

negotiations. This goes back to an initiative of that city from 1370, when they initiated a similar peace process.

Principles or Social Contract?

But just as durable peace is not simply the absence of war, protest and opposition are not the same thing as the design of a viable new international security and development architecture. Zepp-LaRouche used her keynote address to present ten proposed *principles* for the panelists' consideration and deliberation, principles which would serve as the bedrock for such a new architecture. She cited the model of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia—as had Lyndon LaRouche in a video clip from his 1999 video “Storm Over Asia,” which was shown at the seminar—and noted that it took four years of intense discussion of such principles before peace could be achieved. So too with the *Federalist Papers* in the United States, which elaborated the political philosophy and principles underlying the new American Constitution.

Part of the problem is that many sincere opponents of today's deadly unipolar world do not agree that such principles are required or possible—or that they even exist in a scientifically knowable form to human beings. Many hold the view that the best mankind can do is to come up with the equivalent of a “social contract” among nations, a kind of Rousseauvian pact that would carve out a multipolar world where each nation's competing (and often contradictory) interests are balanced out against those of other countries or regions.

But the concept of Man underlying Rousseau's (multipolar) “social contract” is in all essentials identical with that of Thomas Hobbes's (unipolar) “Levia-

than”: a beast-like individual guided by his or her pursuit of individually defined self-interest, against those of other individuals.

An entirely different, higher solution must be found, Zepp-LaRouche argued, stating in Point 8 of her proposed principles:

A solution to the existential threat to humanity cannot be found with the help of secondary or partial arrangements, but the solution must be found on the level of that higher One, which is more powerful than the many. It requires the thinking on the level of *Coincidentia Oppositorum*, the Coincidence of Opposites, of Nicholas of Cusa.

And in her tenth and final proposed principle, she concluded:

The basic assumption for the new paradigm is, that man is fundamentally good and capable to infinitely perfect the creativity of his mind and the beauty of his soul, and be the most advanced geological force in the universe; which proves that the lawfulness of the mind and that of the physical universe are in correspondence and cohesion, and that all evil is the result of a lack of development, and therefore can be overcome.

The first panel of the Nov. 22 seminar was titled “Stopping the Doomsday Clock: The Common Good of the One Humanity.” The second panel was on “Peace Through Development.” The texts of all of the leaders' presentations in the first panel follows below.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. A Westphalian Approach

This is the edited transcript of an excerpt from Lyndon LaRouche's famous 1999 video, “Storm Over Asia,” where he takes up the matter of war, and how to actually build peace through development. It was shown during Panel 1, “Stopping the Doomsday Clock—The Common Good of the One Humanity,” of the Schiller Institute's Nov. 22 seminar, “For World Peace—Stop the Danger



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

of Nuclear War: Third Seminar of Political and Social Leaders of the World.” The full proceedings of the conference are [available](#) at the Schiller Institute website.

What is the fundamental interest of the United States? Is it to find somebody we call an “enemy,” the way the British do, and go out and say, “Let's prepare for war against this chosen, designated enemy”? Should we go

out and pick out official enemies of the United States, and stage wars with them, simply to have somebody to shoot at, or someone to hate?

Is that our policy?...

We start from scratch and we build an order, which is designed to bring peace.

Now, as a result of that Treaty of Westphalia and the agreement to this principle, we have the emergence of a policy, not a perfect policy, but the emergence of policies which included what became the policies of the United States, what became essentially the policy of community of principle as expressed by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams.

So, when we have adversaries in the world, we don't go around trying to punish people. We don't go into countries and spank them, because we don't like their internal conduct. You don't do that. Only idiots or warmongers do that. It's not allowed. Don't try to legislate morals at the point of a bayonet, of invading or occupying troops. That leads to the worst result.

And when people say, "Well, it's a terrible crime. We're morally offended. We've got to go in there and straighten these people out," all you're doing is you're spreading war. *You're spreading war that cannot be stopped!* Because, now, the people who are going in to do the punishing are the new criminals, and hatred of those criminals will result in people taking reprisals against them! And when they take reprisals, then the people who are the victims of their taking reprisals will

become angry, and they will kill, too!

So, the solution to war, as has always been understood by the great strategists of modern European civilization, and also China, is to bring peace!

Now, how do you build peace? Well, certain principles: Do we agree that a sovereign nation-state is a fundamental human right, established by modern European civilization? So the first human right we must agree upon, is the sovereignty of the other nation-state. If we can agree on that, we've got a start. If we agree that the purpose of treaty relations is to find mutually beneficial effects: Do we want to promote trade? Do we want to promote the benefits of trade? Do we want to see other nations more secure? More internally secure, with happier people, less likely to get angry and start doing terrible things?

Let's find a new way. Let's stop talking about, "we want to fight for this, we want to fight for that, we want to fight against this"—let's stop that nonsense! Let's say, what is it that we really need? Can't we find a way to cooperate, and build peace, and build security, and build cooperation? Can't we go to others and say, isn't common justice so much in the interest of us all? Haven't we learned our lesson? Isn't it time that we cooperate? Isn't it time that we build a system which is consistent with the interests of us all, as they tried to do, in the very difficult negotiations which established the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648? That's what the policy must be.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Principles of a New Security and Development Architecture

This is the edited transcript of Helga Zepp-LaRouche's Keynote Address to Panel 1, "Stopping the Doomsday Clock—The Common Good of the One Humanity," of the Schiller Institute's Nov. 22 conference, "For World Peace—Stop the Danger of Nuclear War: Third Seminar of Political and Social Leaders of the World."

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche is the founder and leader of the Schiller Institute. The full proceedings of the conference are [available](#) at the Schiller Institute website.



Schiller Institute
Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Let me greet you, wherever you may be.

What has brought people from all over the world together here in this conference, is the recognition that humanity *is* at a crossroad. There is clearly the danger that the present geopolitical confrontation—between those forces who want to assert that the Western liberal model of democracy is be the only good, and the only acceptable model, and those who insist that the idea of a unipolar world is irrevocably past