

Schiller Institute Weekly Dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Global War or Universal Peace— Who Shall Decide?

The following is an edited transcript of the Oct. 9, 2024, weekly Schiller Institute dialogue with Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Embedded links and subheads have been added. The video is available [here](#).

Harley Schlanger: Hello and welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche. This is Wednesday, October 9, 2024. I'm Harley Schlanger and I'll be your host today. You can send your questions or comments by email to questions@schillerinstitute.org.

Helga, there seems to be a debate underway among the establishment network which runs what the Russians are calling the “collective Biden,” over what to do about Ukraine. The *Financial Times* reported on a “shifting mood” in Washington and in European capitals, where some are starting to acknowledge that Ukraine cannot win. Zelensky just announced he's cancelling the November fake “peace conference,” and then last night it was just announced that Biden's trip to Germany, where he was scheduled to preside over the Ramstein Ukraine Contact Defense Group in a meeting, that that's been cancelled, allegedly to deal with the damage expected from Hurricane Milton. There's skepticism about this, because he didn't seem so involved in the damage from Hurricane Helene.

But given these developments, we have our first question: “What, in your opinion, is the significance of his change in plans? And is it possible that there's a split developing within the Biden administration and within NATO, over plans to keep backing the fight against Russia to the last Ukrainian? And if so, doesn't this show that some have concluded that Vladimir Putin is not bluffing?”



White House/Adam Schultz

U.S. President Joe Biden. There is a split in the “collective Biden” administration over sending long-range missiles to Ukraine.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: It's probably even much bigger than that because, while the Western media are still trying to keep the people in the dark, in the corridors of power there is a realization that we are sitting on two regional crises which could go to a global escalation. That is, one is Ukraine and the other one is the Middle East. And one has to look at

these two things together, because—let's go one after the other. Concerning Ukraine, the Ramstein meeting which was supposed to be addressed, or shared, by



NATO

Former NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg proposes a peace plan that includes part of Ukraine joining NATO.

Biden was postponed—not clear until when. But Jens Stoltenberg, the just-retired, former NATO General Secretary, is now proposing what amounts to what they call the German proposal, which would be the idea that there will be some agreement with Russia, whereby the offer would be that Ukraine would join NATO, but only the Western part, while the Eastern part would be treated like the G.D.R. [East Germany] in 1956, when West

Germany joined NATO. Now, that is completely out of the question; Russia will never accept that. But it reflects the fact that the latest reports are that the Russian advances on the battlefield are so significant, and the situation of the Ukrainian army—they just don't have the soldiers; there are reports about a general demoralization; a lot of people are deserting. So, it's generally just a question of time when this will absolutely end, because there is just no more fighting capability among the Ukrainians. Now, we are actually at the point that former Inspector General of the Bundeswehr Gen. Harald Kujat [ret.] had warned about already in August one year ago: that NATO will come to the decision of either having a negotiated solution, one which will be accepted by Russia—which this present one is not—or go for an escalation. And that is the immediate question ahead.

And there is very clearly a battle about that, where it looks like the military in the United States, who know what the implications are, are more on the side of ending this, or going for a diplomatic solution, while the more political part is basically saying, “No, let's enable the Ukrainians to use long-range missiles deep into the territory of Russia,” even though that has been clearly defined as the ultimate red line; that's why Putin has changed the nuclear doctrine of Russia. So, I'm afraid we are sitting, in respect to Ukraine, in the immediate vicinity of a decision of escalation which could lead to, in the worst case, a global nuclear war, or to finally come to a peace resolution which, unfortunately, the latter one is not so much up front.

If you combine that with the situation in the Middle East—let me just give you some of the elements: I can



cc/Fraktion Die Linke im Bundestag

Former Inspector General of the Bundeswehr Gen. (ret.) Harald Kujat warns that NATO must come up with an acceptable peace proposal or face an escalation with Russia.

only advise you, watch a [video](#) which was put out yesterday by a platform called “Dialogue Works.” And there, the host had Col. Lawrence Wilkerson on, the former Chief of Staff of Colin Powell [2002-2005], when he was U.S. Secretary of State, during the time of the Iraq War. And what Colonel Wilkerson presents there, I can only advise you to listen to him. It may not all be 100% verified, but for those of you who normally never get any real coverage about events, it is an eye-opener. He starts with a short presentation of a video which apparently was made in Türkiye—which that alone is absolutely a must to see. It has a scenario where in the year 2040, the 16th anniversary of the genocide against Gaza is documented in cities around the world—in Seattle, in Berlin, in Paris, in Seoul—there are exhibitions of the horrors which happened in Gaza in that year, and many children are asking their

grandparents, “Where were you when this happened?” It's very moving, and the pictures, indeed, are quite adequate. So, please watch this two-minute video.

Then Colonel Wilkerson goes into the possible scenarios, and he reports there's a massive debate in the United States right now, between those who say the United States should come in on the side of Israel, where Israel is about to retaliate against Iran—this now is not in the video, but I'm saying

it—there is a debate: Should Israel hit “only” the oil refineries of Iran, or go to attack the nuclear facilities, which Donald Trump had suggested in an unbelievable statement? It is very clear that these nuclear facilities of Iran are in the mountains—and they're hidden deep in the mountains—and the only way you could destroy them is with nuclear weapons. I don't know if Trump



Schiller Institute

Col. (ret.) Lawrence Wilkerson warns that we face a danger of general war in Southwest Asia.

knows that, or if he's just light-heartedly saying that, but it is unbelievable.

What Colonel Wilkerson says is that there is a debate between those who say, let Israel do it alone, or, the United States should be on the side of Israel doing it. In any case, we are looking at the abyss. If this happens, we are entering the danger of a general war in the Middle East, which would involve every force. Because if you start to attack Iran in such a massive way, naturally, the whole place would go up in flames, and all the Arab states— The Arab states have just formed a new alliance, in which they say they want to stay neutral and not get involved in any conflict on the side of the United States if there is an attack on Iran. That is a completely new element in the situation, because the distance between Israel and Iran is very great, and it requires refueling both for strikes into Iran as well as for airplanes flying out—and that cannot be done without U.S. assistance.

If you look at these two situations—and I really think one has to look at them together—the absolute point of no return in respect to Ukraine and then, secondly, the absolute powder keg of the situation in Southwest Asia, I think what we in the Schiller Institute have been saying the whole time is that we need a stop to this; we need a complete change. People have to speak out that we are on the verge of World War III, and that we absolutely have to go in a different direction, by going in the direction of a new security and development architecture, which stops geopolitics and puts in its place the idea of cooperation. So, that is really what we are looking at.

Schlanger: We have several questions on both the Ukraine situation and the Middle East, from a peace activist in the United Kingdom. He writes: “British Prime Minister Keir Starmer and his government moved quickly after his election victory to escalate the conflict between NATO and Russia. But with polls showing a major drop in support for him, what do you think the clever bastards in the City of London have as a fallback plan?”

Zepp-LaRouche: I don't know if they have a fallback plan. The British are known to always bet on all sides simultaneously. But right now, the idea is to keep pushing this escalation. And I can only say, the best thing which could happen is that the international com-

munity, rather than following the media lines and lies which are being told, should start an investigation of why the Ukraine war is still going on. Why was the peace option that existed in March 2022, the so-called Istanbul solution—which both sides, Ukraine and Russia, agreed upon—sabotaged through the trip to Kyiv by then British Prime Minister Boris Johnson? And that all the many people who have died since—more than 500,000 people on the Ukrainian side, and a lot of people on the Russian side as well—that all goes to the account of Boris Johnson and the British. And that should be investigated. Then maybe one could shift world opinion.

Schlanger: Helga, we have a question here on the situation in Germany. Someone writes: “I watched the Oct. 2 Schiller Institute event on the threat to Germany if it accepts the U.S. offer of U.S. nuclear long-range missiles, which can hit Russia, and was very impressed by the video. Do you know if this was seen in Germany? Is there opposition among Germans to the Scholz government accepting U.S. nuclear missiles?”

Zepp-LaRouche: The opposition is growing. It is not yet enough, but that's why we made this special program, with former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock, nuclear expert Ted Postol, and other experts: Rainer Rupp, Wolfgang Effenberger, Col. (ret.) Alain Corvez. And we are right now trying to circulate these videos, especially the one from Matlock and Postol, because they are outstanding American experts: Matlock, a senior diplomat, who was an eyewitness of the end of the Cold War and the German reunification; and Postol, because he is probably one, if not *the* world's greatest expert on nuclear weapons, and he made a very, very dramatic point that Germany will cease to exist if it ever comes to an actual war. And I can only ask you, our viewers— We have put out these two videos as excerpts from the whole conference, because most people will not have the time to watch the entire program. Help us to get these two videos out in the maximum way. Both are [available](#) on the Schiller website. Send it out to everybody you know, because the only way we can stop this danger is if every citizen on the planet would be aware of what are the consequences of a nuclear war and then, basically, to take to the streets and other actions to tell the governments they must get away from this course of confrontation. There are other



BüSo

Peace rally in Berlin demands no deployment of long-range missiles in Germany.

people mobilizing: There was the Oct. 3 Berlin rally, a demonstration which was significant—not large enough, but significant—and there several people issued a new Berlin appeal, demanding that these long-range missiles absolutely must not be installed in Germany. So, there are people moving, but I think it’s very far away from the degree of urgency which now exists, and the long-range nuclear missiles are just a derivative of what we are facing right now. So, I can only ask you to help us to distribute these two videos as far as you can.

Schlanger: Here’s a question from a student in California. She writes: “Biden, Harris, and Blinken keep saying they are working hard to prevent a full-scale war from breaking out in the Middle East. But it appears that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is either ignoring him, or they’re saying one thing in public—that is, no full-scale war—while they’re supporting his plans to crush Hamas and Hezbollah and go after Iran, in private. Could the U.S. stop Israeli aggression, or does Israel control U.S. politics?”

Zepp-LaRouche: It’s now very far developed, and it’s not

so clear whether we are looking at the “breakaway ally” scenario, where certain forces in the United States pretend to be in opposition to Israel, and then Israel does what it wants anyhow—that’s one option. It could also be, for example, Netanyahu just called back Gallant, his Defense Minister, who was supposed to go to the United States to discuss all of this. Now he just made an unbelievably untruthful video.

There is this debate I mentioned before: Should the United States go with Israel in retaliation against Iran? And then, what will be the scope of this

retaliation, which I would assume the United States is trying to—if they decided to go with Israel—As I said, Israel cannot really do it without the United States, because of logistic and various satellite information and other logistical support.

The only thing which could stop this is if the United States would emphatically say, “No more weapons, no more money.” And if need be, even tell Israel, “We have the means to tell you not to.” I don’t think the sentiment is like that—especially not in the election campaign—but the United States is clearly the only country which could do it. But if enough people realize we are on the verge of seeing a firestorm that could bring down the entirety of Southwest Asia,



Dialogue Works

In the year 2040, the 16th anniversary of the 2024 genocide against Gaza is remembered in exhibits around the world. The children ask their parents, “When this happened, did you just watch?” See this powerful two-minute [video](#).

people have to demand it! That is the key point.

Schlanger: Actually, there was a following up to that from Jim Hogue, who is a long-term contact, who raises the question of, “How can we reasonably discuss the situation in Israel, until we learn what really happened on Oct. 7, 2023? Was it a plan by Netanyahu? Was it an error, a security lapse? Do you have any thoughts on that?”

Zepp-LaRouche: That is, in a certain sense, a question for historians, because we are right now in the middle of an escalation. And, obviously, in respect to what Israel is doing in Gaza, the line is that it is just a reaction to Oct. 7, 2023. All the people in the region—the Arabs, other Islamic countries, the various so-called “neutral countries,”—they all know that what we are seeing playing out right now is a tragedy, which really started with the Balfour Declaration [of 1917—ed.] and the entire history of the conflict ever since. In Germany, you’re not even allowed to discuss that, so I will limit my remarks to— People should try to get an all-encompassing picture. The only thing to do right now is to stop the fighting; to bring— I think it was the Danish Prime Minister who made the proposal that the international community should enforce the two-state solution, meaning, enforcing it; meaning UN blue helmets or some variety thereof. But the question is really that the international community cannot just watch this, because it will blow up! The only country which could really stop it without a major war is the United States. And that means all the responsibility is on this present administration, and whatever other administration is coming in.

Schlanger: Here’s a question on the situation in Europe: “Western policies often backfire, like the sanctions policy against Russia, which hurt Europe more than Russia. The European Union is now moving for a trade war against China. Who would be hurt more by a trade war, the EU or China?”

Zepp-LaRouche: Both of them would suffer, and it’s a completely idiotic policy. Fortunately, many industrialists have started to speak out. In Italy, the steel sector; in Germany, the auto sector is finally speaking out, that such sanctions would be absolutely shooting yourself in the knee. But the larger picture is that it cannot be separated. It’s not just the sanctions, because

the tariffs are just a part of— In the West, they’re trying to go for Global NATO: declare Russia, China, and by that token the entire Global South, the enemy, and try to decouple from China, or as they call it euphemistically in the European Union, to “de-risk,” which is ridiculous—it’s the same as decoupling. And if that would be carried through, it would lead to the separation of the entire world economy into two completely separate blocs: a Global NATO bloc, which would be an effort to contain Russia, China, and the Global Majority, which is impossible; or we get the countries of the collective West to cooperate—and I think that that is the urgent demand of the day!

People have to become active, because we are sitting on the verge of an explosion of the international situation, which once it goes one step further, I am greatly afraid it cannot be brought back under control. The people who have some influence and some amount of power have to start now to act. And people who think they’re just ordinary people, the only thing left for them is to take to the streets and make clear that they are not supporting this and that the governments have no right to do what they’re doing right now, if they’re on this confrontation line.

It’s not just the tariffs. It’s part of this much larger geopolitical confrontation which has to stop.

Schlanger: Here’s a question about the upcoming BRICS summit over Oct. 22-24, in Kazan, Russia, from a podcaster in Cameroon. She writes, “I’m excited about the prospect of more African countries, such as Algeria or Nigeria, becoming members of the BRICS. But I’m curious about something you have said, Mrs. LaRouche, that it would not be difficult for the U.S. to work with the BRICS. I see no evidence that there’s any interest among leading figures in the U.S. to cooperate with and support a multipolar system. Why do you say it would be easy?”

Zepp-LaRouche: Because China has made many times the offer, and said that the BRICS, and before, the Belt and Road Initiative, are open for cooperation for every country! When Obama met several years ago with Chinese President Xi Jinping, when Obama was still President of the United States, President Xi explicitly offered to the United States to cooperate. That’s why I’m saying it would be very easy. And even if the situation with Russia right now is at an absolute, historic low point, that is just the realization on the side of

the Russians that there is no interest on the side of the U.S., or other people in the West, to even talk. This is why the Russian Ambassador to Washington Anatoly Antonov, just left! This is incredible. He left his post, and there is no replacement, obviously reflecting the fact that Antonov—and he had said it before repeatedly—that nobody in Washington wanted to talk to him! Here you have the Russian Ambassador in Washington, and he has to articulate his frustration over the fact that he has nobody to talk to? I mean, what happened to diplomacy?

That is why the answer has to come from other forces, like governors, state legislators, mayors. The American people are not on the same course, necessarily, as this confrontation to declare everybody an enemy. And the United States, right now, is faced with some very, very serious problems. The present crisis in some of the states along the Southeast Coast, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia—already Hurricane Helene probably caused 1,000 people to die! That’s not yet the official figure, but there are estimates that under the rubble there are probably that many people who have died. And hundreds of thousands of people have lost their homes. And what is now the reaction of the government? There is no sufficient budget any more for FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and now the new Hurricane Milton is expected to make landfall in Florida today. This could be the worst hurricane in 100 years.

And what it reflects so much is not “global warming,” or any of the stories that are being put out, but the fact that the United States has disinvested in infrastructure for a very long time, and that there has been no preparation for natural catastrophes—like we have seen in Germany or many other places. What this reflects is a collapse of the infrastructure, as part of the collapse of the physical economy of the United States—and that is just one side, the collapse of the physical economy. And then you have on the other side, the pending blowout of the financial system—which



Washington Embassy of the Russian Federation

Russian Ambassador to Washington Anatoly Antonov has packed up and gone home. He said he had no one to talk to in Washington.

could happen at any time—triggered by any even stupid incident. So, there is a good enough reason why the United States, why Germany, which is in free fall in respect to its economy, why they should change policy and go back to a perspective of cooperation, technological innovation, investment, and just bring the world into order!

It is just the financial powers that be, that are so concerned about the maintenance of their bankrupt financial system, who are at the same time the profiteers of these wars—including the

present wars.

So, we have an incredible, existential, civilizational crisis, which should catch the attention of, really, every citizen on the planet.

Schlanger: Here’s a question: You just mentioned the hurricane that’s about to hit Florida this afternoon. Someone writes in: “Tampa, which is the home of the CENTCOM logistics hub for all Pacific and Middle East operations,” and asking if Hurricane Milton would have an impact on Netanyahu’s plans?

Zepp-LaRouche: We already see that the meeting in Ramstein, that the Ramstein task force has been postponed, because President Biden says he has to stay in the United States to attend to the unfolding catastrophe. Well, I’m now making this only half-seriously, but half in earnest: Maybe St. Peter has some passion for what is happening on Earth, and he sent these hurricanes to tell people that they should get reasonable—like the pharaohs had to be hit with the plagues. I’m only half-serious, but there is maybe some element of truth in it, insofar as you cannot violate the laws of the physical universe for a long period of time without the universe hitting back. This is called “natural law.” This shows that there is a higher lawfulness in Creation, if you want, in the physical universe, which is: if you don’t invest in what protects people, then that is the result. So, in a certain sense, you can take it as a warning from above.



The U.S. National Guard

Aftermath of Hurricane Helene. The rebuilding will be complicated by the years of disinvestment in infrastructure and the lack of preparation for natural catastrophes.

Schlanger: Ironically, St. Petersburg, a city in Florida named after Saint Peter, is expected to be hit very hard by the storm surges.

All right, Helga, I have a question for you from a contrarian historian on my network, who's an author, and he says: He disagrees with you that the U.S. was anti-colonial. He says it was never anti-colonial. It's been in colonial wars since its founding. And he says, "For example, the Monroe Doctrine is an imperial claim to U.S. sovereignty over South and Central America." And he's basically referring to what the *New York Times* did with its "1619 Project." How would you respond to him?

Zepp-LaRouche: It's factually not true. Look at John Quincy Adams, the author of the Monroe Doctrine. He was very, very emphatic that it was not the purpose of the United States to have wars abroad and "chase foreign monsters." And he was advocating a foreign policy in which the United States would be one republic among others, trying to have an alliance of sovereign states. The War of Independence was against what? It was against the attempt by the British Empire to keep its colony. And when the War of Independence broke out, it was emphatically an anti-colonialist war, which drove George III crazy. The British, at that time, they lost their marbles, and have not regained much of it since, over the loss of their largest and most cherished colony! And in the same way, the

Monroe Doctrine was not what people make out of it today, but what was the Monroe Doctrine against? It was against the arms of the octopus reaching into Latin America by who? What were the countries of Europe at that time? They were all empires! These were not nation-states, they were empires—Metternich, after the Congress of Vienna; the British, the French, the Dutch—everyone was an empire.

So, that is really a distortion of history, which should not stand, because this idea of the United States having been always evil—it's very popular, but it does not do justice, because the United States was a project by the Europeans to

create a republic. And if you look at the Declaration of Independence, it's a document which is valid. That's why I made it the founding document of the Schiller Institute, but just changing a few words to make it applicable for the whole world: "These rights are inalienable." And I changed altogether six words: where it says "colony," I said "developing countries," to make it applicable. And that idea of sovereignty, of the devotion to the common good, which is in the American Constitution, and especially in the Preamble of the Constitution, that was the most advanced Constitution at that time—and it represents a complete watershed.

The British tried to undo that, in the War of 1812, and by allying with the Confederacy in the Civil War. And then, when they realized they couldn't reconquer the American colonies by military means, they started to subvert it by convincing the American establishment to adopt the model of the British Empire, as the joint basis for a unipolar world—and that is what we are looking at up to today.

So, if you look at the history of the United States, it was the fight between being a republic and being an empire. And unfortunately, the present establishment seems to think that they're better off to be an empire. But that is not the true identity of the United States.

Schlanger: In a final question, we return to the matter of the BRICS summit on Oct. 22-24, and the

question is, “How significant is it that Türkiye wishes to join the BRICS?”

Zepp-LaRouche: It’s very significant! Because it shows you the trend of the time. The European Union has given Türkiye the cold shoulder for many years now, and the frustration in Türkiye over that fact has been growing. And now, with the BRICS, there is a true alternative: The Belt and Road Initiative; the projects of the New Silk Road in which Türkiye has historically been in a key geographical position to be the hub between Asia, Africa, and Europe. And I think with Türkiye being part of NATO—so far they have said they want to be both part of the BRICS and part of NATO. But that creates a very interesting question, because with the present outlook of NATO, that’s practically impossible. So that means either they will kick Türkiye out, or they will accept the Turkish model to transform NATO into the idea of cooperating with the BRICS. In any case, it creates a huge pressure point on everybody in the right way!

Schlanger: This Friday, Oct. 11, you’ll have another Zoom call of the International Peace Coalition. This has become a major center of discussion and dialogue in the absence of government institutions taking these up. What’s the plan for this Friday?

Zepp-LaRouche: We will very, very earnestly try to have spokesmen and speakers on the two crises which I mentioned before. I think the need to get people really on the seriousness of the situation, we need all forces who could possibly be there. So, join with us at this meeting. I don’t have the full list of speakers yet, but I’m absolutely certain that people will use that platform to sound the alarm which is more urgent than ever before.

Schlanger: Helga, you’ve been sounding the alarm and people are listening. I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes. See you, I hope, on Friday.

EIR Offprint Special Report Available

The Great Leap Backward: LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal

Executive Intelligence Review has released this Special Report to warn of the extreme danger to mankind represented by the Green New Deal, also called “The Great Reset” by the leaders of the Davos World Economic Forum.

Already being implemented, this plan is taking over the direction of national economies from sovereign governments, using the power of central banks and the too-big-to-fail private financial institutions, cutting off credit to fossil fuel power generation and to industrial and agricultural enterprises claimed to emit too much carbon. Meanwhile it is creating a new huge bubble in the “sustainable fuel” sector, hoping to prop up the increasingly bankrupt financial system.

Stopping it by returning to a Hamiltonian American System credit policy, requires an understanding which is the purpose of this report.



EIR subscribers who have received this Special Report as their 68-page Feb. 12 issue: Get an Offprint edition for someone you know who should have it!

Special Report is available in soft cover printed copy for \$30 plus shipping, or as a PDF for \$20 (requires e-mail address).

<https://store.larouchepub.com/product-p/eirsp-2021-1-0-0.htm>