

I. International

International Peace Coalition

A Philosophic Discussion for Peace

by *EIR* Staff

Feb. 28—The 91st weekly [meeting](#) of the International Peace Coalition (IPC) today turned into a profound philosophic discussion on the true meaning of politics and diplomacy which must be established in order to prevent the descent into global war, and on the current extremely dynamic transformation taking place in the wake of U.S. President Donald Trump's election and his forceful intervention to stop the surrogate war on Russia in Ukraine.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute and convener of the IPC, opened the forum by pointing to the tectonic shift taking place, with the collapse of the collective West. The unipolar world, ruled by the West since the end of the Soviet Union, is disintegrating, and “is never to be fixed again.”

The war in Ukraine is lost, but the Europeans refuse to stop, preparing for a war they cannot win and cannot afford. In a state of denial about reality, they sent French President Emmanuel Macron, British Prime Minister Keir Starmer, EU foreign policy chief Kaja Kallas, and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky to Washington to coerce Trump to continue the war, but totally failed. It is an “arrogance of power,” Zepp-LaRouche said, which is expressed by the 2007 Lisbon Treaty. That treaty was used by the EU leadership to effectively create a European constitution, including a provision to wage collective war, without the consent of the European people—after 2005 referendums in the Netherlands and France on the creation of such a constitution were soundly defeated.

She emphasized Russian President Vladimir Putin's recent declaration that the talks with the Trump administration are going well, and that the intention is to create global security for all countries—very much like the intention of the IPC and the Schiller Institute to create a new architecture for security and development for all nations. She warned that the situation in the Middle East is still treacherous, and that we must not finish our fight for peace until all the threats are resolved.

Peace Is Bad for the Military-Industrial Complex

Ray McGovern, a co-founder of the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, posed the question: Will the Europeans be able to stop Trump's peace effort? He warned that the media is a major weapon against peace, and “peace is bad for business.” He reported that former presidential candidate Dennis Kucinich and his wife had authored an article showing that with the outbreak of peace talks in the U.S., the stock values of the military-industrial companies had begun a sharp decline, whereas in Europe, where the leaders are militarizing their countries, the military-industrial stocks are booming. He ridiculed the continuing anti-Russia hysteria, asking if Rachmaninov and Tchaikovsky were merely pumping gas at a Russian “gas station.”

Trump is not only saying “no more war in Ukraine,” he is also saying “no more NATO.” Europe can no longer depend on the U.S., McGovern said. Nonetheless, the danger in the Middle East is still great, and we should recall what McGovern's friend, the late peace activist Daniel Berrigan said: “The difference between doing something and doing nothing is everything.”

Dr. Jérôme Ravenet, a professor of philosophy in France, an author of a thesis on Chinese President Xi Jinping, and a China scholar, pointed first to British Prime Minister Tony Blair's repulsive speech in Chicago in 1999 openly promoting imperial intervention in foreign countries, which became the basis and justification for the many regime change wars by the UK and the U.S. in the following years. Sanctions and military interventions only escalate conflicts, they do not solve them, Ravenet said. Are they insane, he asked, or are they convinced that military intervention is necessary to counter a perceived evil?

The West has now worn out its power with color revolutions and hubris. He then discussed the great philosophical minds of Western civilization, drawing from each a sense of justice. He pointed to Dutch philosopher

Baruch Spinoza, who distinguished between power and potency (the latter works through ideas, rejects physical force, and requires inclusivity), showing that power proves to be impotent (as the failure of sanctions demonstrates, as well as the fact that regime change wars only create chaos), whereas the Chinese policy of the Belt and Road Initiative shows the benefit of inclusivity. He said that the West has demonized China, denying that the concept of socialist democracy can even exist.

Contrary to the Wolfowitz Doctrine of Western superiority and hegemony, the great philosophers pointed to common sense and a multi-polar world; that contradictions do not mean declaring others to be enemies—pointing to Nicholas of Cusa’s concept of the “conjunction of opposites.” China’s idea of a “win-win” policy, and Charles de Gaulle’s notion of a “third way” between communism and capitalism, are better approaches, he said.

Zepp-LaRouche praised Dr. Ravenet’s “enlightened” presentation, and agreed fully that the Chinese concept of “socialist democracy” was a better approach. After all, she noted, “democracy is dead in Europe,” as evidenced by the cancellation of the election in Romania because the winner was against the war in Ukraine, and he was then arrested to prevent him from running again. Europe is tied to the “deep state” in the U.S. She brought up the notion of synarchy, the idea that the oligarchy and the banking interests must have power over the will of the masses, pointing to former U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s denunciation of the “deplorables”—the mass of people who rejected the oligarchic policy—as an example.

Ray McGovern thanked Dr. Ravenet, saying that he felt like he was “back in grad school, taking notes.” He said that we must also consider the role of racism in the thinking of the oligarchy. He noted that he studied the Classics and learned Greek, he found that there were two words for power—*kratos*, meaning hegemony, and the other, *dynamis*, being relational, in which the interests of the other were important. He added that Jesus used the term for relational power.

Dr. Ravenet added that in regard to anti-China racism, it was French philosopher Montesquieu who introduced the notion of “oriental despotism,” although he knew nothing about China. His concern was to oppose Gottfried Leibniz, who was working with the Jesuits who were in China. Dr. Ravenet concurred with McGovern that Jesus rejected the concept of power as hegemonism.

Mubarak Awad, a Palestinian-American who heads Non-Violence International, provided a video discus-

sion with the Schiller Institute’s Gerald Belsky, in which he strongly endorsed the LaRouche Oasis Plan. He said Palestinians are “less interested in one state or two states, but that people cannot live without water.” He denounced the politicization of water, pointing to Israel’s cutting off the water supply as part of their war on Gaza. He said that Palestinians do not trust the West, since its leaders repeatedly say “peace” and “two-state solution,” but not a single U.S. President has enforced that policy, all saying that “it is up to Israel.” Other countries must be brought into the planning, such as Türkiye, India and African countries; not just Europeans, who had colonized the region.

A Shared Community of Mankind

In response to a question about what type of leadership was needed in Europe, Zepp-LaRouche said, “Not those who reject the common good.” She pointed to China’s notion of the “shared community of mankind.” Leaders must “inspire,” she said, which requires a love of poetry and music. Such leaders existed in the past, such as Charles de Gaulle, the Prussian reformers who followed Friedrich Schiller and the Humboldts, the leaders of the 1955 Bandung Conference, Confucius, and Joan of Arc. “We need discussions of these ideas,” rather than the common use of “slogans and text messages.”

Dr. Ravenet expressed his delight that the Schiller Institute exists to discuss these issues. He said that he had taught the Chinese language for years, but that in France there was an effort to marginalize the teaching of Chinese and other languages. Zepp-LaRouche responded that knowing other languages and cultures was crucial if we are to create a world worthy of all nations and all peoples.

Jacques Cheminade, the head of the French Solidarity and Progress party, said that leaders must be willing to break from the “set rules of discourse” to seek the truth.

A question was raised as to whether Trump had the fortitude to counter the Deep State. IPC co-moderator Dennis Speed responded that the new U.S. Attorney General, Pam Bondi, had demanded that the FBI release all files relating to the Jeffrey Epstein case, only to find that thousands of pages had been withheld. She has [now demanded](#) that they all be released immediately, and to know who had withheld them. Tulsi Gabbard, now the Director of National Intelligence, has countered the British demand that Apple create a “backdoor” on all their cell phones so that British intelligence can spy on everyone. These are the cases which will determine whether the Deep State will prevail or not.