking something out of today's brilliant... hasn't it been marvelous? I mean the quality of the panel and of the moderators has been fantastic, and believe me, particularly the moderator. And I've been to a hell of a lot of these things in my life, and this is one of the best things I've ever been to.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to leave two phrases, two ideas, one from the pope and one from President Reagan. From the pope, "Be not afraid." This is what I am taking away from this meeting. And with Ronald Reagan it's that famous Thomas Paine one, which is, "We have it in our power to make over the world again." And I think if we can take those away from this, they can inspire us to make necessary advances, necessary reforms that we need to make this country and this world a lot better.

Thank you, John, for indulging me.

President Klaus: Just two sentences. First, I hope I will never make a mistake using the term populism or the objective populist in my speeches, in my remarks. This is a

wrong label, misused label; this is not an unethical term, so I would suggest never allow people to use the term populism, because it is an artificial edict of the political elites on all those who disagree with what is going on. This is my very strong statement. And second, optimism: you know there is a famous German saying, "Optimismus ist flich," which means, "optimism is an obligation."

John O'Sullivan:

Well, I'm afraid we don't have time for the last question which was going to be, Is Emanuel Macron the man who is going to save Europe? And so, may I ask you to show your appreciation for a tremendous panel?