
Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The Cultural Basis For a Peace Policy

Mrs. LaRouche is the founder of the international Schiller Institute and the chairman of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity party (BüSo) in Germany. Subheads have been added.

I want to address two questions: One is, how to answer the threat of war, with a peace offensive, not only in the Sudan, but globally; and secondly, I want to talk about the cultural aspect of globalization, and how to defeat it.

Now, what I want you first to do, is look at the African continent as a whole. It is a continent which would break the heart of any human being looking at it, because it is a continent torn by war. Almost every country which is trying to develop, such as Sudan, has an ulcer, which is depleting its resources, preventing it from developing; and, even if there may be regional, local, ethnic, religious, and other conflicts, there is no conflict in Africa that I know of, which is not steered from outside the continent, and the issue is, always, raw materials, gold, diamonds, oil, or other resources. The people of Africa are regarded by the thieves who want to loot the African continent, as nuisances. They have the same attitude as Cecil Rhodes at the turn of the Twentieth Century, namely, that people of black color should be gotten rid of, because they should not consume these valuable resources.

Take another aspect. Recently there was a conference in Durban, South Africa, which discussed the question of AIDS and other epidemics raging on the African continent. Many speakers said very clearly, that the mortality rate in Africa right now, is already at the level of Europe in the Fourteenth Century. The death rate is the same rate. The World Health Organization issued a report a year ago, in which they said, concerning AIDS and other epidemics, antibiotic-resistant diseases, and others, that there is only a very small window of opportunity to be used, or else it will be too late, not only for Africa, but for the whole world.

The Global Context

This is, briefly, the condition of Africa. However, this is not the whole picture, because this African tragedy is taking place in the context of a global systemic collapse of the Anglo-American-dominated financial system. And the danger is, as Mr. LaRouche has said very, very clearly, that out of this financial breakdown, and economic depression, there comes, as in the 1930s, a new fascism, but this time, I can assure you,

if it were to develop, it would be much worse than Adolf Hitler and Mussolini combined. The financial oligarchical elite has only one answer: that is, fascist methods based on racism and eugenics, steering religious wars. You only have to look at the Middle East, where an unprecedented wave of violence has broken out, and you can see, that it is the intention of the financial oligarchy, to inflame not only the Middle East, but to spread religious war to all of Central Asia, Southeast Asia. And one thing is very clear: that if we don't stop this, the whole world, not only Africa, will plunge into a new Dark Age.

Mr. Friesecke has given you a very harsh, but realistic view of the intention of the enemy of Africa, projecting poverty and misery into the year 2015 and beyond. It is clear that the idea of Samuel Huntington, of the "Clash of Civilizations," indeed, is to steer wars, continue conflicts, set people against each other, play up the differences and conflicts, and play on the backward and chauvinist traditions in each case.

The Model of the Peace of Westphalia

If you take the realistic view, and say that this is our supposed destiny, this is what the enemy has in store for us, is it then not possible to say: Rather than focussing on our regional conflicts, on our local differences, that we join together and understand that, only if we unite, can we defeat this larger enemy outside?

And there is one very powerful precedent showing how to end such conflict, and that is the Peace of Westphalia, which ended not only the Thirty Years War in Europe, from 1618-1648, but this was actually a religious war, which lasted altogether 150 years, and caused tremendous carnage. Certain areas were destroyed up to 60%, 80% — people dead, villages destroyed. What did people do? After they realized that the continuation of war, generation by generation, grandfather, father, son, killing, killing, revenge, killing, killing, killing, back and forth, that nobody would gain, and that there was only one solution, to stop the war.

This document, the Peace of Westphalia, which I recently re-read, is a rather remarkable document. It has three essential components: first — and this occurred in the Seventeenth Century, quite a while ago — people came to the conclusion that the only way to stop the war, is from now on, to base foreign policy on the principle of love. Now that may be a shocking idea, because if you hate your enemy, because your enemy has just killed your wife, children, your sons, relatives, then to say, "Stop, I have to love my enemy" — it is a very challenging concept.

The second principle of the Peace of Westphalia, was that they decided that every crime committed by each of the participating war parties, and the crimes of the people working with them, their companions, their allies, *every crime should be forgotten, for the sake of peace*. In other words, you cannot have peace by endlessly listing a long series of crimes, of who did what to whom, because if you continue to do that,

after war has raged for such a long time, you will never find a clean slate, because it is the nature of war that crimes are committed, that unfortunate things do occur. There is only one way, which is to say, if we want to stop the bloodshed, *stop it, make a tabula rasa, forget it, for the sake of peace.*

When that was done, in the case of the Peace of Westphalia, it led to peace, and it led to the beginning of international law in Europe, and it had tremendous benefits. When it was not done, as in the Versailles Treaty after the First World War, injustices were continued, and that led immediately to World War II, and World War II did not stop there. In a certain sense, we are still living in the tradition of two world wars of the Twentieth Century. If you take the Peace of Westphalia, you have peace, but if you take the Peace of Versailles, you breed more war.

The third principle of the Peace of Westphalia, was that, for the first time in history, at least in European history or other history that I know of, there was a clear definition of the role of the state in the reconstruction of the destroyed areas. And historically, this was the beginning of what Mr. LaRouche calls “physical economy,” and what later became Cameralism in Germany.

Peace Requires a Certain Image of Man

If you agree that such an approach has to be taken, how do you then proceed? You have to start with the image of Man. You have to be aware of the fact that every man is born in the image of God, the Creator. And being in the image of God, means that Man is capable of imitating the most noble aspects of God the Creator, which means, creative cognition. Therefore, individual rights, inalienable rights of all human beings, are not only the right to life, to a decent living standard, health care, longevity, education, a fulfilled life, and so forth, but it is the right of every individual to develop his or her powers of cognition. The political order, therefore, must be brought into cohesion with these inalienable rights of Man, generally called natural law.

This is only possible through the sovereign nation-state, and I will explain why only the sovereign nation-state can guarantee these rights. Until the Fifteenth Century, all over the world—in Europe, in Africa, in China—all governments were actually imperial by design, which means that only a very small elite had the privilege of literacy, of participating in culture, while the majority of the population was backward and did not participate. In the Fifteenth Century, the nation-state developed (I can explain later, how), and for the first time, the idea was created that the nation-state must take care of the common good of the people, and that the only way this can be done, is that the government must sponsor and further scientific and technological progress.

Thirdly, the government must make sure that the number of intellectuals increases, that the number of educated people expands to finally reach the situation of universal education.

This can be guaranteed only through the representative



Helga Zepp-LaRouche: “Don’t talk about the crimes and the negative things, but about the kind of things the African continent can be united around, as proud nations.”

system, in which representatives have a reciprocal relationship to the government and to the governed; they have to, on the one side, serve in the best interests of the nation, of the government, and, on the other side, represent the interests of the people. They are accountable to the people and they are accountable to the government. So they have an extremely important role. “Representative” means also that you can vote them out of office if they don’t represent the people, which is a very important measuring point, the reason why no supranational institution can guarantee the rights of the people, is because the bureaucrats of supranational institutions, like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the European Union—they are not accountable. I haven’t voted for them, but they decide my destiny. So, they are to be gotten rid of and replaced by a truly representative system.

This idea, of the common good in the nation-state, must also be the basis of foreign policy. One of my favorite philosophers, is the great thinker of the Fifteenth Century, Nicholas of Cusa, who actually developed a model, for how peace in the world, in the universe, can be possible, only through the development of all nations. He said, *concordance in the macrocosm*, is only possible if each *microcosm develops in the maximum way*. You cannot have a peace order in which some develop, and some not. But there has to be the maximum development of each microcosm.

A Community of Principle

Now, obviously, in order to think this way, what you need is a passionate love for the idea of a community of people.

You have to be a patriot, but you also have to rise above your own national thinking, and develop true love for mankind. Nicholas of Cusa picked up also on the famous Parmenides paradox of Plato, which poses the problem of how to reconcile the conflict of the One and the Many. He said, there are different nations and people, who are all different expressions of the variety of God's creation and they all have an individual character, but they also have, beyond that, a transcendent representation. Therefore, the individuality of nations has to be respected, but they are bound together through a universal unity. And those nations, and those peoples, have inalienable rights, like individuals, but they are united through a universal spirit which is present in all the particulars. So peoples and nations exist in their differentiation, but their unity existed before and is primary. So there is unity in diversity. Concordance, peace, is only possible in the macrocosm, through development of the microcosm.

There is a simpler way of putting this. It is as if you treated other nations the way you treat your family members: If you are a father or a mother, what more pleasure do you get, than if you see your children grow? If you see that your relatives are doing well, that your uncle suddenly learns a new language, which opens his mind to new things, and he can read new books, your nephew makes a breakthrough in mathematics, in physics, your little granddaughter suddenly becomes a beautiful musician? It makes you happy, because you see that people develop, that they become enriched. If you take that emotion, to wish to bring forward the best in all people, as the basis of foreign policy, then peace is very simple.

As in a family, you don't want all to be uniform, but you want each of them to bring out his or her own particular character as far as possible. Nicholas of Cusa was very wise; already in the Fifteenth Century, he said that whenever a member of the human species makes a discovery, it must be spread. Cusa said that the human soul is the place where the development of the universe takes place, so much so, that without the human soul, there would be no progress. This progress, this discovery of science, of geography, of music, is so important, that it must be immediately made available to everybody, so that their development is not slowed down. This was in the Fifteenth Century! The opposite of technological apartheid, which says only certain countries can have access to technologies, and others should never get them. The idea here is the opposite: Everybody must have access to every technology as soon as it exists.

Nicholas also called for the systematic collaboration of scientists and engineers—and I was very happy when here, an engineer said, engineers of the world should unite, because one engineer should not take down what another engineer has built. And the same thing is true, that a true lover of music will not play wrong notes when he hears another musician



Confucius, whose philosophy revolves around the idea of “ren,” which means universal love for mankind—the counterpart to the Greek/Christian notion of “agapē.”

from another country play very well. So let us encourage the communication of the scientists, of the musicians, of the artists, of the engineers, because they speak a universal language.

Ecumenicism: The Example of China

I want to add one more thought. That is, Mr. LaRouche has mentioned, there are some influential regions of the world where this notion of man in the image of God is not accepted axiomatically. The question is, what do you do then? Among Christians and Muslims, you can reach agreement on the human dignity of man in the image of God, it is something we can agree upon, especially in the face of an enemy who attacks this. But what do you do with people who do not agree to this?

I want to basically take one example, which may be useful, and that is the question of Chinese culture. Chinese culture predominantly does not believe in God; they don't believe in Islam or in Christianity, they have all kinds of other influences. But they have one extremely important current, the current of Confucius, which, as you will be able to see if I just briefly mention some of its ideas, fits with the values of Islam and Christianity.

Confucius has one central concept in his entire philosophy. This was the idea of *ren*, which means love, or *agapē*. Confucius said that *ren* is a kind of internal cultivation of yourself. Therefore it is very easy, the moment I desire love, benevolence, and charity, love is there. I can willfully decide I want to have love now. He said, people are in need of love, more urgently than water and fire. The principle of love should be applied to the governing as well as to the governed. When gentlemen are earnest with their kinsmen, the people will be inspired with love, not only to have love, but to practice it,

universal love for mankind. He said, *ren* is an idea which subsumes a whole spectrum of moral values.

Another key notion of Confucius was the notion of *li*. He said, *li* means that everyone finds the appropriate place in society, that there is no break between the past and the present. *Li* is an expression of cultivated humanity. In a certain sense, it is the same idea as the maximum development of the microcosm, or the monad in Leibniz, that each person must develop his own maximum potential for the sake of society. The rank of a person must not be dependent on rank or family, let alone worthless money, but must depend on moral perfection. The more moral a person, the higher his rank. Nicholas of Cusa has the same idea as Confucius, that the rule should be by the wisest, and the wisest who respect the law the most. Confucius had this notion of *sheng ren*, the person of the highest moral perfection, who also has the mandate of heaven and keeps that mandate, as long as he performs on this level. One of his pupils, Shi Lu, asked Confucius, what does ruling mean? Confucius said, to go ahead of the people, to give an example, and inspire them, and have moral excellence.

In this Confucian tradition was another thinker called Mencius, who lived from 390-305 B.C., and he had another extremely important concept, namely, that Man must live according to his own internal moral laws, no matter what external conditions are. Never sell out your soul, no matter how difficult it may be. Mencius also said that each person has the same potentiality in him to achieve these highest perfections.

Friedrich Schiller, after whom the Schiller Institute was named, had the same idea, expressed in the famous play, *Don Carlos*. He said, “Be king of a million kings.” Don’t have someone elevated to be a king; have everybody become a king. Everybody, every child, must eventually become a genius. This is what Confucius said, and I think this is the issue of every culture: how to elevate every human being to this level.

Looking to the Future

Let me just say one word about the Schiller Institute. In 1984, the Schiller Institute was founded, based on these ideas: that foreign policy must be based on *agapē*, that the only way to have peace is by relating to the best traditions and potentialities in other nations, in all fields, in science, economics, art. For example, when you talk to an American—leaving aside certain evil ones we won’t talk about right now—you don’t talk about their evil role in the Confederacy, slavery, their crimes in Vietnam, but you want to elevate them, and you want to appeal to them in the tradition of the Founding Fathers, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. In the same way, when you talk to Germans, don’t talk to them all the time about what Hitler and the Nazis did and their crimes, which obviously exist, but talk to them from the standpoint of their proud tradition of Nicholas of Cusa, Leibniz, Bach, Beethoven, Schiller, and so forth.



Friedrich Schiller, Germany's poet of freedom, understood that every person has the capacity to become a genius.

I had wanted to fill out this concept for this region, but because of a lack of studying, and time, I wasn’t able to. However, I would like you to do this yourselves, and ask: What is the best tradition of Sudan? What is the worst tradition? What is the best tradition of Egypt? Of Ethiopia, Nigeria, the Great Lakes region? South Africa? Try to find that tradition to elevate people. Don’t talk about the crimes and the negative things, but the kind of things the African continent can be united around, as proud nations.

Leibniz, in his *New Essays on Human Understanding*, said something extremely interesting, again in the Seventeenth Century. He said, if one day—and here is the question of globalization—if one day, British nominalism, which is the same as empiricism, materialism, and egoism, dominates the whole world, this will have catastrophic consequences. Because those who follow their bestial impulses will try to seduce the minds of others, because they are ambitious. They will set fire to the four corners of the world, and there is a danger that these poisons, step by step, will enter the minds of those who govern. Then, the sense for the common good will disappear, and these people will ridicule those who take care of the good of their nations. Eventually, however, these people will have the same fate as the fate they are trying to create for others: They will all go under, and then the necessary revolutions will follow.

This is exactly the condition we are in today, because it cannot go on the way it is going. And I want to end with another thought of Leibniz, who said, that because God created the best of all possible worlds, God has made the world also in such a way that a very great evil, provokes an even greater good in people, which is capable of defeating the evil. Thank you.