

The story of the Schiller Institute

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and chairman
of the Schiller Institute

Although the Schiller Institute was only established in May 1984, recent events have already demonstrated the urgent and historic necessity for such an institution. Until that time, the world did not possess a single institution which was working toward promoting republican principles of foreign policy in relations among nations. But during the short time from July 3-4 to the present, the Schiller Institute has held three full international conferences with over 4,000 participants from 60 countries, all of whom were swept up by an extraordinary quality of enthusiasm on an international level—an experience that has subsequently had most beneficial repercussions in many countries.

What were the circumstances of the birth of this Institute, which in such a short time has been able to develop such amazing effectiveness?

The evolution of this idea began with none other than Friedrich Schiller himself, whose works and ideals have always been the connecting thread throughout my life. It was, on the one hand, the conception of beautiful humanity as represented by the incomparable person of Schiller, speaking so grandly and clearly from all his works, and on the other, his ideas on the relationship between the state and the individual, on patriotism and world citizenship, which deeply influenced my own development and have thus become so closely intertwined with the prehistory of the Schiller Institute.

Decoupling Europe

What specifically triggered the idea to found the Institute in the summer of 1984 was the shocking realization that the tendencies within Western Europe inclining toward a “decoupling” with the United States, had progressed much further than I had previously ever thought possible. It became clear to me that the Soviet Union’s long-cherished intention of splitting the Federal Republic of Germany out of the Western Alliance, as its key tactic in securing hegemony over Western Europe, had gone into an operational phase. Not a

single one of the existing leading institutions seemed ready or willing to call this tendency by its real name, not to speak of acting on such knowledge. The so-called peace movement left us no doubt about its function as Moscow’s fifth column; the Social Democratic Party dramatically shifted its political character into an anti-Western, anti-industry party; and anti-American currents became unmistakably evident even within the governing parties. This observation prompted the insight that all of the so-called think tanks, on both sides of the Atlantic, were propounding various versions of the same decoupling policy—ranging from cautious formulations about “greater European independence” all the way to the public campaigns for a “third way” toward an “independent *Mittel-europa*” or for “nuclear-free zones.” And soon enough, Oskar Lafontaine was asking the typical and yet crucial question, whether it is really so hard to imagine the Federal Republic living under a system similar to that of the G.D.R. (East Germany).

How could it have come to pass that, despite the increasingly apparent aggressive nature of the Soviet Union, a not insignificant part of West Germany’s population could still believe that President Reagan, and not Moscow, was their real problem, and that the West no longer had any values worth defending?

The crisis in U.S.-West German relations

Confronted with this situation, I felt it was urgent to form a new institute for the renewal and improvement of external relations between the Federal Republic and the United States, an institution which would both investigate the causes for this disaffection, and at the same time establish this relationship on a new and positive basis. The subsequently released results of such studies show that one essential cause of these pacifist tendencies and the accompanying problem of West German “identity,” is to be located in mistaken policies of the Anglo-American occupation forces, whose personifica-

tion, John J. McCloy, represented by far the worst side of the American political spectrum. Such policies were in stark contrast to those pursued by such men as Douglas MacArthur in postwar Japan. Thus, in Germany, the politics of occupation not only made a mockery of the much-touted "New Beginning," but worse, Allen Dulles did everything in his power to shore up existing structures, in order that he might then declare them as "U.S. assets," ever at his disposal. Above all, this policy was aimed at preventing the new Federal Republic from feeling the slightest identification with the positive accomplishments of its own history, so that, while America's entry into World War II had indisputably brought the best moral tendencies to the fore within the American population, the subsequent postwar policies under Truman were unfortunately diametrically opposed to those original aims of the American Revolution.

I am deeply convinced that German-American relations are in such a state of profound crisis that no pragmatic solution or cosmetic tricks will be of any help. If the relationship of these two nations is to regain any world significance, then this will only occur on the basis of the best traditions within both nations—namely, the fundamental ideas of the American Revolution and the German Classics. Nothing less than this will do: men and women must once again pledge themselves to the ideals of that age, to the historically fortuitous coincidence of the American Revolution with the rise of the German Classics, and they must learn to draw upon these ideas for the intellectual energy and moral fortitude required to solve today's problems.

Even during the Schiller Institute's infancy it was already clear that not only the Federal Republic, but all of Western Europe was in the same predicament vis-à-vis the United States. Not only was the rising tide of decoupling sentiment threatening to dramatically shift its military and strategic potential in favor of the Soviet Union, but worse, it became increasingly clear that the cherished values of the entire 2,500 years of Western civilization were now at stake. And when the decouplers on both sides of the Atlantic began speaking of a "shift in values" which had ostensibly already taken place and had destroyed any objective basis for the Western Alliance, we could no longer idly sit by. If we were ever to lose our ideals of individual and political freedom—ideals which were the product of 2,500 years of European civilization and which reached a pinnacle of influence 200 years ago in the establishment of the young American republic and the Ideal of Humanity promoted by the Weimar Classics—then such a loss would plunge the world into a new period of unspeakable barbarism.

It was for this reason that the first two international conferences of the Schiller Institute—in July in Arlington, Virginia and in September in Wiesbaden, West Germany, each with over 1,000 participants—concentrated on the looming threat of Western Europe's decoupling from the United States, and on a definition of a new and positive basis for collaboration in the spheres of culture, economics, scientific work,

and defense. In the course of the detailed discussion of these problems at both conferences, the Schiller Institute not only earned the distinction of being the only foreign policy institute to have come out squarely on the side of maintaining the Western Alliance, but was just as unequivocal in its support for European-American cooperation toward the rapid realization of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative."



German-American relations are in such a state of profound crisis that no pragmatic solution or cosmetic tricks

will be of any help. If the relationship of these two countries is to regain any world significance, then this will only occur on the basis of the best traditions of both nations—the ideas of the American Revolution and the German Classics.

The Schiller Institute's international significance was also highlighted in a backhanded way by Soviet Politburo member Vadim Zagladin, who felt compelled to personally author an attack against the Institute in the pages of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*.

In the meantime, members and supporters of the Schiller Institute in America and Western Europe have collected over one million signatures in favor of maintaining the Alliance on the basis defined by us, and have shown themselves determined to produce concrete proof that the movement in support of the Western Alliance will, in the long run, turn out to be far stronger than the so-called peace movement.

However, the problem of bad principles in foreign policy is not confined to relations between America and Western Europe, but plagues all the world's nations, and particularly relations between the nations of the northern and southern hemispheres. It is here that we are often confronted with the paradoxical situation, that many developing countries truly desire to remain America's partner and friend and to remain firmly allied and obedient to the Western Alliance, at pre-

cisely the moment when the foreign policy of the American State Department—particularly the United States' support of the brutal austerity policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF)—is depriving these states of their very means of existence. Hence, here, too, the Schiller Institute has shouldered the task of “formulating concrete proposals for a fundamental change in foreign policy, and especially presenting grandly conceived development projects for Ibero-America, Asia, and Africa.”

In order to compel the Reagan administration to renounce its support for the IMF in favor of the industrialization of the developing sector, the Schiller Institute held its third international conference Nov. 24-25 in Crystal City, Virginia. To this end, I issued a call to individuals as well as governments, to present constructive criticisms concerning those aspects of American foreign policy that were endangering their governments or even their nations, along with recommendations as to the alternative policies they hoped to see from the United States. In this way we could prepare, for President Reagan's consideration, a full array of completely new foreign policy options vis-à-vis these nations.

More than 100 prominent individuals from over 50 nations responded to this call, and presented their working policy papers at the Crystal City conference, where over 1,500 delegates urgently called upon President Reagan to begin his second term by breaking with the policies of Henry Kissinger, the Eastern Establishment, and the IMF, and immediately return to the economic principles of the American Revolution, i.e., to the economic theories of Alexander Hamilton, Friedrich List, and the two Careys.

The atmosphere of excitement surrounding this conference, the interaction of people from so many nations with American representatives from every conceivable social background, but all focused on the realization of one single idea, was an unforgettable experience for all. Such an elevating event has probably not been seen in America since the Civil War and the presidency of Abraham Lincoln. Not only were there in-depth discussions about how American technology could be utilized to quickly halt the fearsome and catastrophic famine in Africa, and how we could build ports, streets, railway networks, irrigation and desalinization works, nuclear reactors and industrial plants. There was also a presentation of how, on the basis of Lyndon LaRouche's plan for the development of Ibero-America, entitled “Operation Juárez,” and his “Fifty-Year Program for the Development of the Pacific Basin” for Asia, the so-called developing sector could be liberated once and for all from the threat of destruction, so that these regions could be transformed into regions of burgeoning economic growth.

The inalienable rights of man

But the most important aspect of this conference was the birth of a new movement for the inalienable rights of man. The conference participants unanimously passed a new “Dec-

laration of the Inalienable Rights of Man”—a wording differs only slightly from that of the American Declaration of Independence, and which takes up those rights which the Founding Fathers demanded for the young colonies, asserting them now for all nations of the globe.

Especially the American participants instantly recognized that the developing nations' demands for industrialization and sovereignty differed not one bit from the demands underlying the American Revolution. And the foreign guests, on their side, recognized equally well that it is not enough to merely criticize the negative aspects of American foreign policy, but that it is now more necessary than ever to focus the concerted and joint efforts of all international republican forces on a revival of the spirit of the American Revolution—but this time not only in America itself, but throughout the entire world.

It was in this spirit that, during the conference, a parade with over 3,000 marchers proceeded to the White House, where this assembly of former civil rights activists, farmers, ministers, and others in public positions urgently called upon President Reagan to guarantee the inalienable rights of all men by changing the foreign and economic policies of the United States. All shared the consciousness that this hour marked the birth of a new movement, completely in the tradition of the great civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s, but also going beyond this, since it was claiming the rights for all human beings. All firmly pledged to carry this movement into all countries of the world, and to make it grow and expand as long as will be necessary to ensure that these rights are actually procured.

The next step was taken on Dec. 15. In many cities in North America and Ibero-America and in Western Europe, the Declaration of the Inalienable Rights of Man was read in public places and was posted on thousands of churches and public buildings. On Jan. 15, Martin Luther King Day, a days-long march from many American cities will culminate in a march on Washington in which about 100,000 people will participate. And that is just the next step. . . .

But most important, what has become evident in the activities of the Schiller Institute and the new international movement for the inalienable rights of man, is a visible change occurring within the committed individuals themselves. Only to the extent that people, regardless of their position and occupation, address themselves to “humanity's great objectives”

selves primarily with their own petty personal needs, but rather dedicate themselves to the welfare of their entire nation and the human species as a whole—to that extent they have begun to think in a truly human way.

If we fail in this humanistic transformation, then our human society will simply not survive. Especially over the past weeks and months it has become clear that Moscow's near-term intention with its Ogarkov Doctrine is to conquer world hegemony, even if this means risking a confrontation

leading to a third world war. Nevertheless, the underlying reason why the West has allowed things to reach this point of crisis, lies mainly in the current moral crisis in the West.

The most gentle thing which might be said about our own era, is that our society has fallen into such miserable depths of banality that the thoughtful person begins to imagine himself squashed flat onto a two-dimensional plane. Truly great thoughts are virtually non-existent, but this is not even perceived as a loss, due to the broad availability of cheap, degraded forms of amusement. And many of us are indeed degraded: just consider our so-called culture, with the brutality of its films, the giant size of the black market in videotapes flaunting perverse acts, the problem of child pornography, etc., and no one can doubt that we are in a dying civilization. A society dominated by the strength of one's elbows, careerism and conformity, status-seeking, pragmatism, sentimentalism, and irrationality on the one hand, but which is no longer capable of even a trace of human feeling for the children dying of hunger in Africa and all the other misery and suffering on this planet, is a society which has lost its moral fitness to survive.

The Schiller Institute has set out to alter this situation. Its call for a return to the ideals of the American Revolution, of the German Classical period and of those historical epochs in other countries which have reflected the same ideals, is therefore the Institute's central conception. Human reason is always capable of finding an answer to every problem confronting it; this is what distinguishes us from mere beasts. Yet within ourselves, we must never destroy that which renders us capable of reason.

That is why the great examples of the classical and renaissance periods in our past are so indispensable for us today. They show us how much more refined and differentiated were the thoughts and feelings of those great humanists, how much more they took for granted a respect for the inalienable rights of their fellow men. Yes, if humankind is to survive, then it will only be possible if human beings—concrete, real, individual men and women—take it upon themselves to put an end to their own degeneration and to change themselves in practice. Unless people today learn to make it their most important aim to perfect within themselves their own potential humanity—to develop a higher quality of human soul—then they have failed in the mission for which they have been placed upon this earth.

The Schiller Institute intends to draft many concepts for all areas of foreign policy. But its most important aim will always be for people to respect within themselves that which makes them human. Only in this way will they learn to love and respect that same humanity within others. And what holds true for our relations with our fellow man, is a thousand times truer for our relationship with other nations.

And that is also why the task of educating mankind to comprehend the poetic beauty of Schiller's works, is the world's most political issue.

Western Europe

Alliance hanging on, despite pressures

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

From the standpoint of Western Europe, 1984 was characterized by a most dramatic combined Soviet and Western oligarchical attempt to break the alliance between the United States and Europe—as dramatic as it could have been short of an outright Soviet use of military force to conquer European territory. Given the enormity of the forces set into motion to bring about a decoupling of Europe and particularly West Germany from the United States, the fact that the Alliance survived the year appears almost startling in hindsight.

The most important defeat for the Soviets and their Western allies was their lack of success in “the German theater.” Not only did the stationing of the American Euromissiles in West Germany proceed as planned despite enormous pressures, but the government of Chancellor Helmut Kohl did a crucial about-turn on the more overriding question of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The same German government, which in the first half of 1984 vowed to lead a European campaign to defeat President Reagan's “Star Wars” program, was by the end of the year issuing categorical statements in its support.

Yet the fact that a Sovietized version of George Orwell's 1984 nightmare failed to surface on schedule does not mean that the battle has been won or Western Europe secured from Moscow's clutches. The brilliant achievements of this past year—and so they were, given the odds—have only bought time, hopefully sufficient time for those committed to rationality to succeed in tilting the momentum of events in their direction.

The governments of Great Britain and France closed out the year with announcements that they were for sale to Moscow and the New Yalta traitors in the West. Having been, at least for the present, stymied in the European heartland, Moscow is aggressively recruiting allies along the peripheries. Principally targeted have been Britain, France, and Italy. Greece, under the premiership of Andreas Papandreu, has, of course, already left NATO “in all but name,” as the Turks