

## Schiller Institute Weekly Dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

# After the U.S. Election, Create a New Security and Development Architecture

*The following is an edited transcript of the Nov. 6, 2024, weekly Schiller Institute dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute. Embedded links have been added. The video is available [here](#).*

**Harley Schlanger:** Hello and welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute. It's Wednesday, November 6, 2024. I'm Harley Schlanger and I'll be your host today. You can send questions and comments by email to [questions@schillerinstitute.org](mailto:questions@schillerinstitute.org).

Helga, yesterday former President Donald Trump was elected, again, to be President of the United States. He defeated Vice President Kamala Harris, who had been selected by the Democratic Party establishment, after they decided to put Joe Biden into an early retirement, through what many called a "soft coup." In other words, sacrifice Biden to save the party. Well, it appears it didn't work. Caitlin Johnstone commented: "Turns out campaigning on the promise of continuing a genocide while courting endorsements from war criminals like Dick Cheney is not a great way to get progressives to vote for you."

Now, Helga, when you were looking at developments in the recent days, you said, "Our moment in history is here, because it is very clear that the old system is crumbling, and the chances to put in a completely new system are absolutely there." So how should our viewers think about the developments of the last week, including the election of Donald Trump?

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:** It's definitely a moment of a break in a very tense strategic situation. Trump has promised to stop wars. Now, obviously, we have to see if the words are followed by deeds, but also events—the Vice President said something similar. So, I would take the attitude, he's a newly elected President, and

let's see if he follows through with his promises.

Now, obviously, the key question is not only what he does inside the United States, but, naturally, the foreign policy is crucial. I think he will do something to bring the Ukraine war to an end. There is a potential for that, even if the Russians are very cautious, which is understandable, given their point of view. But that potential does exist. I'm not so optimistic concerning Southwest Asia. But the really crucial question is what will be the attitude of the Trump administration to the efforts by the Global Majority to build the new



Donald Trump Facebook page

President Donald Trump and his wife Melania.

economic system. And I would just hope there are enough voices internationally who show that potential.

The initial reaction from the Chinese, from Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Mao Ning, was that the Chinese position is basically one of offering win-win cooperation. And this is given the fact that Chinese President Xi Jinping, several years ago, had already offered to President Barack Obama, that the Obama administration should cooperate with the BRICS and the Belt and Road Initiative, to which Obama reacted very negatively by putting out the "Pivot to Asia" instead. But that offer obviously still exists, and, given



Grigory Sysoev / Photohost agency brics-russia2024.ru

*The Kazan BRICS Summit, Oct. 22-24. Now expanded by 13 “partner” countries, BRICS represents 57% of the world population.*

the fact that the countries of Hungary and Slovakia—who are very interested in ending the Ukraine war, because it’s a neighboring country and it’s a terrible thing to have such a war in their neighborhood—are also on a very positive course with China, there is a potential to end the Ukraine war, and to build bridges.

The countries of the Global South, that have proven in Kazan, Russia, at the recent BRICS summit, that they are definitely determined to move in the direction of a more just and equitable, new world economic order, they also will see the opportunity and I could very well imagine that many of them are reaching out to the Trump new government, to see whether a new, positive attitude can be arranged.

Now, that may be whatever it will be. I can only say that our task—the LaRouche Organization, the Schiller Institute—that we have to use this moment to really catapult the world situation into a new paradigm, a new

security and development architecture, because, I’ve said this repeatedly and it’s more true than ever before: If we do not overcome geopolitics, which is the Wolfowitz Doctrine, which is the idea of the Wolfowitz Doctrine demanding that the U.S. should remain the hegemon of the world forever, but also geopolitics, which is the idea that one nation or a group of nations have the right to impose their interests over other nations—that thinking has to go, especially in the time of thermonuclear weapons; and we really have to use the present situation to try to move out of this extremely dangerous zone.

How dangerous it is, is underlined by the fact that just hours before the election result was known, the United States launched a Minuteman ICBM missile, which is nuclear-capable, to demonstrate the nuclear readiness of the United States. Now, this just shows you that the mindset of the present administration is still in the old



Public Domain

*A U.S. LGM-30G Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile in a silo. One was launched right after the election results were announced.*

paradigm, and that is exactly where the problem is located.

So, the next period will be extremely dangerous. The period from now until the inauguration of Trump remains one of utmost suspense and danger and, naturally, even beyond that. But if one can hope that what Trump said he will do— Naturally, one has to watch very carefully what Cabinet he is putting together. If it's people who will insist, as Trump himself had said during the election campaign, that he wants to split the relationship between Russia and China, this has zero chance of happening, given the fact that the reason why these two countries have moved together so closely, has everything to do with the strategic danger. So, I don't think there's any chance to split these two countries, but it would be very unfortunate if the message coming from the new Trump administration would be that he wants to go in this direction.

If, on the other side, there is a concerted effort to try to move the world into a better place—and that's what our upcoming [Schiller conference](#) is all about, to establish a new security and development architecture, which takes into account the interest of every single country, in the tradition of the Peace of Westphalia—we are possibly on the verge of a completely new era. But it does require a lot of efforts by a lot of people of good will.

So, I'm on the one side optimistic that something big can be done, but on the other side, it would be a fatal mistake to take down the alarms, because we are not out of the danger zone in the slightest, and therefore, it still does require a maximum mobilization of people who are fighting for peace.

**Schlanger:** You mentioned the upcoming Schiller Institute conference, which will be Dec. 7-8. People should look for the announcement for that on the Schiller Institute website. We should have more out shortly.

Now, Helga, I spoke with an elected official in Germany today who said that he sees the Trump victory as good news, but with some problems, and you basically referred to that. But what he said in particular were the two big problems: One, potential opposition to the BRICS from President Trump; and secondly, support for Netanyahu's genocide against the

Palestinians. And he asked, "What do you think can be done to change the direction of these two issues?"

**Zepp-LaRouche:** The countries of the Global South are not passive players, or partners or entities. They're on the move. The countries that came together in Kazan represent 4.7 billion people and 57% of the world population, and there are about 30 more countries that have expressed interest to join the BRICS. So, I don't think these countries will just wait it out and see what Trump does; they will also reach out and make



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

*Diane Sare, LaRouche Independent candidate for U.S. Senate from New York in the 2024 election, at the October 26 concert and rally against the ghoulies of war.*

clear what their interest is.

The West is really at the point where rethinking is urgently required. First of all, Trump probably will go in the direction of tariffs against China, tariffs against the European Union; this will not go without frictions. If he remains on that level— Within Europe, for example, the media this morning were quite amazing. There were commentators stating, "This is the end of democracy!" Obviously, Trump was just democratically elected; two houses of Congress are now Republican, which is not exactly a sign that democracy doesn't function—this is a democratic vote! So, why is democracy at the end?

I mean, there were some problems in the election, obviously, like our independent candidate for U.S. Senate in New York, Diane Sare. She was only

given half as many votes as the number of people who signed to put her on the ballot, and her voting tallies were 0.35% without *any* vacillation for the entire duration of the election day. This is statistically impossible, because normally these results go up and down, depending on where the vote is taking place. So, I'm not saying there are no problems with that outcome.

But the countries of the Global South are on the move. They want to have a new, just, equitable world economic system, which allows them to overcome underdevelopment. And I could very well imagine—since there are many leaders who have very clear ideas about the future, such as the presidents of Brazil, Indonesia, China, Nigeria, South Africa, the Prime Minister of India, and many others—that I can very well imagine that they can also intervene in the situation, and put their wishes on the table. And then, the United States has to think, does it want to cut off relations with the Global Majority, or does it want to have a positive relationship? Now, the Biden administration, for sure, was for decoupling, for Global NATO, which would mean economic and political and military decoupling, and the world being split into two separate blocs—which would be devastating for the world economy. And it would not be good for America; it would not be good for Europe, either

So, this period of the next three months will be used by practically all sides to try to put their system on the table, but the Global Majority is the Global Majority. And for the collective West, if they cut off relationships with the only area of the world economy which is really growing, which is China, and in terms of demographic growth, it's Africa, they would really shoot themselves in their own knee.

This is a period where history can be shaped, and therefore it's not the last word to listen to those people who are trying to read the pages of a past chapter of history.

**Schlanger:** We have some very interesting questions for you, Helga. Here's one from Takis Ioannides, who writes: "A new President of the United States was elected. Europe has been destroyed by the Ukraine war. Citizens in all countries suffer; the quality of life is low. The European Union's plan for immigrants has failed miserably." And he says, "Germany is mainly responsible for the failure." Then he asks: "Is there a chance



Victor Orbán Facebook page  
*Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, an outspoken critic of EU support for the NATO war against Russia, expressed great expectations for President-elect Donald Trump.*

now for Europe to cooperate properly with the U.S., for the end of the war, and the recovery of our life, and how can it be achieved?" That's the question for you.

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Let's see what happens. If you look at the initial responses from even President of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen warmly greeting President Trump on his victory, now, let's see if that warm atmosphere remains. But, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán from Hungary has already expressed great expectations; there are many others who have expressed like sentiments, or even just formal, polite welcomes. And this is a moment when you can put a new policy on the table.

And I think everybody would do well to review, why is the world coming to this crisis point? All the policies the U.S. and European nations have been complaining about were blowbacks to their own policy! The neoliberal model just did not function. In a certain sense, this vote for President Trump really has certain echoes of his being elected in 2016, which at that time was a worldwide rejection of the neoliberal paradigm: The Brexit [UK split with the EU] was part of it; the vote against the change of the constitution in Italy was another one—worldwide demonstrations. So in a certain sense, this present Trump vote, again, was the result that people reject the war policy, they reject

“woke” policies, and in a certain sense, it is a moment where one can forcefully put a different agenda on the table. So I don’t look at it passively, but the people in Europe who like the Trump election, they should reach out to the Trump administration, or the Trump-elect administration, because this is a time to really try to put a better policy on the table.

If the West wants to have good relations with the Global South, well, it is very easy: They should stop a policy of confrontation; they should offer cooperation, and basically say, “Europe has a lot of science and technology capacity still”—“still” one must say—the United States does so to a certain extent, because

most of their capacity is unfortunately in the military sector, which needs to be reconverted. But if there would be a joint policy to say, let’s build up Africa, and Latin America, and Asian countries which are not so developed, and help them to become middle-income countries in the short term by building up infrastructure, developing agriculture, industrial parks, fast trains, energy grids, energy distribution, to combat the deserts by providing new fresh water through desalination via nuclear plants, all of these projects, and that way create a situation where the migrants don’t want to migrate any more, because they would have good reason to stay home and build up their own country! Would that not be the way to solve the migrant question? Is that not something the Trump administration could pick up on, and rather than trying to subdue any Chinese investments, like the Chancay Port in Peru, they would say, “Let’s cooperate in building the bi-oceanic railroad, and other key infrastructure projects in Latin America,” and that way the migrants would stay home!

Wouldn’t that be better than building a wall, where many people are dying on the way to reach a wall, to just then be— Unfortunately, Trump’s impulse will probably be to be very hard on the migrants. But if all the Latin American countries, and African countries and others would, basically, approach the Trump



*Chancay Port on the Pacific coast of Peru, a “megaproject” being developed with China, pictured here in June 2024, which will be inaugurated by the presidents of China and Peru on November 14, 2024.*

CGTN

administration and say: Look, we want to solve the migrant problems, but not by building a wall and then leaving the people in between, hanging there dying and being miserable, being denied their basic human rights—but by changing the policy! Cooperate. Why cannot the United States and China cooperate in building up the Latin American economy? And do likewise with the Europeans for Africa?

It would be so easy! And I’m not naïve or blue-eyed, but I know for sure that if there would be a gesture coming from the collective West in the direction I’m saying now, the African countries, the Asian countries, the Latin American countries, the BRICS countries would immediately agree. So, why don’t we all work toward that end, because that’s the only way to resolve this crisis.

**Schlanger:** Here’s a question from a contact in Ohio. He writes: “The media just doesn’t get it. In all of the articles and commentary I’ve heard today about the election, none identify the support for endless wars as contributing to the election victory of Trump. I consider this psychological warfare.” And he asks for your comments on this.

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Well, it is obviously psywar, but it also reflects— You know, I have asked myself many

times, why is it that the establishments of the West are not capable of reflecting on the fact that their policies have failed. I mean, normally, when you see that you're trying to do something and it doesn't work, for example, in quotes, "humanitarian interventions," trying to export the liberal Western model of democracy—in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Libya, in wherever—and it did not function anywhere! The result is the influence of the United States in Southwest Asia, as a result of these interventionist wars, has shrunk to the lowest level in the entire period! And you would think—For example, in Germany they participated in the Afghanistan war, because we once had a defense minister who said that "German freedom is defended at the Hindu Kush." You remember how shameful the withdrawal of NATO from Kabul was in 2021? You would think that they would reflect on why this did not function! And maybe there are people here and there who realized that this was a wrong policy, because you cannot go into a culture of a completely different background, totally different civilization, sometimes several thousands of years old, and then try, with a few soldiers who scarcely leave their camp, try to impose "democracy"—it's doomed to failure from the very beginning!

And I think the reason why these establishments are not willing to reflect on that, is because they think that their entire position, privilege, money, income, all of that depends on the narrative they have all adopted as a club, and therefore they stick to it, even if it doesn't function any more. But I have only the image of East German Communist leader Erich Honecker, who at the 40th anniversary celebration of the G.D.R., basically said, "Socialism will remain for a thousand years, and neither ox nor donkey will stop it." It was less than two weeks or 12 days, I think, before Honecker resigned, and in three weeks the Berlin Wall came down.

If an establishment is not willing to realize that their policies don't function, then the principle of what is written in the Declaration of Independence comes into effect, namely, that if a people endure a bad government for a very long time, then, when no other means is available, they have the duty to change the government! Now, we just saw with the Trump election such a reflection of this policy, and therefore, it would be a moment for other people, who are not in one of the two camps, but who are in the institutions,

who are in the permanent bureaucracy, to really think, "Would it not be the moment to return to the better traditions of every country, both in the United States and in Europe?" Because we have lost our way, and the time is urgent to restore a better policy in the best traditions each of us has.

**Schlanger:** Now, here's a question from Israel: "Netanyahu fired his Defense Minister, Yoav Gallant, saying he's lost trust in him. Gallant cited Netanyahu's failure to present a post-war plan, and his unwillingness to set up a commission of inquiry into October 7 [2023] as two major reasons for tensions between them." So, he writes, "Some in Israel are speculating that Netanyahu was acting to preempt a move by some in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), in coordination with U.S. officials in Washington, to bring down his government. What do you think?"

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I'm not privy to such information, but the timing when Netanyahu fired Gallant is obvious. You know, in the middle of the U.S. election, obviously, he thought or hoped that the U.S. would be paying attention to other things.

The situation in Israel is terrible, and many commentators say that what is happening is a serious threat to the existence of Israel. I can only hope that the voices of reason in Israel become stronger and manifest themselves.

**Schlanger:** Here's a question from Professor L., who asks: "Do you think the U.S. and Russia could move toward a thaw which could include building a new arms control and disarmament policy, which would stabilize international relations?"

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Given the fact that Trump, himself, was the one who cancelled many of these agreements, one can only hope that there is a rethinking. The urgency to move to such new agreements is more urgent than ever before. But as I said, everything really depends upon what kind of administration he is putting together. And I can only say, the more people speak out and try to make their voices heard in this period of consolidation, the more important their influence can be.

**Schlanger:** And here's a question from Christo-

pher from the Philippines: “Is it feasible that the BRICS could create a financial system modeled on Lyndon LaRouche’s idea of a New Bretton Woods?”

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Yes. At the Kazan BRICS meeting, there was an effort to move in this direction, but they didn’t go all the way in doing that. Several of the member-countries of the BRICS have their own internal pressures and interests, wanting to have a foot in each camp. So, they only went for what is a flanking operation, calling for a BRICS investment fund platform, a grain platform, and similar things. [Paulo Nogueira Batista, Jr.](#), the former Vice President of the New Development Bank, said that the IMF is unreformable, while several countries said they want to reform the IMF, the World Bank, and so forth.

The [Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche](#) remain the absolute *ne plus ultra*, namely, that you have to get rid of the overhang of the \$4 quadrillion outstanding derivatives debt, the several hundred trillion of public debt, and public and private debt, and that as long as you remain in this indebted system, there is no way the West could join a new financial architecture. So, the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche: that you have to have a Glass-Steagall banking separation; that the investment banks have to take care of their books themselves without bailout packages of various kinds; that you then have to move to protect the commercial banks; that you have to set up National Banks; that you have to connect these National Banks with clearing houses, to set up a new credit system—all of these steps are relatively easy. And that would be the way to create the condition for the collective West to join the BRICS fully in a new economic system.

Now, whether or not the countries of the West have the wisdom to move in this direction depends a lot on an intelligent electorate and state citizens who step forward, or change the governments as they are, which right now has been the case in many recent elections—in Germany, in France, and elsewhere.

So, it remains an organizing task and, again, that’s why we have scheduled a new Schiller Institute conference over Dec. 7-8, where this new development and security architecture is one of the key foci. And the [Ten Principles of a New International Security and Development Architecture](#) I have suggested, which should be considered for such a security architecture,

are really the basis for such a discussion. So, please read these, and join our conference and help us to organize for it to make it an outstanding event. We set the date in such a way that it should intervene in the present situation, in as many countries around the world as possible, because we need to bring forth the best of all people to solve this crisis.

**Schlanger:** Madeleine, who’s monitoring the chat page, reports that many people are saying they’re happy that Trump won. One example is Diana S. from Canada, who writes: “Good morning, Helga and Harley. Congratulations to the American people and President Trump. What a fantastic win for freedom. The people have spoken. I’m so happy today, and I’m not even American. This was a win for the world.”

Another woman wrote in, who is a regular on the International Peace Coalition calls, and she says: “In listening to what you’re saying, I have one message: Get on the phone and build the attendance for this week’s IPC Zoom call. The IPC has been instrumental for the change that’s been underway.”

So with that, Helga, what’s on tap for this Friday’s [IPC Zoom meeting](#)?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** I can tell you that we are organizing for the Friday call, but also already for the Schiller Institute Conference on Dec. 7-8, and we have an enormous interest from top, top, top people! So, please! Understand that this is an extraordinary possibility to put together an international coalition. The IPC meeting this Friday, for sure, will discuss the implication of the outcome of the Trump victory in the United States, and what needs to be done by international forces to help—so get on this call. And I can only fully endorse what you just said: get on the phone, organize all your friends, all your colleagues. This is the moment when we can actually shape history, so that is what we should do.

**Schlanger:** I think in posing the question, she anticipated that that would be your answer. So, Helga, thank you for joining us today. Sorry for my voice, but I think it’s important that people get these updates *every single week*. See you on Friday.

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Yes, and you get your health better!