

International Peace Coalition

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: The West Must Cooperate With the Global Majority

Oct. 27—*The following is an edited transcript of the Oct. 25, 2024, remarks by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute, to the 73rd meeting of the International Peace Coalition.*

Opening Remarks

Thank you, Anastasia, and hello to all of you. I just shortly before this program started, got information which I did not have time to check out, so take it with a grain of salt; but the report said that a huge fleet of U.S. Air Force KC-135R refueling planes and a large number of F-16 fighter jets have been transferred to various U.S. air bases in the Middle East. If that turns out to be true, it would, naturally, be a worrying sign, given the fact that there was just the conclusion of the meeting of the BRICS in Kazan, which one could describe as truly historic, insofar as it is marching forward in creating a new world economic system. In Kazan, before nine BRICS members—originally it was four, then five, then nine—13 new countries joined [as partner nations], bringing the number of countries up to 22. This represents 4.7 billion people, which is 57% of the world's population. So, already with that existing BRICS combination, it is the Global Majority of the world population.

Chinese President Xi Jinping had said in his speech to the opening session that he hopes that the BRICS will guide the world back to a path of the overarching trend of peace and development. Then he asked the question, should we allow the world to descend into the abyss of disorder and chaos? Naturally, if there would be an escalation of the Middle East war, it would be that option. Or, said Xi Jinping, should we step back to the path of peace and development? Then he called on people to be defenders of common security, and he said we humans are an indivisible community of security. So, there were many formulations by Xi Jinping, by Russian President Vladimir Putin, by others, absolutely echoing what we have been discussing here at the International Peace Coalition for more than

a year: namely, the absolutely urgent need to create a new international security and development architecture which must take into account the interests of every country to bring the world away from the abyss of the threatening wars which could become regional and even global, and then nuclear war.

So, it is unfortunately not inconceivable that an escalation in the Middle East would be a reaction to that, because this is now the key question of the whole world: Will the West, will the United States and will European nations react to the absolutely legitimate desire of the countries of the Global South to form a more just and equitable world economic order which will allow them to overcome poverty and under-development? Will the West react to that by confrontation, by trying to dismantle it by targeting individual BRICS members, as we have seen in the recent period? Or, will reason dominate to say that there is only one road to peace, and that is that we find a way of cooperating? That is the most burning question in the whole world, and we have to make sure that people understand that, because the mainstream media—at least here in Germany—is ridiculous. We will hear later on from one of our correspondents who was in Kazan on the ground. The mood was one of enthusiasm and optimism, while the Western media has been reporting about this as if it was just all a PR show organized by Putin in order to prove that he is not isolated, but that there was nothing to it. This is the most ridiculous reaction I have ever seen.

In any case, the question is, will the West relate positively to this new development or not? All the problems of the world could be managed easily if the collective West would now say this is the legitimate desire of the collective countries of the South. They want to overcome colonialism and establish a world economic system which allows them to develop; therefore, we support it. If that happens, we can really enter a new era of humanity. But if the reaction of the West is to say no, we will try to smash this new formation, then

we are on a short road to disaster.

Unfortunately, I do not exclude that. If this information I reported in the beginning turns out to be true, then the road to disaster could be a very short one. Also, it should be noted that the former Deputy Director of the Israeli National Security Council, a person named Eran Etzion, just published an article in the Israeli press, where he said that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's cabinet just recently voted secretly on the so-called Eiland Plan, which is the idea that in the northern part of Gaza, about 300,000 to 400,000 people who live there are being told to leave. All who do not leave will be killed or starved to death; and then that area will be annexed and resettled with Israeli settlers. This is the sharpest critique from a former Israeli official to my knowledge to be published so far. He called this a war crime, and he called on officers to not respond to orders to participate in this plan. He said it's the moral duty of officers to refuse, and for civilians to step away and not participate in this.

Former U.S. Marine intelligence officer and UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter has put out a warning in the recent days in which he portrays a very gloomy picture of what he expects to happen. Namely, that Israel is preparing what he calls a "package of drone and missile attacks," and then they would proceed to attack the Syrian and Iraqi air defenses and attempt a decapitation strike against the military and civilian leadership of Iran. Then there would be a response by Iran, using everything they have, and then Israel would respond with a nuclear attack on the nuclear installations of Iran. Now, that is what Scott Ritter thinks; I just report it here.

But we are in an extremely tense situation, and unfortunately the situation around Ukraine and the whole scenario in Europe is not looking very much better. It is still the case that the United States and German Chancellor Olaf Scholz are refusing to give the Ukrainians permission to use the long-range missiles they have received from the West for deep strikes into Russia. That is still holding, but on every other front you see a step-by-step escalation. The most recent one is that you have now several headquarters in Germany which are preparing for a coming war between NATO and Russia. One is, naturally, the Ramstein Air Base which is the supply base for all kinds of military equipment, including cruise missiles. Then you have the Wiesbaden-Erbenheim headquarters for the entire Ukraine com-

mand of NATO. Then you have a new headquarters in Rostock on the Baltic Sea, which is supposed to be the headquarters for operations in the Baltic Sea. This is quite a scandal, because the German Defense Ministry announced that this would be completely under German command, under the command of the Bundeswehr. But unfortunately, at the same time, and obviously uncoordinated, the Brussels NATO headquarters released a press release in which they said that the German command is only temporary and it will be replaced by other nationalities—Swedish, other countries—therefore, naturally, revealing the NATO character of that headquarters. That is a violation of the 2-plus-4 Treaty, which officially gave Germany sovereignty in 1990 after German unification. It has a clause that says this is occurring under the provision that no foreign troops should be stationed on the territory of the former GDR. This is very clearly a violation of that, and it reveals one more time the lying which is going on all the time. It just deepens the mistrust about every word that is coming from anybody from the Western side. Naturally, this caused a quite sharp reaction from Russia, which said this will have serious consequences.

So, we are sitting on a complete powder keg. On the one side there is real reason for optimism; I think this development in Kazan, while it did not go all the way obviously—because it is very tricky and complicated, so they did not go for a new world reserve currency, or even a BRICS-related reserve currency; but many other statements were made. The New Development Bank is scheduled to provide a lot of investment credit; they will create a new BRICS investment platform which is supposed to massively invest in infrastructure and development projects. The BRICS grain platform will be created; so a lot of very important things have happened. And there is still a very long list of countries that have expressed their intention, and hope to be welcomed into the BRICS very soon. So, it is a very positive development. If the West would not be so wrong, we would be happy. The United States is a melting pot—or that's what people have always called it. There are people from all over the world who emigrated to the United States to have a better life. If the United States would now say, we will help these countries— We have many hyphenated Americans—there are Lebanese-Americans, Palestinian-Americans, Nigerian-Americans, Afghan-Americans and so forth and so on. If the United States would say, we will

help together with the BRICS, we cooperate with the BRICS and we help these countries to industrialize so that the migrants stay at home and help to build up their own economies—that would be the only human way to solve the refugee crisis. It would resolve all of these conflicts; it would make every conflict immediately manageable. We would really enter a peace era.

So, the International Peace Coalition must do everything it can so that that option is put on the table, and that everybody knows that that is really the way out of this war danger.

We Must Have Everything at Once

Palestinian Ambassador to Nigeria, the Hon. Abdullah M. Abu Shawesh, in response to a previous speaker, commented that the problem for the conflict lies on the side of the “the current messianic government of Israel.” He said the official Palestinian government has been on the record calling for negotiations and a two-state solution, and that without addressing the destructive and dishonest nature of Israel and its support by the Western establishment, the problem can never be solved. Zepp-LaRouche replied with the following comments:

I want to thank the Ambassador for what he has said. I think that we really have to put this question on center stage, because if we don't resolve this, the potential that the world will end over this crisis is very clear. However, I would like to reiterate that in my view—and if you would disagree, please tell me—the only way it makes sense is that we have to have everything at once. We have to have a commission of inquiry; we have to put the question of the war crimes on the table internationally. But it absolutely, in my view, must be combined with a vision of how to get out. Because while it is true that the war crimes have to be stopped and investigated and so forth, if we don't break the cycle of violence and the eye-for-an-eye, it will go on forever—well, not forever, because you will have nuclear war in the meantime. This is why we need the whole package. We need immediate ceasefire, a two-state solution, the Oasis Plan, a regional peace conference for the entirety of Southwest Asia, and a new global security and development architecture in which, then, the issue of Palestine and the two-state solution is one feature. If we would get all the forces of the International Peace Coalition and other peace groups—because there are many

other peace groups around the world that also are fighting. But we have to get all of them to put this big package on the agenda for it to work; that is my view.

So, please tell me if you agree or disagree, but I think you must use the momentum which now exists with the BRICS countries that now have become 22 countries; it is the majority of the world. The momentum is there. The Chinese are important in terms of reconstruction of Gaza; this was mentioned by Dr. Baskin before. I really think the only hope is that we really push this, and make a conference, maybe in Southwest Asia. There are many countries that could host such a conference. We can do it with the IPC, but I think we have to get some of the countries in the Gulf States, or Jordan, or any country which is not entirely in the conflict, but has a vested interest to help to bring about a solution.

So, I think we should aim for an actual physical conference in Southwest Asia in the short term.

Could an Expanded BRICS Replace the United Nations?

During the discussion, one participant asked Zepp-LaRouche whether the expanding BRICS could eventually supplant the moribund United Nations.

There is right now an enormous amount of discussion going on in all kinds of areas about the need to reform the United Nations. The big problem obviously is that the Security Council will block the discussion of such a reform. But I'm not excluding the possibility for what you are saying to come true, but the key question right now is, in the next period, can we get the United States and European nations including Great Britain, which I think will be the most difficult one—no, maybe second to Germany which is right now a colony of the British and the United States; and colonies sometimes tend to be worse than the colonial masters. But can we get them to not go against this new emerging system, which has already progressed pretty far; it's now 22 countries, and you named some of them. There are many more that have applied. I think we are now at the critical phase, because if the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, these countries are now moving against this new formation— And I'm happy to hear [former CIA analyst and co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity] Ray [McGovern] is optimistic, and I'm happy to hear that Father [Harry] Bury is optimistic as well. I'm listening to these comments.

However, I think that the nut to be cracked is more fundamental. If we do not get a friendly idea across to Europeans and the United States to join the BRICS, the problem will not go away. And there were several people, like the former deputy head of the New Development Bank, Paulo Nogueira Batista, Jr., who said the IMF is unreformable. That points to the real crux of the matter.

Why is it not so easy for the North Atlantic, IMF-dominated system to join with the BRICS? They would have to give up the derivatives bubble; they would have to give up the speculation part of the financial system. That would require something like a Glass-Steagall [banking separation] reform. You would have to write off a lot of the debts; the system is completely indebted. If they would do that—remember it was Xi Jinping who offered to then-President Barack Obama that the United States should join the BRICS. He even made a special model for a great power special relation memorandum of understanding of how they could work together without impinging on each other's sovereignty and so forth. This was flatly ignored by Obama.

So, the real crux of the matter is, can we get a discussion in Europe, in the United States, on how to join—not formally, you don't have to become a member—but how to move from confrontation to cooperation. In my view, this is what will decide if this thing can be solved or not. Then the question of will the BRICS [replace] the UN, or can the UN be reformed, is really a secondary question.

Closing Remarks

I do not want to dampen the hope, but my hope is located in something else. That is that I believe that the universe is made in such a way that it opens up new degrees of freedom whenever something horrible emerges, because it is the tendency of the universe to outdo evil with greater good. If that will apply for the next period, we have to see. But I just want to say, we are not out of the crisis area. I just had a whole bunch of discussions with people in Germany, and there is a realization that we have lost already not only our sovereignty, but freedom, democracy, human rights. We are really marching very quickly to—or are already in—a dictatorship. This judgment came from so many different quarters: from industry, to the peace movement, to various people. I can only say it's good to have

hope, but I only believe in those miracles which we do ourselves. I really want to call on everybody in the International Peace Coalition. We have to really use this moment. I think it is a golden opportunity, because the Global Majority is organizing itself, and it does mean an alternative.

But I can only repeat myself: It is my deepest conviction that the crucial moment is not just the U.S. election; obviously depending on who becomes President will pretty much make a major dent. But even more important is, can we get the United States and Europe to take a positive attitude towards the Global Majority of mankind? If we succeed in doing that, all other problems are manageable. We can resolve the Ukraine crisis and the Middle East crisis, and Sudan, and many other crises in the world. But if we don't cause a change in the thinking of a good portion of the people in the United States and Europe—because the example that Jews and Muslims are working together nicely in London—that is not a good argument, because it's never the people who are the problem. You can put any segments of two people together and they will normally absolutely have a friendly, amicable relationship. It is what Pope John Paul II once called the “structures of sin.” There are these structures which are—as Ray McGovern always says, the MICIMATT structures: the City of London, the combination of the military-industrial complex, which is the big money machine making money on war, and the financial interests. If there is not a willingness to go back to a kind of system like it was the case with Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy—periods in American history when the power of Wall Street was contained, relatively speaking—that's the problem.

I can only say, please make yourself familiar with what these leaders from the BRICS countries are saying, and do not believe what the media is saying. They paint them as demons and dictators and whatnot. Just read the speeches of [Brazilian President Luiz Inácio] Lula da Silva, of [President of South Africa Cyril] Ramaphosa, of Xi Jinping, of Putin, and compare that to the speeches you see from the leaders of the West. Make your own judgment. I think that is the most important. You have to nourish your own thinking and your own analytical capability, because this is a difficult period, and you have to navigate through a lot of disinformation. So, I'm hopeful, but only if we do our job.