

Diane Sare

America's Voice in the Emerging New Global Architecture of Peace Through Development

This is the edited transcript of the presentation by Diane Sare to Panel 2, "Peace Through Development," 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. Sare ran as an independent LaRouche candidate for United States Senate in New York. She has the distinction, along with many other people who have spoken at Schiller Institute conferences, of being listed on a kill list put out by the Ukrainian Center for Countering Disinformation. The topic of her talk today, is probably the reason for her being on that list. The full proceedings of the conference are [available](#) at the Schiller Institute website.



Schiller Institute

Diane Sare

Exactly a week ago today, a missile landed in a Polish field, killing two farmers. While President Biden was fortunately sane enough to refrain from blaming Russia, being perhaps dimly aware of the awful implications of doing so, the immediate screaming barrage from the American press and [Ukraine's] President Zelenskyy, accusing Russia of having struck Poland—even after Biden stated that it was not a missile from Russia—should indicate that we are perilously close to the annihilation of the human race. Even if Biden has pulled us back from Armageddon this time, his general commitment to the destruction of Russia and the suppression of China can have consequences far worse than he imagines, and which neither he nor his handlers will be able to control.

In 2002, Lyndon LaRouche, in a paper titled "The Historical Individual" (which was reprinted in the Schiller Institute's *Leonore* [magazine](#)), wrote:

During each tragic moment of great crisis, every

nation, every culture is gripped by the need for a sudden and profound change in its quality of leadership. Its survival then depends upon its willingness to choose a new quality of leadership which is typified by those extraordinarily exceptional individuals who stood, in retrospect like immortal souls, apart from, and above mere popular taste of their time....

[A]s in great Classical tragedies portrayed on stage, in such times as this present moment, a moment of imperiled European civilization as a whole, the nation whose people abhor the exceptional individual in favor of popular opinion, is already doomed to be brought down: brought down, like foolish Romans drunk from their cheering for the popular mass entertainments of the Colosseum then, or foolish audiences at today's football stadium, rock concert, or video orgy, a people doomed by its own habituated, popular, inherently tragic misbelief in comfort and pleasure....

If you look at who seems to be winning American elections these days, you might presume that the American people have completely lost their minds and morals, and the world is doomed. I can't entirely rule out that possibility. However, happily or unhappily, the electoral process in the United States has been severely corrupted, and is not a reflection of the thinking of the American people. This is not to say that we had large numbers of qualified leaders running for office in the midterm elections. We had few; and like myself, they were considered enough of a threat to be placed on a Ukrainian kill list, blacked out of the press, and excluded from the debates.

Apparently, there is a fear on the part of those who could control the electoral process in the United States that people might be susceptible of responding to qualified leadership. So, that leadership must be suppressed

in all possible ways. The censorship and suppression indicate the weakness, not the strength, of those criminal elements in Western governments who are failing to convince the people of the need for war with Russia or China.

It must be understood that there is no such thing as merely avoiding war. That's the problem with the anti-war Left. There is no way to have peace if you believe that we must curtail energy and food consumption to "save the planet." There is no way to have peace if the United States refuses to collaborate with China in eradicating poverty worldwide. There is no such thing as stasis in the universe. Everything is in motion, and particularly, all things living. Human economy is no exception. Either we are progressing, or we are dying; that's it. Either we are increasing the energy throughput of the system, allowing more people to live longer, more prosperous lives, or we are creating the conditions for an uncontrollable collapse where billions die of starvation and disease.

On September 20, 1963, President John F. Kennedy gave a remarkable speech to the UN General Assembly. First, he had sharp words for differences between the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to Berlin and Cuba, and the principle of self-determination of people. He even said, "Our defense around the world will be maintained for the protection of freedom." President Kennedy went on to say:

But I would say to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and to their people, that if either of our countries is to be fully secure, we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb—a weapon better than ballistic missiles or nuclear submarines—and that better weapon is peaceful cooperation.

We have, in recent years, agreed on a limited test ban treaty, on an emergency communications link between our capitals, on a statement of principles for disarmament, on an increase in cultural exchange, on cooperation in outer space, on the peaceful exploration of the Antarctic, and on tempering last year's crisis over Cuba.

I believe, therefore, that the Soviet Union and the United States, together with their allies, can achieve further agreements—agreements which spring from our mutual interest in avoiding mutual destruction....

Finally, in a field where the United States and

the Soviet Union have a special capacity—in the field of space—there is room for new cooperation, for further joint efforts in the regulation and exploration of space. I include among these possibilities a joint expedition to the Moon. Space offers no problems of sovereignty; by resolution of this Assembly, the members of the United Nations have foresworn any claim to territorial rights in outer space or on celestial bodies, and declared that international law and the United Nations Charter will apply.

Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the Moon be a matter of national competition? Why should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing for such expeditions, become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure? Surely, we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending someday in this decade to the Moon not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all of our countries.

All these and other new steps toward peaceful cooperation may be possible. Most of them will require on our part full consultation with our allies—for their interests are as much involved as our own, and we will not make an agreement at their expense. Most of them will require long and careful negotiation. And most of them will require a new approach to the Cold War—a desire not to "bury" one's adversary, but to compete in a host of peaceful arenas, in ideas, in production, and ultimately in service to all mankind.

How many Americans are aware that President Kennedy had proposed that the Moon landing be a joint effort with the Soviet Union? And that he proposed this in the middle of the Cold War, less than one year after the Cuban Missile Crisis? Our nation has gone horribly awry. It began after the death of FDR, just before VE Day, eliminating his ability to shape the postwar world. When the American people complied with the Warren Commission cover-up of the assassination of Kennedy, we gave up a commitment to the principles expressed in that speech. And when we failed to get to the truth about rogue elements from within the United States which perpetrated the 9/11 attack on our nation, and

went around the world killing and displacing millions of people in poor countries, rather than face the terrifying truth, we surrendered to those treasonous elements within our own government.

As a result, we are now on the brink of Armageddon if we don't change our ways. That fact is becoming known to a growing number of people in the United States, and it helps that billions of people around the world live in nations whose leaders recognize that the United States no longer has the moral authority or economic strength to impose its arbitrary rules upon the

world.

However, that's not enough to ensure that we will avoid a catastrophic end. I don't think we should count on the restraint of President Joe Biden to prevent us from falling over the cliff, but we must build a robust movement in the United States in the streets, and in the town hall meetings of the Congressmen, which not only forces an end to the proxy war against Russia, but which elevates the American people to consider what a newly-sworn in President Kennedy asked of us, that we consider what we can do for mankind.

María de los Ángeles Huerta Del Río

The Role of the Media in Creating a World Movement for Peace and Development

This is the edited transcript of the presentation by María de los Ángeles Huerta to Panel 2, "Peace Through Development," 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. Huerta is a former Mexican Federal Congresswoman. She spoke in Spanish, with simultaneous translation into several languages. The full proceedings of the conference are [available](#) at the Schiller Institute website.



Schiller Institute
María de los Ángeles Huerta

briefly. When we think of these media as instruments of domination and legitimacy of the structures of power, I think that they achieve this because conventional media, particularly radio and television, the printed press, they have a capacity to invade the mind space of the public collectively and individually.

This means that the imposition of economic and political models achieved by high-level global authorities have had a very important arm of support in the large, global media chains, not much different from what was accomplished during

World War II, when Hitler himself and the Nazis repeated lies over and over until they had convinced a large portion of the population that those lies were true.

Think of what is happening now and how important this is. Eighty percent of television and radio viewers and listeners in many countries in the world depend exclusively—or that is, they feed exclusively from two or three media companies. This also happens worldwide. Seventy percent of communications equipment worldwide is in the hands of only six media groups; Seventy percent of production of information in the world is in the hands of six media groups. What does this mean? It means that the framework of a media

Greetings to all of you, and a very good afternoon!

I believe, that in order to carry out a world mobilization for peace and development, it is also necessary that we who have made proposals here about what must be done, pause for a moment, to reflect seriously on the impact of how the great global powers have used the traditional communication media until now.

I'd like to briefly say that if we think about traditional, private, commercial media in the world, we can realize that they have functioned from the beginning, as what the Italian Antonio Gramsci described as the "ideological instruments of the State." I'll refer to these