

Schiller Institute Weekly Dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Urgent Appeal from Russian General: Citizens of the West, Wake Up Before It's Too Late!

The following is an edited transcript of the Aug. 28, 2024, weekly Schiller Institute dialogue with Schiller Institute founder and chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Embedded links and subheads have been added. The video is available [here](#).

Harley Schlanger: Hello and welcome to this week's webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and Chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. This is Wednesday, August 28, 2024. I'm Harley Schlanger and I'll be your host today. You can email your questions and comments to questions@schillerinstitute.org or post them to the chat page.

Helga, you've been emphasizing for the last week or so that the next three to six months will be the most dangerous period in human history, and the International Peace Coalition has just issued a statement on what must be done to avoid tragedy, titled "Council of Reason, Not Council of War!" available on the Schiller Institute [website](#).

Interestingly, as NATO has been running roughshod over red lines, Russian Major General Apty Alaudinov called on citizens in the West to "wake up" and get into the streets and demonstrate. In this context we have our first question from a U.S. podcaster with military ties. He writes: "Clearly the Western establishment has decided to use war and wartime methods, such as coups, assassinations, and censorship to protect their empire. What do you think it will take to move more prominent individuals to back your efforts to have Western nations give up their imperial dreams, and instead work with the BRICS and the Global South?" And he refers to

the statements of Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., and Tulsi Gabbard when they were endorsing Donald Trump, in which they warned of the danger of nuclear war. Are these the kinds of statements that can help move us away from World War III?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I think it's definitely useful and extremely urgent. I think the first step to avoid catastrophe is that the populations all over the world, not just on both sides of the Atlantic, but emphatically also in the Global South, wake up to the ab-



Mil.gov.ua

Ukrainian soldiers on deployment. The Kursk invasion has made NATO's direct involvement to defeat Russia undeniably clear.

olutely urgent fact that we are on the verge of nuclear war. And this is not generally understood in the depth and the seriousness of the situation. Because in the recent days, many experts and analysts, also on both sides of the Atlantic, have made the argument that the Ukraine invasion of the Kursk region of Russia is not what some media were initially portraying it as, namely that Ukraine would make a surprise attack on Russian territory, conquer some Russian territory as a bargaining chip for negotiations when there are peace settle-



U.S. Army/Spc. Trevares Johnson

A truck-fired missile launch in Germany. "Allied" NATO deployment of long-range missiles on its German soil will make it a Russian target.

ments, that Ukraine would have something to bargain with, in terms of territory occupied by Ukraine inside Russia.

Now, what emerges instead is a picture, which I think is no longer in doubt, that the reason why the Ukrainians put their best-equipped and best-trained battalion into Kursk has a completely different nature: That is without any doubt a brigade, not like the people in the Donbass who are dying in high numbers every day, but a brigade trained at the highest level of NATO training, NATO equipment, and NATO satellite support, the top, top, top NATO standard. So, the question I asked myself initially, why would Ukraine, or whoever is backing Ukraine, do this? Why not reinforce the troops in Ukraine itself who are clearly losing territory all the time? Is it just for PR effect, is it to prove that Ukrainians are still capable of delivering, and therefore promoting to have Western equipment continuously sent? That was one hypothesis, but now, as more reports are coming in, more experts are making their statements, it is more clear that the reason is that it's actually part of a NATO attack against Russia, with the aim to keep going, to not stop; and I think it's very definitively reaching the point, or may have already reached the point that the threat to the territory and integrity of Russia is

becoming such that Russia's nuclear doctrine would kick in. Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov repeated that just yesterday, and said that the men and women who are controlling the nuclear weapons in the West are playing with fire: They're playing with matches as if they had never grown up. And others, like Gilbert Doctorow, a well-known expert, he basically makes the argument that it has already reached the point where the nuclear option is the only thing left for Russia.

Obviously, the Russian military, General Staff and leadership, know that part of the game is to entrap Russia into using nuclear weapons, which obviously, if that would happen, would be aimed to discredit Russia, especially in the eyes of the rest of the world, the Global South, China, and many other forces, everybody around the world would

distance themselves from Russia.

I don't know: This is becoming ludicrous. This is becoming a game and calculations with nuclear Armageddon, with the possibility of the extinction of human civilization. And given the fact that the whole control of the military-industrial complex, that NATO is obvi-



Russian embassy, NZ

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov



X page

Nuclear weapons expert Gilbert Doctorow

ously of vital interest to those who are in power, right now, I think there will be any effort made to prevent Trump from winning the presidency again. The danger zone is now. We are reaching the end of certain processes all at once right now. So, I am sticking to my concern that the period between now and the election, and then the next point, when the new President enters into the White House, is the period of the heightened,

most dangerous instability so far. That doesn't mean that, depending on how things go, that that danger won't diminish afterward, but I think we have to be absolutely on alert, and I think the situation is much, much more dangerous than during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis; it's for sure more dangerous than during the 1980s middle-range missile crisis, and at that time, there were hundreds of thousands of people in the streets to protest against it. And I think what's required now is not hundreds of thousands, but millions of people in the streets everywhere.

Schlanger: Part of that question of waking up is for all of our viewers to send in your questions and comments, participate in the dialogue, and then take it out to everyone you know: Because we have to have that kind of mobilization that's been going on with the International Peace Coalition.

Helga, given what you just said, there's a question that just came in: "Do you think NATO is crazy enough to attack Russian nuclear energy plants?"

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, obviously, in a lot of things that are happening, they are done in such a way that they always involve the possibility of "plausible denial." I don't think we'll see a situation in which NATO openly would attack a Russian nuclear power plant, unless you are in the middle of actual warfare already. But I think the danger that it would happen is enormous, and there were three drone attacks on nuclear plants—one on Zaporozhye, and two against the Kursk NPP—which the Russian air defense systems defeated, so they were unable to cause any damage.

But about that, I want to really say that several nuclear scientists have commented, in the meantime—and what I find most remarkable—is that the Greens internationally, especially the Greens in Germany, which for decades were saying, "We are against civilian use of nuclear energy because what if there would be a military attack on a nuclear plant, it could cause incredible radiation and terrible damage." Well, I have not heard one peep from the Greens in Germany, nor any other

Greens, condemning the three Ukrainian drone attacks on the two nuclear plants! And the fact that Russia was able to shoot them down does not diminish the intention of those who were firing the drones. So, the Greens, in my view, have completely discredited themselves again as complete frauds, totally ideological, not in any way concerned about nuclear fallout, just as they are unconcerned about any other damage, such as the CO₂ emissions from war deployments, such as warships and planes. In my view, the lack of action by the Greens, should really give Green voters something to think about.

Schlanger: That leads into the next question, that comes from a Russian TV news producer, who asked



Commons: RIA Novosti

The Kursk nuclear power plant, a target of the Ukrainian invasion of Russia.

about the September 1 state parliament elections in Thuringia and Saxony, and the possibility for a major shake-up—a major defeat—for the government coalitions, including the Greens. He asks: "Will this change things in Germany? Will this change the Scholz government's position of being totally subordinate to the Anglo-American policy?"

Zepp-LaRouche: It will be a big blow, for sure. If it's enough to really change this government, one has to see. As of now, the polls in both Thuringia and Saxony show that the AfD [Patriots for Germany] will come in first, the CDU [Christian Democrats] in Saxony will lose its office as minister-president; and the Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht (BSW) will come in strong, as

second or third. Now, let me point out something extremely important in this context: Saxony's Minister-President Michael Kretschmer (CDU) was leading in the polls until recently. Then he made a statement that, while he is for negotiations and dialogue with Russia, he nevertheless backs the stationing of U.S. long-range missiles in Germany from 2026 onward, whereupon his polls dropped below number one, and it may very well be that the AfD will be the strongest party come the September 1 election.



CC BY-SA 4.0: Sandro Halank

Saxony Minister-President Michael Kretschmer lost his lead by calling for stationing NATO long-range missiles in Germany.

The Ghost of ‘*Deutsche Sonderweg*’

Now, let me say a few words on the long-range missiles stationing. It's much more important than people think. This was apparently a decision made by the United States; that's what Scholz said after the NATO summit last month, and he said it was a good decision. He admitted, therefore, that there was no German participation in it. It now seems that there were discussions before the NATO summit, between Germany and the United States on that topic. One, first of all, has to see it in the context of the change of the nuclear doctrine by the United States in March, which was secret; it's not even electronically available, because it's so top-secret, and it changes the U.S. nuclear posture to an expected three-front war, against Russia, China, and North Korea. That was in March. So, apparently, when the NATO summit occurred in July, that obviously was already under the rubric of the changed U.S. nuclear doctrine, and therefore also the decision to deploy long-range missiles in Germany.

There was no broad discussion in NATO about this bilateral agreement between Germany and the United States. There is no mention of it in the NATO statement in July, and what that means is that a decision that clearly changes the strategic balance between Russia and the United States, and severely threatens and aggravates the security interest of Germany, making it a nuclear target—because Russia will for sure counter it with symmetric or asymmetric, but more likely sym-

metric countermoves—means there was no debate, obviously not in Germany; not in the Bundestag, not in the public, not in the media, but also not generally among the European allies!

Now, contrary to NATO's December 1979 “Dual Track” policy, which led to the Pershing II/SS-20 middle-level missile crisis in the beginning of the 1980s— At that time there were four additional [NATO] allies, which were consulted on that. This time [they were not consulted]. Now, for the first time in the entire postwar history, Germany is singularly doing something. That German decision brings forward the ghost of the *deutsche Sonderweg*, Germany's special path, which historians

hold responsible for the road that ended in National Socialism and the Nazis in the 1930s. So, for Germany to again go on a single path without consultation with the allies, when that decision clearly touches upon the security interests of all the allies in Europe, because the consequences will be felt by not only Germany, but also by all of Europe, I can only predict that many of the smaller countries will feel that their security interests have been again trampled on by this German unilateral decision. And I think, given the tension in the EU already, that will have a very erosive effect on the unity of NATO, on the unity of the EU, because it is not something built on trust, on confidence, or reliability; and I think that it is felt by people.

I think the discussion about that has just begun, because it's quite a while until 2026, but February 2026 is also the time when the [New START](#) treaty runs out, and at that point, you will have absolutely no single disarmament agreement any more, and that is the time when the U.S. is planning to put their long-range missiles into Germany. So, if there is not a super-escalation in the immediate period, which I think there will be, I think by the latest at that point, you will have a major crisis in Europe. And people are sensing that: The more intelligent and more watchful parts of the population are already concerned, and that is why the political parties that are endorsing this, are dropping in the polls

like a hot potato. And I think the consequences of that are absolutely severe. In any case, I wanted to say that, because there is a lot more going on than just meets the eye, but I think one can be sure that Germany will change nationally, because these two state elections in September, and another one later in the year, have national implications.

Schlanger: On what you were just talking about, we have a question from one of our regular correspondents. “What about differences in NATO generals that we are not privy to seeing? Are there divisions? Are there differences?”

Zepp-LaRouche: For sure, because what I just referred to before. If these missiles, which are supposed to be American missiles on German soil— There was previously a discussion that there should eventually be a joint Italian-French-German missile system that is apparently affected by this, and behind the scenes, I’m quite certain that there is a lot of disunity; and if you look at the political landscape in Europe right now, it’s one of chaos. That’s not exaggerated. France has no government yet; [President] Macron is nixing certain options. France is in chaos. The coalition government in Berlin is the most unpopular government in the post-war history of Germany; I think other, smaller countries, such as Hungary, Slovakia, but also other countries in Eastern Europe are really not agreeing with the present course, so we are sitting on a powder keg. And what I said is, this unilateral decision by the United States, emphatically forcing it down the throat of Germany, to put these missiles into Germany, will have a very eroding effect.

Schlanger: We have some questions coming in that relate to the idea of wartime preparations, such as censorship and so on. Diana from Canada says, “I’m certain most Canadians have no idea what’s happening outside the country. National media won’t cover it. I think it will take a horrible event such as 9/11 to wake them up.”

We have also from an Australian who is active in the Assange campaign—the campaign to free Julian Assange—who said, “After all of the exposure of the efforts in the Assange case to suppress free speech, they’re at it again in a bigger way, targeting Scott Ritter; the arrest of the CEO of Telegram, Pavel Durov; the chasing of the Rumble CEO out of Europe—he said he

had to leave Europe for security reasons; the arrest of Richard Medhurst.” And she says, “Where are the honest reporters who should be reporting this? Where are the civil libertarians? Where are the statesmen?”

The Interests of Humanity

Zepp-LaRouche: [laughs] Well! That’s a very appropriate question, “Where are they?” I think there is right now a lawsuit—I’ve forgotten where it came from, but it came maybe from South Africa or from some other Global South country—against the mainstream media for having been complicit in the genocide in Gaza. And while that may not look like the most urgent question, in light of what’s going on there— I think it’s the absolutely unbelievable horror: 20% of the people in Gaza are reported dying of acute hunger and starvation, and the world is doing nothing adequate to stop it! which I think will be a stain on the memory and the conscience of all of those who have been quiet about it.

But even worse, the mainstream media for the most part, are part of the narrative that always says, “following the aggression by Hamas on October 7, 2023,” and then they say whatever else is happening, but always you have to give it the appearance that what is happening now is the result of what happened on October 7, and covering up to a very large extent the enormity of what is going on in Gaza. So these media are being sued for, being held complicit, of being co-responsible. And maybe this will not affect the events today and tomorrow, because, also the deployment of the two U.S. aircraft carriers in the region has raised questions, what are they there for? Possible regional war in the Middle East, or are they part of a larger deployment in the NATO confrontation against Russia? But whatever happens in the short term, if we get out of this crisis alive, which is not certain by any means, because we are closer to World War III than at any time before—if we get out of this, the behavior of the West, the media, of the so-called high-level politicians, that will not go away. It will be a stain on the conscience, a stain in the history, because, people who were in power may think we are in a pre-war situation, and therefore we can order that there is only one view allowed; but if you look back in history, the historians (provided there will be any, which is not certain), there will be a history written, and that history will not be written this time by the victorious powers, like in the Second World War postwar period. Recently the role of the

Soviet Union has been written out of that history in the Western textbooks. But given the dramatic change taking place right now, where the Global South is already playing a much larger part in developments, I'm really concerned that if we don't find our way back, in Europe, in the United States, we will be discredited for a very, very long time. If you think about how long it took Germany to recover from being at the low point at the period of the Nazi dictatorship, I think we are really urgently required to change our course and go back to dialogue. We may be beyond that point already, because we have gambled away a lot of options already.

But it has to now be a broad discussion among the people, in the parliaments, but the entire public is called on to debate this! We cannot go like sheep to the slaughterhouse: We have to have an open discussion: What is in the interest of our countries? and humanity as a whole?

Schlanger: We have a report in here, Helga, that this is the largest number of people watching live that we've ever had. That's a good sign, but we need to keep building it.

Emmanuel sent a note saying that his view is that the purpose of the Kursk campaign by Ukraine and NATO, is to provide political cover for incumbents hoping for re-election, and who will, indeed, continue the war.

Now, on that note, we had an earlier question: "Is there anything to the report that the International Criminal Court will proceed with indictments of [Israeli Prime Minister] Netanyahu and [Defense Minister] Gallant, and the Palestinian leaders?"—and of course, two of them who were part of the indictment are dead now. But the person asks, "Why won't [presidential candidate Kamala] Harris endorse the ICC report if she really cares about Palestinians?"

Zepp-LaRouche: I think people should ask her that at any rally, at any town meeting and election event possible. Because the reality of the situation concerning the genocide in Gaza, is that there is only one place that could stop it, and that is the U.S. government. And obviously, Biden backed Netanyahu up to this point, and Kamala Harris pretends to be more sympathetic, but I



CC/Gage Skidmore

U.S. presidential candidate, Vice President Kamala Harris, has not changed from the Biden policy, but attempts to show more sympathy for Palestinians.

think there is only one way to stop it, and that would be that the United States would have to bring in their full power, to lean on Israel in such a way that they have to do it. And they're the only ones.

So, I think the fact that that is not coming, should— That just proves that Kamala Harris has not changed from one policy to the opposite; she has not undergone that transformation. She is just obviously in an election campaign— A lot of words are being used to create a positive image. But I'm still waiting for anything substantial coming from Kamala Harris. I have not seen any sign of it.

Council of Reason

Schlanger: I don't think you're the only one waiting. I think the whole press corps claims to be waiting, but they haven't pressed her, yet.

Again, I would encourage people to go to the Schiller Institute website and download the August 26 [statement](#) from the International Peace Coalition, "A Council of Reason, Not a Council of War!" There are a few questions on this, that I think we can conclude with. From a regular, Gerry, he asks about a Westphalian agreement with Britain: Shouldn't that be the emphasis, to try to get an agreement with Britain, since they're so much involved in things?" And he also says, "I think the constant rhetoric about nuclear war is actually instigating it. What do you think about that?"

Zepp-LaRouche: There is a recent interview by an Italian general, who was the head of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. And he basically said that the instigator of this present Ukraine crisis is the British. And I think that is absolutely the case, and therefore, I do not put my hopes on the British at all, simply because their empire is what is at stake.

Now, people think the British Empire no longer exists: I think it definitely exists in the form of the Anglosphere, the idea of the neocons to rule the world based on the special Anglo-American relationship. And that is why we are in the mess we are in. So, I think the reason why we are in such a crisis is because we are experiencing the end-phase of an empire, and I can only say, I do not believe that the leading institutions will change. It requires the absolute mobilization of the masses of the people, to go into the streets: I don't think there is any way to solve it without that. I don't think that that is the only thing which is required, which is why I have called for the [Council of Reason](#) which is slowly moving, but it is moving. There is a serious discussion to look out for those individuals of outstanding character and contribution to the well-being of mankind, and it's coming together. It's not happening as quickly as I would wish, but it is being seriously discussed, because many people are at a point of despair, for what can be done to prevent mankind from going into a catastrophe of which nobody would be left to even comment about it.

Schlanger: Let me conclude by reminding people that the International Peace Coalition will be meeting again as it has every Friday for now 65 weeks. And maybe you could say something in conclusion to inspire people to participate in that, because it's become an extremely important forum for the kind of people that should be on the Council of Reason, to discuss how to wake up the population. So, Helga, why don't you say something about this week's upcoming meeting?

Zepp-LaRouche: Just to comment on the aspect of the previous question, that the rhetoric about World War III is instigating it, it's the opposite. Look, I'm discussing with important figures in different countries, and there are only a few people, a small percentage of people, who are aware of how far advanced this threat is. The idea that you can ignore all the red lines of Russia and then say, "Now you see, Putin didn't re-

spond with nuclear weapons. That means there are no red lines, yet. That means we can continue, continue, continue." That is the most foolish, the most criminal and most idiotic policy you can possibly have!

The reality is that we are right now already almost at the point of no return, in terms of threatening to come to the point where Russia will have no other way than to resort to its own nuclear doctrine.

So, I think that that danger is very immediate. The fact that the Kursk deployment is not for bargaining of a peace negotiation for Ukraine, but if you think it through, it is part of a general deployment by NATO into the territory of Russia with German tanks, with American soldiers, with the whole spectrum, being into Russia already. And that brings us extremely close to the danger of, really, a point of no return.

That will be the issue at the upcoming meeting of the International Peace Coalition on Friday, August 30: We already have lined up very important speakers. I think we will have the list of speakers on the Schiller Institute website today or tomorrow—probably today. And our number of participants is growing. In the last several weeks we have had around 550-600 participants, and afterwards many more. And more than 50 countries being represented. I think next time, we will hear from Larry Johnson, Ray McGovern, and several others. You should join it: The most important thing is to internationalize the peace movement, because we have to be united to be strong enough, so that we can get the kind of effect that we had with the middle-range missile crisis in the 1980s, which did contribute to the conclusion of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. And right now, we need a lot more.

And so, I can only say, on September 1 we will have demonstrations in many parts of the world, with International Peace Day. Look out for where these demonstrations will take place. On September 28, you have both Scott Ritter's rally and also Rage Against the War Machine. Then on October 3 there are nationwide demonstrations in Germany. And you should look out for them and build them: Tell all your neighbors and colleagues to go into the streets and demonstrate for peace! And all that will be discussed on Friday.

Schlanger: Well, Helga, thank you for joining us today, and hopefully everyone who's on right now will be joining you again on Friday.

Zepp-LaRouche: Till Friday.