

# **Foredrag af Rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Hvad sker der i og omkring Ukraine? den 5. marts 2022**

“Jens Jørgen Nielsen, som er historiker, Ruslandskender og forfatter til bøger om både Ukraine og Rusland, holdt dette foredrag d. 5. marts 2022 på Aarhus mod Krig og Terrors debatmøde om situationen i Ukraine.” fra hjemmesiden Flygtninge og Fred her.

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/220305Jens-Joergen-Nielsen-Rusland-Ukraine96.mp3>

Diabilleder:

Download (PPTX, 2.67MB)

---

## **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. marts 2022:**

### **Vil falsk kemisk angreb bringe Nato i åben krig med Rusland?**

# Klik her for lydfilen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/tg-11.3.22.mp3>

Resumé:

Det ser ud til at vestlige efterretningstjenester planlægger et falsk kemisk angreb, som det man lavede i Syrien i som fik Trump til at bombe Syrien i 2017. Vil man få Nato i åben krig med Rusland? Faren for en atomkrig har aldrig været større. Der er to krige: Den i Ukraine og den større økonomiske krig USA og Vesten har iværksat imod Rusland. Man forsøger at få russisk kapitulation men trækker også tæppet væk under økonomien, særligt Europas. Hvor længe varer det inden at vi ser konkurser pga. af Ruslands manglende betalinger? De vestlige tiltag som man siger skyldes "Putins krig", var noget USA længe har presset på for, både 2 % af BNP til militær og stop for køb af russisk gas. Nato har længe sendt våben og trænet Ukraines hær, også de åbent fascistiske elementer i den, for at Ukraine kunne påføre Rusland maksimal skade. Skaden på Ukraine betyder lige så meget for Vesten, som man bekymrer sig om befolkningen i Afghanistan.

Vestens økonomiske atombombe imod Rusland, udelukkelsen fra SWIFT og indefrysningen af Rusland formue i udenlandske banker vil medføre at ingen kan vide sig sikker, hvis pengene står i vestlige banker der handler på politiske ordrer. Dollarens og euroens rolle som reservevaluta vil blive kraftigt udfordret. En russisk statsbankerot og manglende russiske betalinger kan vælte meget.

Uden russisk gas, olie og kul står Europa stille. Energipriserne himmelflugt gør stor økonomisk skade. Fødevareforsyning og fødevarepriser rammes også af mangel på

kunstgødning og evt. dårlig høst i Ukraine og Rusland. Og fiskere som bliver hjemme fordi det er for dyrt at sejle. Andre ting, som f.eks. produktion af mikrochips kan også blive hårdt ramt. Vestens sanktioner vil gøre stor skade på økonomien. Rusland vil nok nationalisere eller tvangsovertage vestligt ejede virksomheder som McDonalds og JYSK der har lukket ned for aktiviteten. Hvad med Carlsberg?

Rusland siger, at de aldrig igen vil være afhængige af Vesten. Fokus bliver på Kina og Asien. Man satser på den verdensorden, som Rusland og Kina fremlagde den 4. februar. Kina vil støtte Rusland for de ved, at hvis Rusland knækker, så er det deres tur bagefter.

Globalt økonomisk kaos truer pga. Vestens sanktioner imod Rusland. Ifølge UNICEF og Verdensfødevareprogrammet er 1 million børn under 5 år på vej til at dø af sult i Afghanistan. 8 millioner børn og 22 millioner mennesker er i fare, og de kan kun hjælpe 12 millioner. Vesten gør ingenting.

Vi behøver en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur som alle, også Rusland, Kina og Indien, kan se sig selv i og vi behøver den nu. Skriv under på Schiller Instituttets appel. Rejs debatten. Gør noget, før det er for sent.

---

## **EIR spørger forsvarsministre fra Danmark, Storbritannien og Sverige om en**

# ny sikkerheds- og økonomisk arkitektur på TV2 live

København, 4. marts (EIRNS) – {EIR} stillede et spørgsmål om Schiller Instituttets forslag til en ny sikkerheds- og udviklings arkitektur på et pressemøde i dag med forsvarsministrene fra Danmark, Storbritannien og Sverige, om bord på den danske fregat Niels Juel, ved lanceringen af den militære øvelse Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) i Østersøen. Storbritannien har ledelsen af JEF, og denne øvelse med udgangspunkt i Danmark omfatter også Sverige og de tre baltiske lande, Estland, Letland og Litauen.

Den danske forsvarsminister Morten Bødskov besvarede {EIR}s spørgsmål, i selskab med den britiske forsvarsminister Ben Wallace og den svenske forsvarsminister Peter Hultqvist.

Pressekonferencen blev transmitteret direkte og er arkiveret på dansk TV2. Der var filmhold og reportere fra andre danske medier, Sverige, Storbritannien (BBC), Agence France-Presse (AFP) og muligvis også andre lande, hvor det muligvis er blevet transmitteret.

Her er endnu en video, som også inkluderer TV2's spørgsmål, om Danmark og Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) optrapper krisen med deres militære øvelser i Østersøen.

Hele pressekonferencen kan stadigvæk ses på TV2News den 4. marts 2022: Find "Nordeuropæiske forsvarsministre briefer om samarbejde" her.



"EIR: Michelle Rasmussen fra {Executive Intelligence Review} i USA. I betragtning af alvoren af krigen i Ukraine og faren for optrapning, ligefrem indtil atomkrig, har formanden for Schiller Instituttet Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordret til en international konference om en ny sikkerhedsmæssig og økonomisk arkitektur, der skal tage hensyn til alle landes fælles interesser. Har De en kommentarer til dette – nogen af

ministrene?

“Den danske forsvarsminister Morten Bødskov: Der er kun én kommentar, nemlig at det JEF-samarbejde, som vi har indgået her, er vejen frem. Vi står sammen her i dag, for at bekræfte vores værdier, vores samarbejde, og det er vejen frem for den region, som vi befinder os i nu, og jeg er glad for, at vores britiske kollega og min svenske kollega er til stede her i dag.”

Under den korte pressekonference om morgenen, rejste BBC spørgsmålet om atomkrig, da der blev spurgt, om Rusland i lyset af det russiske angreb på et ukrainsk atomkraftværk, ville være indstillet på at bruge atomvåben. Den britiske forsvarsminister Ben Wallace, nedtonede faren ved den nuværende situation med atomkraftværket. Han advarede Rusland mod at ramme atomkraftværker ved et uheld eller med vilje, og erklærede, at Putins tankegang synes at være, at der ikke er nogen grænser. Putin bør mindes om, at NATO er en konventionel og nuklear alliance.

Under eftermiddagens pressekonference var {EIR} den anden journalist i rækken, der stillede et spørgsmål, forud for en national dansk TV2-journalist, der sendte direkte, og som stillede fire spørgsmål om, hvorvidt denne Joint Expeditionary Force-øvelse risikerer at eskalere den nuværende krise. Svaret fra den danske minister var bl.a., at vi er nødt til at trække en streg i sandet over for Putin og sikre friheden i Østersøområdet. {EIR} vil udsende endnu en video med denne udveksling på dansk, efterfulgt af {EIR}s spørgsmål og svar.

### **English:**

COPENHAGEN, March 4 (ERINS) – EIR asked the question at a press conference with the ministers of defense from Denmark, Great Britain and Sweden, aboard the Danish frigate Niels Juel, on the occasion of the start of the Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) military exercise in the Baltic Sea. The JEF is led by Great Britain, and this exercise, with the starting point in Denmark, also includes Sweden, and the three Baltic countries.

Danish Defense Minister Morten Bødskov answered EIR's question, alongside British Defense Minister Ben Wallace and

Swedish Defense Minister Peter Hultqvist.

The press conference was broadcast live and is archived on Danish TV2, and there were film crews and reporters from other Danish media, Sweden, Great Britain (BBC), Agence France Press, and maybe other countries, so it might also have been covered live in other countries.

“EIR: Michelle Rasmussen from Executive Intelligence Review in the United States. Given the seriousness of war in Ukraine and the danger of escalation, even up to nuclear war, the president of the Schiller Institute Helga Zepp-LaRouche has called for an international conference for a new security and economic architecture to address the interests of all countries. Do you have any comments to that – any of the ministers?

Danish Defense Minister Morten Bødskov: There is only one comment, that the JEF (Joint Expeditionary Force) cooperation that we have made here is the way forward. We stand together here, today, to confirm our values, our cooperation, and that’s the way forward for the region that we are in now, and I’m glad that our British colleague and my Swedish colleague are here today.”

During the morning short press conference, the BBC reporter brought the nuclear war question up when he asked if, in light of the Russian attack on a Ukrainian nuclear plant, Russia would be in the mindset to use nuclear weapons. British Defense Minister Ben Wallace played down the danger of the current nuclear plant situation, warned Russia against hitting nuclear plants by accident or intention, said that Putin’s mindset seemed to be that there are no limits, and Putin should be reminded that NATO is a conventional and nuclear alliance.

During the afternoon press conference EIR was the second journalist to ask a question, preceded by a national Danish

TV2 journalist, broadcasting live, who asked four questions about if this Joint Expeditionary Force exercise can escalate the current crisis. The answer from the Danish minister included that we have to draw a line in the sand for Putin, and ensure freedom in the Baltic region. EIR will release another video with this exchange in Danish and followed by the EIR question and answer.

---

**Poul Villaume den 14. januar 2022:**

**Efter 1989 lovede vesten, at Europa skulle have en "ny sikkerhedsstruktur".**

**Skal vi ikke bygge den nu – sammen med Rusland?**

Følgende er to citater fra Poul Villaums debat artikel i Ræson den 14, januar 2022:

**Titlen: Poul Villaume: Efter 1989 lovede vesten, at Europa skulle have en "ny sikkerhedsstruktur". Skal vi ikke bygge den nu – sammen med Rusland?**

*Poul Villaume (f.1950) er dr.phil. og professor emeritus i samtidshistorie, Saxo-Instituttet, KU.*

»Det er i denne forbindelse også værd at minde om, at både NATO selv (London-erklæringen, juli 1990) og alle CSCE-lande

(Paris-charteret, november 1990) ved Den Kolde Krigs afslutning lovede sig selv og hinanden, at der nu skulle opbygges nye sikkerhedspolitiske mekanismer og institutioner og en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur i et helet og helt Europa, som naturligt også skulle omfatte både Nordamerika og Rusland. Man talte også om et sikkerhedsfælleskab, som skulle strække sig "fra Vancouver til Vladivostok". Men efter at Sovjetunionen brød sammen under sin egen (død)vægt i 1991, blev NATO kastet ud i en stille, eksistentiel krise, som man først gradvist overvandt med vedtagelsen af NATOs udvidelsesprogram mod øst i 1993-94 ("expand or die", lød parolen internt). Der blev dermed, som Vestens yndlings-russer i 1990erne, Boris Jeltsin, fortroligt advarede Bill Clinton om i 1994 og 1995, i praksis tale om, at den tilbageblevne koldkrigsalliance blev dominerende i Europa på bekostning af et sikkerhedspolitisk marginaliseret, isoleret og ydmyget Rusland...«

»En anden vigtig erfaring fra Den Kolde Krig er, at uanset hvor skarpt modsætningerne mellem parterne er trukket op, er det altid godt, at der er dialog, forhandlinger og personlige kontakter – gerne suppleret af fortrolige 'bagkanaler' mellem parterne på højst muligt niveau, og med gensidig respekt for modpartens bekymringer, uanset alle politiske og værdimæssige forskelle. Det var på den måde, afspændingsepoken under Den Kolde Krig blev igangsat i 1960erne og 1970erne, og det var sådan, den, især på europæisk plan, overlevede selv det stærkt forværrede supermagtsforhold i begyndelsen af 1980erne. Det er derfor farligt at bagatellisere dét, at der alene finder forhandlinger sted, som måske nytteløs "bla-bla-bla"; det er under alle omstændigheder bedre end "bang-bang-bang" (eller som Churchill formulerede det i 1954, da han ihærdigt søgte at stable et topmøde mellem Øst og Vest på benene: "To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war"). Og en sidste påmindelse, også formuleret midt under Den Kolde Krig, og af gyldighed også i den aktuelle situation mellem Rusland og Vesten, fremsagt af den respekterede britiske militærskribent Sir Basil Liddell Hart i 1960: "Fasthold styrke, om muligt. Under alle



omstændigheder, hold hovedet koldt. Hav ubegrænset tålmodighed. Træng aldrig en modstander op i hjørnet, og hjælp ham altid med at redde ansigt. Sæt dig selv i hans sted – for at se tingene gennem hans øjne. Undgå selvretfærdighed som djævlens – intet gør mere blind.”«

Læs hele artiklen i Ræson her.

---

## **Interview: Li Xing, phd: Den fælles erklæring fra Kina og Rusland af 4. februar: En erklæring om en ny æra og en ny verdensorden**

22. februar 2022 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark gennemførte et 45-minutters interview med Dr. Li Xing, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Institut for Politik og Samfund, Det Humanistiske og Samfundsvidenskabelige Fakultet, Aalborg Universitet, Danmark.

Dr. Li beskriver indholdet af den fælles erklæring af 4. februar 2022 mellem Kina og Rusland og analyserer, hvad dette betyder for forbindelserne mellem Kina og Rusland, men også for resten af verden. De emner, der diskuteres, omfatter unipolaritet eller multipolaritet, et nyt forhold mellem nationer, demokrati, økonomisk udvikling, en amerikansk domineret “regelbaseret orden” eller en FN-baseret orden, behovet for en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som efterlyst af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og hvordan Kina vil reagere på de kraftige vestlige sanktioner mod Rusland, der er udløst

af Ukraine-krisen.

Dr. Li havde også givet Schiller Instituttet et interview den 26. januar med titlen "Samarbejd med Kina": Det er ikke fjenden".

Afskrift på engelsk:

**Interview: Li Xing, PhD**

**The China-Russia Feb. 4 Joint Statement:**

**A Declaration of a New Era and New World Order**

Michelle Rasmussen: Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin held a summit meeting on the sidelines of the Beijing Olympics and issued a statement on Feb. 4 called Joint Statement of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development. Schiller Institute founder and international President Helga Zepp-LaRouche said that this signals a new era in international relations. To discuss the content and implications of the development, I am pleased to interview Dr. Li Xing, Professor of Development and International Relations in the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences from Aalborg University in Denmark. Dr. Li also gave the Schiller Institute an interview on Jan. 26 of this year, entitled "Cooperate with China. It Is not the Enemy."

Before we go into details, can you please give us your assessment of the overall importance of the summit and statement, including what it means for relations between China and Russia, and China-Russian relations with the rest of the world. And at the end of the interview, we will also discuss what it means in the current, very tense situation between Russia and NATO.

Li Xing: Thank you Michelle for your invitation. It's my pleasure to be invited again by the Schiller Institute. First of all let me emphasize that it is a landmark document.

Why? Because the document emphasizes what I call a “new era,” declaring a shift in the world order, a multipolar world order, in which the U.S. and the West are not the only rule-makers, and Russia and China take the lead, and lay out a set of principles and a shared worldview. This is my first general summary.

Second, unlike the U.S./NATO alliance, the China-Russia relationship is described by the joint document as a “close comprehensive strategic partnership.” In Putin’s early words, he said, “The China-Russia relationship is a relationship that probably cannot be compared with anything in the world.” The relationship is not “aimed against any other countries.” It is “superior to the political and military alliances of the Cold War era,” referring to the U.S.-NATO alliance. It also echoes Xi Jinping’s recent statement, that “the relationship even exceeds an alliance in its closeness and effectiveness.” So the document tries to demonstrate that the China-Russia relationship is a good example of interstate relationships.

Rasmussen: You have characterized the introduction as “a conceptual understanding and analysis of global changes and transformations taking place in the current era.” It especially refers to the transformation from a unipolar to a multipolar world. Can you please explain how the statement addresses this, and what it means?

Li: In the beginning of this statement, it puts forward both countries’ conceptual understanding of the world order, which is characterized as “multipolarity, economic globalization, the advent of information society, cultural diversity, transformation of the global governance architecture and world order; there is increasing interrelation and interdependence between the States; a trend has emerged towards redistribution of power in the world.” [emphasis added by Li] “Redistribution of power in the world.” This is what the part emphasizes.

Second, this part also clearly sets up a series of analyses, arguments and discourses to demonstrate both countries’

understanding, and to emphasize the fact that the world order has entered a new era. Again, "new era" are the key words for this document.

Lastly, in this beginning part of the joint statement, it shows both Russia and China's grand worldview that pave the foundation for the two countries' broad consensus on almost all issues of the world, which we will deal with one by one later on.

Rasmussen: Part 1 is about the question of democracy, and it starts by saying: "The sides" —that is, China and Russia—"share the understanding that democracy is a universal human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States, and that its promotion and protection is a common responsibility of the entire world community."

But the charge is that China and Russia are not democratic, but rather autocratic. This is one of the leading accusations by those in the West who are trying to maintain a unipolar world, and they portray the world as a battle between the democrats and the autocrats. How does the document respond to this, and treat the idea of democracy?

Li: Actually, this document utilizes a large amount of space to discuss this point. First, the joint statement points out that "democracy"—including human rights—"is a universal human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States." So here it implies that the concept of democracy must not be defined by the West alone. The West cannot singlehandedly define which country is autocratic and which country is democratic.

Second, the joint document emphasizes that their standpoint is that there is no universal one-form document, or human rights standard. Different countries have different cultures, histories, different social-political systems in a multipolar world. We have to respect the way each country chooses their own social-political system, and also the tradition of other states.

Third, it signals a strong critique of the West, and in this part, there are a lot of criticisms toward the West. That is, that the West has a tendency to weaponize the issue of democracy and human rights, and very often uses it as a tool to interfere in other countries' internal affairs. It is completely wrong for the U.S. and the West to impose their own "democratic standards" on other countries, and to monopolize the right to assess the level of compliance with democratic criteria, and to draw a dividing line on the basis of ideology, including by establishing exclusive blocs and lines of convenience, and this is very bad, according to these two countries, that the West tends to use democracy and human rights to interfere into other countries' internal affairs, and China really suffers a lot from this point.

Rasmussen: How would you say democracy works in China?

Li: I would argue that if we use Western standards to define democracy, then definitely, China is not a democracy. In a Western version of democracy, China does not have a multi-party system, China does not have elections. But the point is, how the West will respond to the fact that according to major Western sources, survey data sources, throughout many years, that the Chinese people's confidence in their government is the highest in the whole world. And the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state receive the highest approval from the Chinese population according to those data. And also China has reached very high, rapid economic development, under the so-called "non-democratic government." Now, how can the West explain these issues? Many democratic countries suffer from economic backwardness and underdevelopment.

So, as to the form of governance in China, I think it is the Chinese people, themselves, who should make the judgment.

Rasmussen: Let's move on to part 2, which is about coordinating economic development initiatives, including harmonizing the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, and also the Russian Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), even more, and taking

initiatives to create economic development, where they emphasize the role of scientific research in generating economic growth, something that Lyndon LaRouche and our movement have had as a priority concept. And also increasing healthcare and pandemic response in poor countries. What do you see as the significance of this call for increasing economic development cooperation?

Li: Yes. I also read this part of the document very carefully. This part shows a clear difference in approach between the West and the U.S. on the one side, and China-Russia on the other side. While the West is emphasizing, or holding the flag of democracy and human rights, China-Russia actually emphasize that peace, development and cooperation lies at the core of the modern international system. So, according to the understanding of Russia and China, development is the key driver in ensuring the prosperity of other nations, even though democracy and human rights are important, but development must be the core. So it implies that good development will lead the country in the direction of democracy, but not defined solely by the West, the concept of democracy.

Second, that following this line of understanding, then China's Belt and Road Initiative and Russia's Eurasian Economic Union are good examples of interregional cooperation. So they actually use the Belt and Road, and also Russia's Eurasia Economic Union, as good examples. One interesting point I want to emphasize is that both countries emphasize scientific and technological development, and "open, equal, and fair conditions." I think here, there is a kind of implicit criticism toward the United States, which has been conducting sanctions against Chinese tech companies, for example, Huawei, or other high-tech companies.

Finally, I'll remark here that both countries show their commitment to the Paris Agreement and to combat COVID-19, and these two issues are the most vital issues for the international community today. So it is a core for every

country to emphasize these two vital issues: climate change, Paris Agreement, on the one side, and COVID-19 on the other side.

Rasmussen: Yes, I can add that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has initiated a proposal which she calls Operation Ibn Sina, which deals with the terrible humanitarian catastrophe in Afghanistan, leading off with creating a modern health system in every country. And if we could get much more international cooperation for building a modern health system, having the economic development which gives the basis for the population to have the immunology to resist disease, this would be a very important field for economic development, which means life and death at this moment.

Li: I fully agree with Helga's understanding and call.

Rasmussen: As to part 3, this is about the increasing, dangerous international security situation, with a sharp critique of Western attitudes and actions. And the statement reads: "No State can or should ensure its own security separately from the security of the rest of the world and at the expense of the security of other States." And here, China addresses Russia's concerns and criticizes NATO's expansion eastward after the Fall of the Berlin Wall. And Russia addresses China's concerns by reaffirming the One-China principle and concerns about building different regional alliances against China –the Quad and AUKUS. It also praises the recent P5 statement against nuclear war.

Can you say more about China's and Russia's concerns? And do you think this is a call for a new international security architecture?

Li: Yes. If you read the document carefully, and this part on international security architecture, or their understanding of international security, occupied quite a large space. So it is a very important part for China and Russia.

In this part, the statement is actually bluntly clear about

their mutual support for each other's national security concerns. For Russia, it is connected with the Ukraine crisis, but the document does not mention Ukraine specifically, but it is connected. For China, it is the Taiwan issue, definitely. So they show their mutual support for each other.

On Russia's concern for its national security, both countries oppose "further enlargement of NATO," and "respect the sovereignty, security and interests of other countries." And it clearly pronounced, there will be no peace if states "seek to obtain, directly or indirectly, unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security of others." The document claims that the NATO plan to enlarge its membership to encircle Russia will mean security for the Western side, but it is a danger for Russia. It is a national security concern.

On the Taiwan issue, Russia reconfirms that Taiwan is part of China—the One-China policy—and it is against any form of Taiwan independence.

Third, the joint statement also openly criticized the formation of closed blocs, as what you mentioned about the Quad. The document does not mention the Quad, but it does mention AUKUS. The document shows that both countries oppose U.S.-led military camps, or security camps in the Asia-Pacific region, definitely implying the Quad and AUKUS, and it points out the negative impact of the United States Indo-Pacific strategy.

Finally, the two countries call for a new international security architecture, with "equitable, open and inclusive security system ... that is not directed against third countries and that promotes peace, stability and prosperity." So this part is very important for China and Russia to challenge the traditional international security architecture, and call for a new international security architecture, which I will touch on a bit later.

Rasmussen: Many political spokesmen in the West have criticized Russia and China for not adhering to the "rules-



based order” and here, in part 4, China and Russia write that they “strongly advocate the international system with the central coordinating role of the United Nations in international affairs, defend the world order based on international law, including the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, advance multipolarity and promote the democratization of international relations, together create an even more prospering, stable, and just world, jointly build international relations of a new type.”

And it continues: “The Russian side notes the significance of [Xi Jinping’s] concept of constructing a ‘community of common destiny for mankind...’”

Can you say more about the significance of this section, about global governance and the difference between the question of the “rules-based order” and an order based on international law, as laid out by the United Nations Charter?

Li: Yes. This part is extremely interesting, because it touches upon the mental clashes between China-Russia on the one side, and the U.S. and West on the other side, about the “rules-based order.” China, in particular, has been criticized a lot, as you also mentioned, that China has been accused by the U.S. of not following the “rules-based order.” If you remember the dialogue between a Chinese delegation and a U.S. delegation in Alaska in December two years ago, then we still remember the clash, that the Chinese claim that the U.S. rules-based order does not represent the global rules-based order, rather the United Nations–China emphasizes that the United Nations should play the central coordination role in international affairs. But the United States does not really like the UN-based structure, which is based on one-country/one-vote. So if we trace UN voting, we could easily find that the United States very often suffers from many setbacks when it comes to UN voting on many issues. So that’s why China emphasizes the United Nations rules-based order, whereas United States prefers a U.S. rules-based order.

And this joint statement also calls for advancing

multipolarity and promoting democratization of international relations. In my interpretation, democratization of international relations implies that the power structure embedded in the Bretton Woods system, which was created by the United States after the Second World War, does not really reflect the new era, as I pointed out earlier. China and Russia think reforms are needed to reflect the new era. This definitely, again, from my interpretation, refers to international financial institutions like the World Bank, and the IMF, where Chinese voting power is proportionally weaker than it should have been, according to its economic size.

And also the joint statement mentions the China foreign policy, as you mentioned in your question, "community of common destiny for mankind," which was raised by President Xi Jinping. And in this nexus China's Belt and Road Initiative is a good example, seen from China's point of view, a good example of community of common destiny for mankind, in which the Belt and Road intends to promote, through worldwide infrastructure investment, the formation of a new global economic order, through creating a community of shared interest, and the community of shared responsibilities.

Unfortunately, the West does not really like both a "community of common destiny for mankind," and the Belt and Road Initiative, because they are interpreted as the Chinese agenda is to transform global governance and the rules-based order.

However, I really think that the West should rethink their opposition, and they must face the fact that the Belt and Road memorandum has been signed by 148 countries and by 32 international organizations. So, according to my judgment, the Belt and Road, and also a community for common destiny for mankind, have already become an indispensable part of global governance and global order.

Rasmussen: Yes, this is also to underscore what you said before, about how important economic development is for the wellbeing of the countries. And here you have China, which was the first country to eliminate poverty in their country, over

the last 40 years, and is offering this as a model for other countries to get economic development. The slogan of the Schiller Institute is "Peace through Economic Development,"—

Li: Exactly.

Rasmussen: The way that you can get countries that have perceived each other as enemies to rise to a new level, to seek common interest, is through arranging economic development programs, not only for a single country, but for a whole region, which encourages them to work together. You spoke before about the Chinese criticism of the Bretton Woods institutions. What the Schiller Institute and Lyndon LaRouche have been saying, is that the initial idea of the Bretton Woods institutions as proposed by Franklin Roosevelt was to try to get the economic development of the poorer countries. But it degenerated into, for example, where you had the World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposing austerity conditions on countries as a precondition for loans, where nothing was done to actually increase the productivity of the countries, in the way that the Belt and Road is actually —with the infrastructure development, creating the basis for the countries to becoming prosperous. And what we're saying is that the total change in the international financial institutions is absolutely necessary now, at a point where financial speculation is blowing out, hyperinflation, and we need to have a new economic architecture, you could say, based on the physical development of the countries.

Li: I fully agree with your remarks and comments.

Rasmussen: Then another important statement in part 4, is that Chinese-Russian relations have reached a new level, as you said at the beginning, "a new era."

"The sides [China and Russia] call for the establishment of a new kind of relationship between world powers on the basis of mutual respect, peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation. They reaffirm that

the new inter-State relations between Russia and China are superior to political and military alliances of the Cold War era. Friendship between the two States has no limits, there are no 'forbidden' areas of cooperation, strengthening of bilateral strategic cooperation is neither aimed against third countries nor affected by the changing international environment and circumstantial changes in third countries."

And yet, this is a plea to end the geopolitical blocs, where the two countries also call for strengthening multilateral fora, like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS.

Li Xing, what will this much strengthened alliance mean for China and Russia, and also for the rest of the world? Should the West be worried, or is this a plea for a new type of international relations? What are the implications for shaping the new world order? What is your conclusion from the joint statement?

Li: I think one of the purposes of the joint statement is to demonstrate the good example of the China-Russia relationship, characterized as mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, and mutually beneficial cooperation. It is not targetted at any other country. It is not like the U.S.-led coalitions which are Cold War minded, according to Russia and China's understanding.

And if we look at the BRICS, and if you look at the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, they are not purely juridical and geopolitical organizations or alliances. They are non-binding, open and non-binding.

After I read the document several times, I reached the conclusion that the unipolar world order is over. The West and the United States might have a hard time to accept it.

So the joint statement shows a strong unity between Russia and China. So my question is where is the West's unity after the Cold War, and when the unipolar world order is over? How strong is the trans-Atlantic relationship today? I don't know: I'm asking the questions to the West, the U.S. The West must rethink its Cold War strategy of reviving unity through

creating enemies, and I think this is a completely wrong strategy, in a multipolar world order, where countries are much more interdependent. So it is necessary for the U.S. to rethink its own version of the rules-based order, in which the U.S. is the rule-maker and others are rule-followers. And this does not work in a new era any more. That is my conclusion after reading the joint statement.

Rasmussen: Now, as to the current situation, today is Feb. 22, and yesterday, Russia recognized the two breakaway republics in Ukraine as independent republics, which is now going to lead to very heavy sanctions by the West. Putin's point was that these sanctions would have come anyway, but in any case, without going into the details of the Ukraine-Russia-U.S./NATO crisis, the fact is that Russia will be most probably faced with enormously hard sanctions.

In our last interview, you were asked, for example, if Russia were thrown out of the SWIFT system, how would China react? Now it's a question of the not only of the SWIFT system, but also of other major financial penalties. How do you see China reacting, in light of the joint statement, to the new sanctions against Russia, that will most probably come?

Li: Let me first of all put it in this way: That sanctions are never one-sided punishments. That both sides will suffer. It's like President Trump's trade war, that President Trump thought the trade war would hurt China. Yes, it hurt China, but it had a backlash, a backfire to the U.S. economy. And today, if you look at the U.S. economy, the inflation actually is, one way or another, connected with the trade war, as well. It was one of the outcomes.

Now, sanctions against Russia will also cause mutually suffering by both sides. Because if you look at the European dependence on Russia's oil and gas, it's about 30-35%; some countries more, some less. If Russia is thrown out of the SWIFT system, which means that Russia cannot have international trade, then Europe cannot pay Russia as well,

then the oil or gas pipelines will be blocked, which is in the interest of the United States, but not in the interest of Europe. This is the first point.

Second, that China and Russia have already agreed that they are not going to use dollars for their bilateral trade. So that doesn't really matter seen from the Russian and Chinese perspective, and in light of the spirit of this joint statement. So definitely China will continue to do business with Russia, and if the U.S. is saying that any country that is doing business Russia will be sanctioned as well, then the U.S. is creating even a larger, a bigger enemy. And China is a different story. And Russia, because Russia's economy, Russia's economic-financial status is relatively limited, compared with China. China is the second largest economy in the world.

By the way, China is the largest trading nation in the world. And you can see that last year, the China and EU trade reached more than 850 billion! That's a lot! And look at the China-U.S. trade as well. If you punish China, in what way? I cannot imagine it. Take China out of the SWIFT system as well? No, you can't do that! Then the whole world is blocked! Then no trade, no economic development at all.

So these are grave consequences of sanctions. I cannot predict the future situations. Until now I haven't read any concrete reaction from the Chinese government, but I guess, following the spirit of this document, which was signed three weeks ago, definitely, China is going to act. China will also act in accordance with the spirit of solidarity between both countries.

Rasmussen: Our analysts were saying that it may be the case that China would buy more oil and gas and other products from Russia. Actually, one thing is that today, February 21, is the 50th anniversary of Nixon's trip to China, [February 21 to 28, 1972] and the opening up of relations, and the United States commitment to the One-China policy. And at that time, many people were saying that Kissinger's strategy was to open

up the relations to China, as a way of isolating Russia, of putting Russia aside. But the fact is that these sanctions and this type of policy over the recent period, has done more to bring Russia and China together, as signified by this document. What is your reaction to that? But also the prospects of how we get out of this?

Lyndon LaRouche, for many years, called for a "Four Power" agreement between the United States, Russia, China, and India. How can we break through, looking at the world as Russia and China on one side, and the U.S. and Europe on the other side, how can we get a cooperation among the great powers for the necessity of dealing with these other very serious crises the world is facing?

Li: Extremely interesting that you mentioned Nixon's trip, of playing the "China card," during the Cold War, in the beginning of the 1970s. You are completely right that the U.S. has historically enjoyed a very favorable position, in which the U.S. has been able to keep relatively stable relations with China, relatively stable relations with Soviet Union, at that time—but making the Soviet Union and China fight each other all the time. And especially after the Cold War, the U.S. still had this favorable position—relatively stable relations with both countries, but China and Russia still had difficult relations with each other.

But today, the situation is reversed. It's totally shocking that the U.S. is fighting both world powers simultaneously. If you remember that the former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, he wrote, before he died, he wrote clearly, that the worst situation for the United States, for the West is when Iran, Russia, and China become a bloc, become an alliance, with China as the economic driver, the economic power. I was very surprised that his words are becoming true today!

So, the only way we can come to the second part of your question, about how we can manage major power relations, is in line with the spirit of the Schiller Institute conference that

took place last week and its call for establishing a new international security architecture. There is no other way. The Western dominance, the U.S. singlehanded dominance, the unipolar world is over. We need what Helga proposed, to establish a new international security architecture. We don't know exactly what the form of this architecture, but that needs discussion from both sides! Unless the international community forms a kind of great, new international security architecture, conflict will continue.

Rasmussen: And then, as we spoke, it goes hand in hand with the increasing economic cooperation and the determination of the great powers to really do something for the economic development of the poor parts of the world.

Li: Yes, definitely. I agree with you. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Is there anything else you would like to add?

Li: No, I just want to add the last point, that I am very amazed by this joint statement, because I have come across many joint statements by two countries, or by multiple countries. But this one is the most comprehensive political document I have ever come across, because it covers every aspect of the world order, international relations, governance, security, values, norms, technology, climate change, health—you name it. So it is an extremely comprehensive document, which shows what Russia and China envision as a just world order.

So I would argue that this document implies a kind of new world order which Russia and China are going to, not only propose, but also push forward.

Unfortunately, this document has been demonized by many Western media—I have read many media talking about – to me it's a kind of Cold War syndrome, because those media describe the document as creating a "bipolar world," they say bipolar world, with the Russia and China/autocracies on the one side, and the U.S. and the West/democracies on the other side. So to



me again, it's a dividing line, when they allege that this document divides the world into two camps again. So to me, this is a typical Cold War syndrome.

Again, I come back to my last point: That we need a new international security architecture, as the Schiller Institute also proposed during the conference last week. Otherwise, there will be no peace and development. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing. This has been a very important discussion.

Li: Thank you very much.

---

## **Interview med freds- og fremtidsforsker Jan Øberg: Om Ukraine-Rusland-USA-NATO krisen, Danmarks forhandlinger om amerikanske soldater i Danmark, og Xinjiang spørgsmålet, den 21. februar 2022**

Jan Øberg, ph.d., er freds- og fremtidsforsker og kunstfotograf,  
Direktør, The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future

Research, TFF, Sverige, <https://transnational.live>

Jan Øberg kan kontaktes her: [oberg@transnational.org](mailto:oberg@transnational.org)

Interviewet er på engelsk p.g.a. international deling.

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Jan-Oberg-21.2.22.mp3>

Afskrift: 1. del om Ukraine-Rusland-U.S.-NATO krisen:

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Hello. Today is February 21st, 2022. I am Michele Rasmussen, the vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. And I'm very happy that peace researcher Jan Oberg agreed to this interview. Jan Oberg was born in Denmark and lives in Sweden. He has a PhD in sociology and has been a visiting professor in peace and conflict studies in Japan, Spain, Austria, Switzerland, part time over the years. Jan Oberg has written thousands of pages of published articles and several books. He is the co-founder and director of the Independent TFF, the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research in Lund, Sweden since 1985, and has been nominated over several years for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Our interview today will have three parts. The danger of war between Russia and Ukraine, which could lead to war between the United States and NATO and Russia, and how to stop it.

Secondly, your criticism of Denmark starting negotiations with the United States on a bilateral security agreement, which could mean permanent stationing of U.S. soldiers and armaments on Danish soil.

And thirdly, your criticism of a major report which alleged that China is committing genocide in Xinjiang province.

A Russian invasion of Ukraine, which some in the West said would start last Wednesday has not occurred. But as we speak,

tensions are still very high. You wrote an article, Jan Oberg, on January 19th, called Ukraine The West has paved the road to war with lies, specifying three lies concerning the Ukraine crisis. Let's take them one by one.

You defined lie number one: "The Western leaders never promised Mikhail Gorbachev and his foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, not to expand NATO eastwards. They also did not state that they would take serious Soviet or Russian security interests around its borders, and, therefore, each of the former Warsaw Pact countries has a right to join NATO, if they decide to freely." Can you please explain more to our viewers about this lie?

**Jan Oberg:** Yes, and thank you very much for your very kind and long and detailed introduction of me. I would just say about that point that I'm amazed that this is now a kind of repeated truth in Western media, that Gorbachev was not given such promises. And it rests with a few words taken out of a longer article written years ago by a former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine, who says that Gorbachev did not say so. That article was published by Brookings Institution. Now the truth is, and there's a difference between truth and non truths, and we have to make that more and more clear when we deal with the West at the moment. The truth is, if you go to the National Security Archives in the U.S., if I remember correctly, the George Washington University that is well documented, their own formulation is that there are cascades of documentation. However, this was not written down in a treaty, or signed by the Western leaders, who one after the other came to Gorbachev's dacha outside Moscow or visited him in Kremlin, and therefore some people would say it's not valid. Now that is not true in politics. If we can't rely on what was said and what was written down by people personally in their notebooks, etc.

George Bush, Margaret Thatcher, Helmut Kohl, James Baker, you can almost mention any important Western leader were unanimous

in saying to Gorbachev, we understand that the Warsaw Pact has gone, the Soviet Union has gone, and therefore, we are not going to take advantage of your weakness. James Baker's formulation, according to all these sources, is we're not going to expand nature one inch. And that was said in 89, 90. That is 30 years ago. And Gorbachev, because of those assurances also accepted, which he's been blamed very much for since then, the reunification of Germany. Some sources say that was a kind of deal made that if Germany should be united, which it was very quickly after, it should be a neutral country. But the interpretation in the West was it could remain a member of NATO, but would then include what was at that time the German Democratic Republic, GDR [East Germany] into one Germany. You can go to Gorbachev's Foundation home page and you will find several interviews, videos, whatever, in which he says these things, and you can go to the Danish leading expert in this, Jens Jørgen Nielsen, who has also written that he personally interviewed Gorbachev, in which Gorbachev, with sadness in his eyes, said that he was cheated, or that these promises were broken, whatever the formulation is.

And I fail to understand why this being one of the most important reasons behind the present crisis, namely Russia's putting down its foot, saying "You can't continue this expansion up to the border, with your troops and your long-range missiles, up to the border of Russia. And we will not accept Ukraine [as a member of NATO]. You have gotten ten former Warsaw Pact countries which are now members of NATO, NATO has 30 members. We are here with a military budget, which is eight percent of NATO's, and you keep up with this expansion. We are not accepting that expansion to include Ukraine.

Now, this is so fundamental that, of course, it has to be denied by those who are hardliners, or hawks, or cannot live without enemies, or want a new Cold War, which we already

have, in my view, and have had for some years. But that's a long story. The way the West, and the U.S. in particular – but NATO's secretary general's behavior is outrageous to me, because it's built on omission of one of the most important historical facts of modern Europe.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Yes. In your article, you actually quote from the head of NATO, the general secretary of NATO, back in 1990, one year before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Manfred Wörner, where you say that in these documents released by the U.S. National Security Archive, that you just referred to, “Manfred Wörner gave a well-regarded speech in Brussels in May 1990, in which he argued ‘The principal task of the next decade will be to build a new European security structure to include the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. The Soviet Union will have an important role to play in the construction of such a system.’ And the next year, in the middle of 1991, according to a memorandum from the Russian delegation who met with Wörner. He responded to the Russians by saying that he personally and the NATO council, were both against expansion “13 out of 16 NATO members share this point of view,” and “Wörner said that he would speak against Poland's and Romania's membership in NATO to those countries leaders, as he had already done with leaders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And he emphasized that we should not allow the isolation of USSR from the European community,” and this was even while the U.S.S.R. was still alive. So it must have been even more the case after the U.S.S.R. collapsed, and Russia emerged.

**Jan Oberg:** Well, if I may put in a little point here, you see, with that quotation of a former NATO secretary general, compare that with the present secretary general of NATO. Wörner was a man of intellect. The leaders around him at the time in Europe were too. I mean, those were the days when you had people like Willy Brandt in Germany and östpolitik [East policy], and you had Olof Palme in Sweden with common security

thinking. We cannot in the West be sure, feel safe and secure in the West, if it's against Russia. Which does not mean at all to give into everything Russia does, but just says we cannot be safe if the others don't feel safe from us. And that was an intellectualism. That was an empathy, not a necessarily a sympathy, but it was an empathy for those over there, that we have to take into account, when we act. Today that intellectualism is gone completely.

And it is very interesting, as you point out, that 13 out of 16 NATO countries, at that time, were at that level, but in came in 1990 Bill Clinton. And he basically said, well, he didn't state it. He acted as though he had stated it, I don't care about those promises, and then he started expanding NATO. And the first office of NATO was set up in Kiev in 1994. That was the year when he did that. And that was a year when I sat in Tbilisi, Georgia, and interviewed the U.S. representative there, who, through a two-hour long conversation, basically talked about Georgia as "our country."

So, you know, it's sad to say it's human to make mistakes, but to be so anti-intellectual, so anti-empathetic, so imbued with your own thinking and worldview, you're not able to take the other side into account, is much more dangerous than it was at that time, because the leaders we have in the western world today are not up to it. They were earlier, but these are not.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Lie number two that you pointed out, "The Ukraine conflict started by Putin's out-of-the-blue aggression on Ukraine and then annexation of Crimea." What's the rest of the story here?

**Jan Oberg:** Well, it's not the rest, it's the beginning of the story. You see, people who write about these things, and it's particularly those who are Western media and Western politicians and foreign ministers, et cetera, they say that it all started with this out-of-the-blue invasion in the Donbass, and then the taking, annexing or aggression on, or whatever

the word is, Crimea. Well, they all forget, very conveniently, and very deliberately – I mean, this is not a longer time ago than people who write about it today would know – that there was a clearly western assisted, if not orchestrated, coup d'état in Kiev in 2014. After, I won't go into that long story, after some negotiations about an economic agreement between Ukraine and the EU, in which the president then jumped off, allegedly under pressure from Putin, or whatever, but there were a series of violent events in Kiev.

And it's well known from one of those who were there, and participated, namely the assistant secretary of State for European Affairs, Mrs. Nuland, and she's given a speech in the U.S. where, if I remember correctly, she says that the US has pumped \$5 billion into Ukraine over the years, to support democracy and human rights, et cetera, and training courses for young NGOs, et cetera. And it's obvious that that operation, that ousting of the president, he had to flee to Russia, and the taking over, partly by neo-Nazis and fascists who were present and who probably did the beginning of the shooting and the killing of people, that all this had to do with the promise that was given to Ukraine years before that it would be integrated into the Euro-Atlantic framework. And then it was kind of stopping and saying, we don't want that anyhow. We will negotiate something else, and we will look into what Putin has to offer, etc.

But that that, in Putin's mind, in Russia's mind, meant that NATO would be the future of Ukraine. And Russia had, still has, a huge military base in Crimea, which it had a lease on for, at the time, I think it was 30 plus years, meaning should Ukraine, which was clearly signalled by the western NATO member's leadership, enter and become a full member of Ukraine, then he would look at a Russian base, either being lost or you would have a Russian military naval base in a NATO country.

Now I'm not saying that that was a smart move. I'm not saying

it was a legal move, but it's very difficult for the western world to blame Russia for annexing Crimea. If you look at the opinion polls and the votes for that, if you will, voting ourselves back to Russia – you know, the whole thing was Russia until 1954, when Khrushchev gave it to Ukraine, and he was from Ukraine himself. And so this happened three weeks before. And I'm amazed that it should not again be intellectually possible for people who witnessed this – The other thing we talked about with 30 years ago. There might be some young fools who would not read history books.

But what I'm talking about was something that happened in 2014, and there's no excuse for not mentioning that there's a connection between that coup d'état, and the influence of the West in Ukraine in a very substantial way, and what happened in Donbas and Crimea.

So I'm just saying, if I put it on a more general level, if we look at today's ability to understand, describe, analyze issues as conflicts, we are heading for zero understanding. There is nobody in the press, and nobody in politics who are able, intellectually, to see these things as conflicts, that is, as a problem standing between two or more parties that has to be analyzed. And conflict resolution is about finding solutions that the parties we have defined as parties, and there certainly are many more than two in this very complex conflict, can live with in the future. What we are down to in banalization is that there is no conflict. There's only one party, Russia, that does everything bad and evil and terrible, while we are sitting in the receiving end, being the good guys who've done nothing wrong in history. Who could never rethink what we did or say, we're sorry, or change our policies, because we are right. There's only one problem. That's them. We're down now to the level in which these things, also the last three months, the accusations about Russia invading Ukraine, has nothing to do with conflict analysis. It is purely focusing on one party, and one party, by definition, is



not a conflict.

We are not party to a relationship anymore, and that makes a huge difference, again, from the leaders and the way of thinking and the intellectual approach that existed 20-30 years ago. And one reason for all of this is, of course, that the West is on his way down. Secondly, and they feel threatened by anything that happens around the world. And secondly, when you have been number one in a system for a long time, you become lazy. You don't study. You don't have as good education as you should have. You bring up people to high levels who have not read books, because we can get away with everything. We are so strong militarily. And when that happens, you know, it's a slippery slope and you are actually on board the Titanic.

This is not a defense of everything Russia does. What I'm trying to say is there is a partner over there, by the way they call us partners in the West. We call them anything else but partners. We don't even see them. We don't listen to their interests. We didn't listen to Putin when he spoke at the Munich conference in 2007 and said, 'You have cheated us.' And of course, when Gorbachev, 90 years old, says, you have cheated us, he's not even quoted in the Western world, because there's no space anymore for other views than our own. You know, this autism that is now classical in the Western security policy elite is damn dangerous.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** I want to just ask you shortly about the third lie, and then we'll get into what you see as the solution. The third lie you, you pointed out, was that "NATO always has an open door to new members. It never tries to invite or drag them in does not seek expansion. It just happens because Eastern European countries since 1989 to 1990 have wanted to join without any pressure from NATO's side, and this also applies to Ukraine." And in this section, you also document that Putin actually asked for Russia to join NATO. Can you shortly, please explain your most important point

about this third lie?

**Jan Oberg:** Yeah, well, it's already there since you quoted my text, but the fascinating thing is that you have not had a referendum in any of these new member states. The fascinating thing is, in 2014, when this whole NATO membership came to its first conflictual situation in the case of Ukraine, there was not a majority, according to any opinion poll in Ukraine. There was not a majority. And I would say it's not a matter of 51%. If a country is going to join NATO, it should be at least 75 or 80% of the people saying yes to that. Third, and it's not something I've invented, it is NATO's former secretary general Robertson, who has told the story. I think it was first released in the Guardian, but it's also in a long podcast from a place I don't remember, which the Guardian quotes. He says that he was asked by Putin whether, or at what time, or whatever the formulation was, NATO would accept Russia as a member.

This probably goes back to what you had already quoted Wörner, the NATO secretary general for having said, namely that a new security structure in Europe would, by necessity, have some kind of involvement, in a direct sense, of Russia, because Russia is also Europe.

And that was what Gorbachev had as an idea that the new [common] European home, something like a security structure where we could deal with our conflicts or differences or misunderstandings, and we could still be friends in the larger Europe.

And that was why I argued at the time thirty years ago that with the demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the only reasonable thing was to close down NATO. And instead, as I said with Clinton and onwards, the whole interpretation was we have won. The Western system, the neoliberal democratic NATO system has won. We have nothing to learn from that. There's nothing to change now. We just expand even more.

And the first thing NATO did, as you know, was a completely illegal. Also, according to its own charter, the invasion, involvement and bombing in Yugoslavia, Yugoslavia was not a member. Had never been a member of NATO, and NATO's only mission is paragraph five, which says that we are one for all and all for one. We are going to support some member, if the member is attacked. Now, it had nothing to do in Yugoslavia. That happened in 1991 and onwards, all the nineties. And you remember the bombings and 72 two days of bombings in Kosovo and Serbia. And it's nothing to do – and there was no UN mandate for it. But it was a triumphalist interpretation. We can now get away with everything, anything we want. We can do it because there's no Russia to take into account. Russia could not do anything about it. China could not do anything about it at the time.

And so, you get into hubris and an inability to see your own limitations, and that is what we are coming up to now. We are seeing the boomerang coming back to NATO, the western world for these things. And then, of course, some idiots will sit somewhere and say, Jan Oberg is pro-Russia. No, I'm trying to stick to what I happen to remember happened at the time. I'm old enough to remember what was said to Gorbachev in those days when the Wall came down and all these things changed fundamentally.

I was not optimistic that NATO would adapt to that situation, but there was hope at that time. There's no hope today for this, because if you could change, you would have changed long ago. So the prediction I make is the United States empire, NATO, will fall apart at some point. The question is how, how dangerous, and how violent that process will be, because it's not able to conduct reforms or change itself fundamentally into something else, such as a common security organization for Europe.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Well, I actually wanted to ask you now about the solutions, because you've been a peace researcher

for many decades. What what would it take to peacefully resolve the immediate crisis? And secondly, how can we create the basis for peaceful world in the future? You mentioned the idea that you had 30 years ago for dismembering NATO and the founder and international chairman of the Schiller Institute, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, has now called for establishing a new security architecture, which would take the interests of all countries, including Russia, into account. So how could we solve the immediate crisis? If there were the political will, what would have to change among the parties? And secondly, what needs to be done in terms of long term peaceful cooperation?

**Jan Oberg:** Well, first of all, the question you are raising is a little bit like the seventh doctor who is trying to operate on a patient who is bleeding to death and then saying, "What should we do now?" What I have suggested over 30 years is something that should have been done to avoid the situation today, and nobody listened, as is clear, because you don't listen to researchers anymore who say something else that state-financed researchers do. So it's not an easy question you are raising, of course. I would say, of course, in the immediate situation, the Minsk agreements, which have not been upheld, particularly by Ukraine in establishing some kind of autonomy for the Donbass area. Now that is something we could work with, autonomous solutions. We could work with confederations, we could work with cantonization, if you will. Lots of what happened, and happens, in the eastern republics of Ukraine. It reminds me of a country I know very well, and partly educated in and worked in during the dissolution, namely Yugoslavia. So much so that it resembles Granica. Ukraine and Granica in Croatia, both mean border areas. Granica means border, and there's so much that could have been a transfered of knowledge and wisdom and lessons learned, had we had a United Nations mission in that part. A peacekeeping mission, a monitoring mission. UN police and U.N. civil affairs in the Donbas region.

If I remember correctly, Putin is the only one who suggested that at some point. I don't think he presented it as a big proposal to the world, but in an interview he said that was something he could think of. I wrote in 2014, why on earth has nobody even suggested that the United Nations, the world's most competent organization in handling conflicts, and, if you will, put a lid on the military affairs, for instance, by disarming the parties on all sides, which they did in eastern and western Slavonia, in Croatia. Why has that not been suggested? Because the western world has driven the United Nations out to the periphery of international politics..

I've said Minsk. I've said the UN. I've said some kind of internal reforms in Ukraine. I have said, and I would insist on it, NATO must stop its expansion. NATO cannot take the risk, on behalf of Europe, and the world, to say we insist on continuing with giving weapons to, and finally making Ukraine a NATO member. You can ask Kissinger, you can ask Brzezinski, you can take the most, if you will, right wing hawkish politicians in the West. They've all said neutrality like Finland or Switzerland, or something like that, is the only viable option.

And is that to be pro-Russian? No, that needs to be pro-Western. Because I am just looking like so many others, fortunately, have done at the Cuban Missile Crisis. What would the United States – how would it have reacted, if Russia had a huge military alliance and tried to get Canada or Mexico to become members with long-range weapons standing a few kilometers from the U.S. border?

Do you think the US would have said, "Oh, they were all freely deciding to, so we think it's OK." Look at what they did during the Cuban Missile Crisis. They could not accept weapon stations in Cuba.

So, one of the things you have to ask yourself about is there one rule and one set of interests for the Western world that

does not apply to other actors? If you want to avoid Russia invading Ukraine, which all this nonsense is about repeatedly now for two or three months. Look into a new status where the East and the West and Ukraine, all of it, can sit down and discuss security guarantees for Ukraine.

President Zelensky has said it quite nicely, I must say. If you don't want us to become members of NATO, and he says that to the West, because he feels that it has taken a long time for the West to act, and he last said that at the Munich Security Conference, I think yesterday or two days ago, by the way, interestingly a man whose country is going to be invaded any moment, leaves the country and goes to a conference to speak which he could have done on Zoom.

I mean, the whole thing doesn't make sense, like it didn't make sense, was it on the 18th or 17th when all the West said that they're going to invade Ukraine, and the Russian defense minister was sitting in Damascus and Putin was receiving Bolsonaro. I mean, don't they have intelligence anymore in NATO and Washington?

So long story short, sit down and give Ukraine the guarantees and non-aggression pact with both sides or all sides, clearly limited non-nuclear defensive defense measures along the borders, or whatever, integration in whatever eastern and Western economic organizations.

And I would be happy to see them as part of the Belt and Road Initiative with economic opportunities. There is so much Ukraine could do if it could get out of the role of being a victim, and squeezed between the two sides all the time. And that can only be done if you elevate the issue to a higher level, in which Ukraine's different peoples and different parts and parties are allowed to speak up about what future they want to have in their very specific situation that Ukraine is in. It is not any country in Europe. It's a poor country. It's a country that has a specific history. It's a

country which is very complex, complex ethnically, language wise, historically, etc.

And that's why I started out saying confederation. I said something like a Switzerland model, something like Cantonization, or whatever, but for Christ's sake, give that country and its people a security, a good feeling that nobody's going to encroach upon you..

And that is to me, the the schwerpunkt [main emphasis], the absolutely essential, that is to give the Ukraine people a feeling of security and safety and stability and peace so that they can develop. I find it very interesting that President Zelensky, in this very long interview to the international press a couple of weeks ago, say I'm paraphrasing it. But he says "I'm tired of all these people who say that we are going to be invaded because it destroys our economy. People are leaving. No business is coming in, right?"

Who are we to do this damage to Ukraine and then want it to become a member of NATO? You know, the whole thing is recklessly irresponsible, in my view, particularly with a view of Ukraine and its peoples and their needs.

So I would put that in focus, and then put in a huge UN peacekeeping mission and continue and expand the excellent OSCE mission. Put the international communit, good hearted, neutral people down there and diffuse those who have only one eyesight, only one view of all this. They are the dangerous people.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** And what about the more long-term idea of a new security architecture in general?

**Jan Oberg:** Oh, I would build a kind of, I wouldn't say copy of, but I would I would build something inspired by the United Nations Security Council. All Europe, representatives for all countries, including NGOs, and not just government representatives. I would have an early warning mechanism where

the moment there is something like a conflict coming up, we would have reporters and we would have investigations we would look into, not conflict prevention.

My goodness, people don't read books. There's nothing about conflict prevention. We should prevent violence. We should prevent violent conflict, but preventing conflicts is nonsense, life is getting richer. There's not a family, there's not a school, there's not a workplace, there's not a political party, there's not a parliament in which there are no conflicts. Conflict is what life is made of. Conflict is terribly important because it makes us change and reflect. I'm all for conflicts, and I'm one hundred and ten percent against violence. But people will say "Conflict prevention is something we should work, on and educate people in." Nonsense from people who never read books, as I said.

So I would look for something like common security. The good old Palme Commission from the eighties, which built on defensive defense. The idea that we all have a right, according to Article 51, in the UN Charter. Everybody has a right to self-defense.

But we do not have a right to missiles that can go 4,000 km or 8,000 kilometres and kill millions of people far away. Get rid of nuclear weapons and all these things. It has nothing to do with defensiveness and common security, and I say that wherever I go and whoever I speak to. Get rid of nuclear weapons and offensive long range weapons.

The only legitimate weapons there are in this world are defensive ones, and they are defined by two things. Short distance, ability to go only over a short distance, such as helicopters instead of fighter airplanes or missiles.

And second, limited destructive capacity because they're going to be used on your own territory in case somebody encroaches or invades you. But nobody wants to have nuclear weapons or



totally super destructive weapons on their own territory because they don't want them to be used to there. So just ask yourself, what would you like in Country X, Y and Z to be defended with? And that's a definition of a defensive weapons. If we all had only defensive military structures, there would be very few wars, but they would also not be a military-industrial-media-academic complex that earns the money on this.

The whole thing here that the big elephant in the room we are talking about is, well, there are two of them, is NATO expansion, which we should never have done this way. And secondly, it's the interest of the military-industrial-media-academic complex, as I call it, that earns a hell of a lot of money on people's suffering, and millions of people who, at this moment while we speak, are living in fear and despair because of what they see in the media is going to happen. None of what we see at this moment was necessary. It's all made up by elites who have an interest in these kinds of things happening or the threat of the Cold War. And even if we avoid a big war now, and I hope, I don't pray to anything, but I hope very much that we do, thanks to some people's wisdom, and it's going to be very cold in Europe in the future after this.

Look at the demonization that the West has done again against Russia, and to a certain extent, of Ukraine. This is not psychologically something that will be repaired in two weeks.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Yeah, and also, as you mentioned at the beginning, it has also something to do with the unwillingness in part of certain of the Western elites to accept that we do not have an Anglo-American unipolar world, but that there are other countries that need to be listened to and respected.

**Jan Oberg:** Yeah, and you might add, what the West gets out of this is that Russia and China will get closer and closer. You are already seeing the common declaration. We will have friendship eternally. And that's between two countries who up

to the sixties at some point were very strong enemies. And the same will go with Iran, and there would be other countries like Serbia which are turning away from the West. We're going to sit and be isolating ourselves because, one, we cannot bully the world anymore, as we could before in the West. And secondly, nobody wants to be bullied anymore. We have to live in a world in which there are different systems. This Christian missionary idea that everybody must become like us. We opened up to China because then we hope they would become liberal democracies with many parties, and the parliament is awfully naïve. And time is over for that kind of thinking.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** I want to go into the other two subjects. Firstly, the question of the negotiations between Denmark and the United States in the context of the political, military and media statements of recent years alleging that Russia has aggressive intentions against Europe and the U.S. the Danish Social Democratic government announced on February 10th that a year ago, the U.S. requested negotiations on a Defense Cooperation Agreement, and that Denmark was now ready to start these negotiations. The government announced that it could mean permanent stationing of U.S. troops and armaments on Danish soil. And if so, this would be against the decades-long policy of the Danish government not to allow foreign troops or armaments permanently stationed in Denmark. And you wrote an article two days later criticizing these negotiations. Why are you against this?

**Jan Oberg:** I'm against it because it's a break of 70 years of sensible policies. We do not accept foreign weapons and we do not accept foreign troops, and we do not accept nuclear weapons stationed on Danish soil. I sat, for ten years, all throughout the 1980s, in the Danish Governments Commission for Security and Disarmament as an expert. Nobody in the 80s would have mentioned anything like this. I guess the whole thing is something that had begun to go mad around 20 years ago, when Denmark engaged and became a bomber nation for the first time

in Yugoslavia. And then Afghanistan and Iraq, and it means that you cannot say no. This is an offer you can't refuse. You can't refuse it, among other things, it's my interpretation, because you remember the story where President Trump suggested that he or the U.S. could buy Greenland, and the prime minister Mette Frederiksen said, 'Well, that is not something to be discussed. The question is absurd,' after which he got very angry. He got personally very angry, and he said, 'It's not a matter of speaking to me. You're speaking to the United States of America.' And I think this offer to begin negotiations must have come relatively shortly after that, as 'This offer is not something you should call absurd once again.' I've no evidence for that. But if these negotiations started more than a year ago, we are back in the Trump administration.

And secondly, what kind of democracy is that? We do not know what that letter in which the Americans asked to have negotiations about this, when it was written and what the content of it was. But what we hear is that a little more than a year ago, we began some negotiations about this whole thing, that is behind the back of the parliament, and behind the back of the people, and then is presented more or less as a fait accompli. There will be an agreement. The question is only nitty-gritty, what will be in it.

In terms of substance, there is no doubt that any place where there would be American facilities based in sites, so whenever you'd call it, weapon stored will be the first targets in a war, seen as such in a war, under the best circumstances, seen by Russia. Russia's first targets will be to eliminate the Americans everywhere they can in Europe, because those are the strongest and most dangerous forces.

Secondly, it is not true that there is a no to nuclear weapons in other senses than Denmark will keep up the principle that we will not have them stationed permanently. But with such an agreement where the Air Force, Navy and soldiers, military,

shall more frequently work with, come in to visit, etc., there's no doubt that there will be more nuclear weapons coming into, for instance, on American vessels than before, because the cooperation would be closer and closer.

**Jan Oberg:** And there the only thing the Danish government will do is, since they know that the “neither confirm nor deny policy” of the U.S., they would not even ask the question. If they are asked by journalists, they would say, “Well, we take for granted that the Americans honor or understand and respect that we will not have nuclear weapons on Danish territory, sea territory, or whatever. Now the Americans are violating that in Japan even. So, this is this is nonsense. There would be more nuclear weapons. I'm not saying they would go off or anything like that. I'm just saying there would be more undermining of Danish principles.

And then the whole thing, of course, has to do with the fact that Denmark is placing itself – and that was something the present government under Mette Frederiksen's leadership did before this was made public – is to put 110 percent of your eggs in the U.S. basket. This is the most foolish thing you can do, given the world change. The best thing a small country can do is to uphold international law and the UN. Denmark doesn't. It speaks like the U.S. for an international rules-based order, which is the opposite of, or very far away from the international law.

And secondly, in a world where you are going to want multipolarity, a stronger Asia, stronger Africa, another Russia from the one we have known the last 30 years, etc., and a United States that is, on all indicators except the military, declining and will fall as the world leader. This is, in my view, be careful with my words, the most foolish thing you can do at the moment, if you are a leader of Denmark, or if you leading the Danish security politics. You should be open – I wrote an article about that in a small Danish book some six or seven years ago, and said “Walk on two

legs.” Remain friendly with the United States and NATO, and all that, but develop your other leg, so you can walk on two legs in the next 20, 30, 40 years. But there’s nobody that thinks so long term in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and there’s nobody who thinks independently anymore in research institutes or ministries. It’s basically adapting to everything we think, or are told by Washington we should do. And that’s not foreign policy to me. There’s nothing to do with it.

**Jan Oberg:** A good foreign policy is one where you have a good capacity to analyze the world, do scenarios, discuss which way to go, pros and contras, and different types of futures, and then make this decision in your parliament based on a public discussion. That was what we did early, 60s, 70s and 80s. And then also when you become a bomber nation, when you become a militaristic one, when active foreign policy means nothing but militarily active, then, of course, you are getting closer and closer and closer down into the into the darkness of the hole, where suddenly you fall so deeply you cannot see the daylight, where the hole is. I think it’s very sad. I find it tragic. I find it very dangerous. I find that Denmark will be a much less free country in the future by doing these kinds of things. And, don’t look at the basis of this agreement as an isolated thing. It comes with all the things we’ve done, all the wars Denmark has participated in. Sorry, I said we, I don’t feel Danish anymore, so I should say Denmark or the Danes. And finally, I have a problem with democratically elected leaders who seem to be more loyal to a foreign government, than with their own people’s needs.

## **China and Xinjiang**

**Michelle Rasmussen:** The last question is that, you just mentioned the lack of independence of analysis, and there’s not only an enemy image being painted against Russia, but also against China, with allegations of central government genocide against the Muslim Uyghur minority in Xinjiang province as a

major point of contention. And on March 8th, 2021, the Newlines Institute for Strategy and Policy in Washington published a report The Uyghur Genocide, an examination of China's breaches of the 1948 Genocide Convention in cooperation with the Raoul Wallenberg Center for Human Rights in Montreal, and the next month, April 27, last year, you and two others issued a report which criticized this report. What is the basis of your criticism and what do you think should be done to lessen tension with China?

And also as a wrap-up question in the end, if you wanted to say anything else about what has to be done to make a change from looking at Russia and China as the autocratic enemies of the West, and to, instead, shift to a world in which there is cooperation between the major powers, which would give us the possibility of concentrating on such great task as economic development of the poorer parts of the world?

**Jan Oberg:** Well, of course, that's something we could speak another hour about, but what we did in our tiny think tank here, which, by the way, is totally independent and people-financed and all volunteer. That's why we can say and do what we think should be said and done and not politically in anybody's hands or pockets, is that those reports, including the Newlines Institute's report, does not hold water, would not pass as a paper for a master's degree in social science or political science. We say that if you look into not only that report, but several other reports and researchers who were contributing to this genocide discussion, if you look into their work, they are very often related to the military-industrial-media-academic complex. And they are paid for, have formerly had positions somewhere else in that system, or are known for having hawkish views on China, Russia and everybody else outside the western sphere.

So when we began to look into this, we also began to see a trend. And that's why we published shortly after a 150 page report about the new Cold War on China, and Xinjiang is part

of a much larger orchestrated – and I'm not a conspiracy theorist. It's all documented, in contrast to media and other research reports. It's documented. You can see where we get our knowledge from, and on which basis we draw conclusions.

Whereas now, significantly, for Western scholarship and media, they don't deal with, are not interested in sources. I'll come back to that. It's part of a much larger, only tell negative stories about China. Don't be interested in China's new social model. Don't be interested in how they, in 30 to 40 years did what nobody else in humankind has ever done. Uplifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and creating a society that I can see the difference from, because I visited China in 1983, and I know what it looked like back then when they had just opened up, so to speak.

And what we are saying is not that we know what happened and happens in Xinjiang, because we've not been there and we are not a human rights organization. We are conflict resolution and peace proposal making policy think tank. But what we do say is, if you cannot come up with better arguments and more decent documentation, then probably you are not honest. If there's nothing more you can show us to prove that there's a genocide going on at Xinjiang, you should perhaps do your homework before you make these assertions and accusations.

That's what we are saying, and we are also saying that it is peculiar that the last thing Mike Pompeo, Trump's secretary of state, did in his office, I think on the 19th of January last year, was to say I hereby declare that Xinjiang is a genocide, and the State Department has still not published as much as one A4 page with the documentation.

So, I feel sad on a completely different level, and that is, Western scholarship is disappearing in this field. And those who may really have different views, analyses and question what we hear or uphold a plurality of viewpoints and interpretations of the world, we're not listened to. I mean,

I'm listening to elsewhere, but I'm not listened to in Western media, although I have forty five years of experience in these things and I've traveled quite a lot and worked in quite a lot of conflict and war zones. I can live with that, but I think it's a pity for the Western world that we are now so far down the drain, that good scholarship is not what politics built on anymore. If it, I think it was at a point in time.

So what is also striking to me is, very quickly, the uniformity of the press. They have all written the day that the Newline report that you referred to, was published, it was all over the place, including front pages of the leading Western newspapers, including the Danish Broadcasting's website, etc., all saying the same thing, quoting the same bits of parts from it.

The uniformity of this is just mind boggling. How come that nobody said, "Hey, what is this Newlines Institute, by the way, that nobody had heard about before? Who are these people behind it? Who are the authors?" Anybody can sit on their chair and do quite a lot of research, which was impossible to do 20 years ago. If you are curious, if you are asked to be curious, if you are permitted to be curious, and do research in the media, in the editorial office where you are sitting, then you would find out lots of this here is B.S. Sorry to say so, intellectually, it's B.S.

And so I made a little pastime, I wrote a very diplomatic letter to people at CNN, BBC, Reuters, etc. Danish and Norwegian, and Swedish media, those who write this opinion journalism about Xinjiang, and a couple of other things, and I sent the all our report, which is online, so it's just a link, and I said kindly read this one, and I look forward to hearing from you. I've done this in about 50 or 60 cases, individually dug up their email addresses, et cetera. There is not one who has responded with anything. The strategy when you lie, or when you deceive, or when you have a political man, is don't go into any dialogue with somebody who knows more or it's



critical of what you do.

That's very sad. Our TFF Pressinfo goes to 20 people in BBC. They know everything we write about Ukraine, about China, about Xinjiang, et cetera. Not one has ever called.

These are the kinds of things that make me scared as an intellectual. One thing is what happens out in the world. That's bad enough. But when I begin to find out how this is going on, how it is manipulated internally in editorial offices, close to foreign ministries, etc. or defense ministries is then I say, we are approaching the Pravda moment. The Pravda moment is not the present Pravda [newspaper], but the Pravda that went down with the Soviet Union. When I visited Russia, the Soviet Union at a time for conferences, et cetera, and I found out that very few people believed anything they saw in the media. Now, to me, it's a question of whether the Western media, so-called free media want to save themselves or they want to become totally irrelevant, because at some point, as someone once said, you cannot lie all the time to all of the people, you may get away with lying to some, to some people, for some of the time.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** President Lincoln

**Jan Oberg:** Yeah. So the long story short is this is not good. This deceives people. And of course, some people, at some point, people will be very upset about that. They have been lied to. And also don't make this reference anymore to free and state media. Viewers may like to hear that may not like it, but should know it, the US has just passed a law – They have three laws against China – How to intervene in all kinds of Chinese things, such as, for instance, trying to influence who will become the successor to Dalai Lama, and things like that. They are not finished at all about how to influence Taiwan, and all that, things they have nothing to do with, and which they decided between Nixon and Zhou Enlai that America accepted the One-China policy and would not mix themselves

into Taiwanese issues. But that is another broken promise. These media are state media in the U.S. If you take Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia, they are those, particularly the latter, who have disseminated most of these Xinjiang genocide stories, which then bounce back to BBC, etc. These are state media. As an agency for that in Washington, it's financed by millions of dollars, of course, and it has the mandate to make American foreign policy more understood, and promote U.S. foreign policy goals and views. Anybody can go to a website and see this. Again, I'm back to this, everybody can do what I've done. And that law that has just been passed says the U.S. sets aside 15 hundred million dollars, that's one point five billion dollars in the next five years, to support education, training courses, whatever, for media people to write negative stories about China, particularly the Belt and Road Initiative. Now I look forward to Politiken [Danish newspaper] or Dagens Nyheter [Swedish newspaper] or whatever newspapers in the allied countries who would say, "This comes from a state U.S. media" when it does.

And so, my my view is there is a reason for calling it the military-industrial-media-academic complex, because it's one cluster of elites who are now running the deception, but also the wars that are built on deception. And that is very sad where, instead, we should cooperate. I would not even say we should morally cooperate. I would say we have no choice on this Earth but to cooperate, because if we have a new Cold War between China and the West, we cannot solve humanity's problems, whether it's the climate issue, environmental issues, it's poverty, it's justice, income differences or cleavages, or modern technological problems or whatever. You take all these things, they are, by definition, global. And if we have one former empire, soon former empire, that does nothing but disseminate negative energy, criticize, demonize, running cold wars, basically isolating itself and going down.

We lack America to do good things. I've never been anti-

American, I want to say that very clearly. I've never, ever been anti-American. I'm anti empire and militarism. And we need the United States, with its creativity, with its possibilities, with what it already has given the world, to also contribute constructively to a better world, together with the Russians, together with Europe, together with Africa, together with everybody else, and China, and stop this idea that we can only work with those who are like us, because if that's what you want to do, you will have fewer and fewer to work with.

The world is going towards diversity. And we have other cultures coming up who have other ways of doing things, and we may like it or not. But the beauty of conflict resolution and peace is to do it with those who are different from you. It is not to make peace with those who already love, or are already completely identical with. This whole thing is, unfortunately, a conflict and peace illiteracy that has now completely overtaken the western world. Whereas I see people thinking about peace. I hear people mentioning the word peace. I do not hear Western politicians or media anymore mention the word peace. And when that word is not, and the discussion and the discourse has disappeared about peace, we are very far out.

Combine that with lack of intellectualism and an analytical capacity, and you will end up in militarism and war. You cannot forget these things, and then avoid a war. So in my view, there are other reasons than Russia, if you will, that we're in a dangerous situation, and that the danger has to do with the West operating, itself, at the moment. Nobody in the world is threatening the United States or the West. If it goes down, it's all of its own making. And I think that's an important thing to say in these days when we always blame somebody else for our problems. That is not the truth.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Thank you so much, Jan.

---

# **Ny forsvarsalliance med USA: Mette Frederiksens ultimative magtarrogance.**

## **Udtalelse af Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Institut i Danmark den 11. Februar 2022**

Når Mette Frederiksen i sin rolle som statsminister inden for få dage har afholdt hele to pressekonferencer, hvor hun flankeret af udenrigsministeren og forsvarsministeren har talt i forherligende toner om kampen for frihed og suverænitet, så er det nok et tegn på, at det er netop de erklærede principper, som hun i en studehandel er blevet pålagt at ofre for fortsat opbakning til hendes fremadrettede personlige karriere. Da Anders Fogh Rasmussen brugte sin platform som dansk statsminister til at støtte Storbritanniens og USA's ulovlige krig imod Irak, der blev legitimeret med løgner om at Irak havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, endte det som bekendt med, at han blev belønnet med posten som generalsekretær for Nato og en international rolle som arrangør af konferencer til støtte for den britisk-amerikanske kampagne for at nedbryde suveræniteten hos de lande, der formaster sig til ikke blindt at følge de diktater, der kommer fra London og Washington.

Hvad har Mette Fredriksen gang i? At give USA ret til at udstationere militærpersonel og udstyr på dansk jord under amerikansk suverænitet afskaffer Danmarks nationale

suverænitet og vil i stedet afsløre Danmark som en ren amerikansk vasalstat. Selv i de mørkeste stunder under den kolde krig, da Danmark var truet af sovjetiske planer om en besættelse af Danmark, var det noget, som danskere med respekt for både nationen og sig selv ikke ville tillade. Det ville have reduceret Danmark fra en nation til blot at være kanonføde i supermagternes stedfortræderkrig (Afghanistan er et skoleeksempel på, hvordan den slags typisk ender).

Forslaget til en ny forsvarsalliance mellem Danmark og USA har som sin grundantagelse, at vi skal forberede os på krig med Rusland, noget som bliver underbygget af mediernes svulstige krigspropaganda. Men siden den kolde krigs afslutning har Rusland på intet tidspunkt truet Danmark eller andre dele af Nato, men har tværtimod passivt set til, mens stadig flere dele af det tidligere Sovjetunionen og dets interessesfære blev indlemmet i Nato. Da turen så kom til Ukraine, sagde Rusland fra, og kræver nu aftaler, der kan garantere Ruslands fremtidige sikkerhed. Det burde være en kærkommen anledning til at diskutere en inkluderende sikkerhedsarkitektur for Europa, som det faktisk blev lovet Rusland, da de satte Østtyskland og de andre tidligere Warszawapagt-lande fri i lighed med de andre sovjetrepublikker. En sikkerhedsarkitektur, hvor både øst og vest kan føle sig hjemme. I stedet ser vi en mobilisering for sanktioner og krig, hvor Danmark nu skal spille en udvidet rolle, på bekostning af danske interesser.

Hvordan kan det forsvares, at Mette Frederiksen overhovedet overvejer at sige ja til et for Danmark så ufordelagtigt og potentielt ødelæggende forslag i dag? Blot fordi en ven kræver at få lov til at dele seng med din ægtefælle eller dit barn, så behøver man jo ikke takke ja. Det er tydeligt, at Mette Frederiksen har lavet en aftale med djævelen, som i dette tilfælde er den britisk-amerikanske finansielle magtelite, der kontrollerer den vestlige efterretnings- og sikkerhedspolitik. I betragtning af den berettigede foragt, som Mette Frederiksen

med flere udviste for Helle Thorning-Schmidt og andre, der helt åbenlyst var villige til at ofre sine vælgeres og nationens interesser for at være en del af magten, så vil nemesis ramme dobbelt hårdt, hvis Mette Frederiksen fortsætter med dette skoleeksempel på hybris.

Om Mette Frederiksen har fået et tilbud hun ikke kunne afslå, eller hvad hun forventer at få som tak for denne ofring af danske interesser og suverænitet, ved jeg ikke. Givet er det, at det på ingen måde er i dansk interesse at indgå en sådan aftale. Det vil ikke forbedre den danske sikkerhed men kraftigt forværre den. Danmark vil flytte sig selv ind i kategorien af strategiske mål for atommagten Rusland. Danmark udstiller sig samtidigt som et land, der ikke længere frit kan handle og interagere med det voksende antal lande, der i lighed med den nylige Beijing-erklæring fra Rusland og Kina ikke længere vil acceptere en særlig vestlig ret til at bestemme de internationale spilleregler, men som mener, at vi skal have en multipolær inkluderende verdensorden, hvor alle nationer bliver respekteret og kan samarbejde uden først at skulle spørge om lov i London eller Washington.

At Mette Frederiksen foreslår dette samtidigt med at chefen for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, Lars Findsen, er varetægtsfængslet under anklage for højforræderi og uden mulighed for at kommunikere med offentligheden, bør få mere end et enkelt øjenbryn til at løfte sig og få flere end blot mig til at spørge, hvad pokker der egentlig foregår? Vi må råbe vagt i gevær og få Folketingets medlemmer til at gøre op med den slappe følgagtighed, de plejer at udvise over for magtens arrogance, specielt blandt "de gamle" partier, og sammen med modige patrioter i de danske institutioner få stoppet denne ødelæggelse af dansk suverænitet og danske interesser inden det er for sent.

---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING den 4. februar 2022: Mette Frederiksens problem: Arrogance + Ignorance = Katastrofe. Video, lyd og resumé..**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/tg-4.2.22-cut.mp3>

Resumé:

Før åbningsceremonien ved OL i Beijing er der topmøde mellem Putin og Xi Jinping hvor Rusland og Kina vil bekræfte det tætte venskab og nok fremlægge nye økonomiske samarbejdsaftaler. Man forbereder at gøre sig uafhængige af amerikanske dollars og SWIFT-systemet. Vestens diplomatiske boykot understreger at man ikke kan regne med Vesten.

Mette Frederiksens pressemøde på Marienborg, hvor hun annoncerede at Danmark nu er i frontlinjen imod Rusland og ikke ville have en ligeværdig dialog er en farlig kurs. Arrogance + Ignorance = Katastrofe. Man er ikke dumme men dumlærde. Man fravælger med fuldt overlæg fakta, hvis de ikke passer ind i fortællingen man forsøger at sælge. Man overser de dramatiske konsekvenser af de beslutninger man træffer som i FE-sagen, Minksagen og nu korstoget imod Rusland.

Rusland havde ikke kun fået mundtlige løfter om at NATO ikke ville blive udvidet mod Øst. OSCE-aftalen fra Istanbul i 1999 garanterede ikke kun frihed for stater til at indgå alliancer for egen sikkerhed, men også at dette ikke måtte ske på bekostning af andre landes. Der har man ikke respekteret ved udvidelsen af NATO og diskussionen om at integrere Ukraine i Nato. Vi må forhandle og samarbejde med Rusland og Kina så alle kan leve trygt og sikkert.

Hvordan kan Vesten beskyldte Kina for at lave (et ikke eksisterende) folkemord i Xinjiang, når man selv gennemfører et reelt folkemord i Afghanistan gennem at fastholde sanktioner og tilbageholde Afghanistans penge i vestlige banker? 20 mio. børn sulter og mange vil dø her i vinter, hvis ikke Vesten skifter kurs.

Se interview med Liu Xing fra Aalborg Universitet på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside.

Nedsmeltningen af det transatlantiske finansielle system er i gang. Siden 2008 er det blevet opbygget gigantiske finansbøler under 13 år med negative renter og kvantitative lempelser. Inflationen i USA er nu 7 % og den er over 5 % i EU. Det er kun begyndelsen. Den kæmpe gæld der er opbygget skal der nu betales renter på og det er der ikke råd til. Der skal betales mere og værdierne er langt mindre værd. Det kan kun gå galt.

Eneste løsning er LaRouches fire økonomiske love. Lær af Kina. Rusland skal ikke vælge mellem Europa og Asien men være bindeled mellem Europa og Kina.

Hvedebrødsdagene er måske ovre for den danske regering. Kan ikke længere gemme sig bag COVID-19. Se på verden med friske øjne inden det er for sent. Gå med i Schiller Instituttet.

Diskussion: Den danske håndtering af COVID-19 var meget bedre end mange andre steder, men det var ikke pga. af regeringen, men fordi der var en høj grad af tillid og samfundssind blandt befolkningen. Husk at mange lande i Europa ikke som Danmark er



hoppet med på briternes korstog imod Rusland.

---

# **EIR udspørger den danske statsminister, udenrigsminister og forsvarsminister om Ukraine-Rusland på TV2**

KØBENHAVN, 31. januar (EIRNS)- I dag, to dage efter at den danske statsminister Mette Frederiksen sagde, at hun ville overveje at sende våben til Ukraine, blev der indkaldt til et pressemøde på Marienborg med statsministeren, udenrigsminister Jeppe Kofod og forsvarsminister Trine Bramsen for at lancere regeringens nye Udenrigs- og Forsvarspolitiske Strategi. EIR havde mulighed for at stille et spørgsmål. Første del af pressekonferencen blev transmitteret direkte på TV2 News, og anden del, der startede med EIR's spørgsmål, blev transmitteret direkte på TV2 Play.

Danmark er midt i beslutningen om, hvorvidt man vil følge den britiske eskaleringspolitik eller afvise den, som flere og flere europæiske lande gør. For to dage siden udtalte statsminister Mette Frederiksen til Jyllands-Posten: »Jeg vil ikke udelukke (at sende militært isenkram til Ukraine, red.), og jeg har ingen principiel modstand mod, at vi gør det. Situationen omkring Ukraine udgør nu en alvorlig trussel mod Europa, og der er en reel risiko for en væbnet konflikt på europæisk jord. Skulle situationen i Ukraine eskalere yderligere, vil Rusland også blive mødt med sanktioner af »en

hidtil ukendt dimension«.« Dette var også budskabet på pressekonferencen.

Inden EIR's spørgsmål blev ministrene spurgt, om Danmark ville sende våben og endda tropper til Ukraine. Indtil videre har Ukraines forsvarsminister bedt om dansk støtte til at håndtere cyberangreb, sagde Forsvarsministeren.

Her er Statsministerens udveksling med EIR-journalist Michelle Rasmussen:

EIR: Det er Michelle Rasmussen, Executive Intelligence Review.

I forgårs sagde Ukraines forsvarsminister Reznikov, at situationen langs grænsen til Rusland er den samme, som for et år siden. At der er ingen aktioner eller fænomener af betydning. Præsident Zelensky sagde, at USA bør holde op med at sige, at krig er umiddelbart forstående – at man ikke skal skabe panik.

Hvis Danmark sender våben til Ukraine, en politik, som er ført an af Storbritannien lige nu, vil det bare optrappe krisen, så vel som, hvis man indførte endnu hårdere sanktioner, som også vil ramme Europa, eller USA's krigsspil, som Global Lightning [øvelse afholdt af USA's strategiske kommando -red.}, om hvordan man fortsætter en atomkrig efter et førsteslagsangreb?

Er det ikke bedre, at have alvorlige forhandlinger med Rusland angående et muligt NATO-medlemskab for Ukraine, offensive våben langs grænsen, og at forhandle om en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, som inkluderer Rusland, som vi burde have gjort i 1991?

Mette Frederiksen: At vi skulle have givet Rusland indflydelse på den europæiske infrastruktur i 1991?

EIR: At efter Sovjetunionens opløsning var der lagt op til –

Mette Frederiksen: Det er helt klart, at det er kun Europa og europæere der bestemmer, hvordan vores infrastruktur skal se

ud. Vi ønsker selvfølgelig at have en dialog med Rusland. Det har vi. Det har vi i NATO-sporet. Det har vi mellem Europa og Rusland. Og det ønsker vi at have fremadrettet. Vi har hele vejen igennem det her appelleret til Rusland om at vælge en diplomatisk løsning, og går dialogens vej.

Det vi samtidig siger er, hvis Rusland vælger at angribe Ukraine, så svarer vi selvfølgelig igen.

Men lad mig gentage. Hvordan Europæere vælger at indrette sig, det er et anlæggende for Europa, ikke for nogen som helst andre.

Jyllands-Posten.

EIR: Undskyld. Udenrigsministeren vil sige noget.

Mette Frederiksen: Vi skal have flere spørgsmål. Jyllands-Posten, værsgo.

---

## **Video: Samarbej med Kina. Det er ikke fjenden.**

### **Interview med Li Xing, PhD, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet**

KØBENHAVN, 27. januar 2022 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark har gennemført et vigtigt, timelangt videointerview med Li Xing, ph.d., professor i udvikling og internationale

relationer ved Aalborg Universitet i Danmark. Li Xing er medlem af det samfundsvidenskabelige fakultet på Institut for Politik og Samfund og leder af forskningscentret for udvikling og internationale relationer. Han er oprindeligt fra Jiaxing nær Shanghai og arbejdede i Beijing, inden han kom til Danmark i 1988 for at tage sin kandidat- og ph.d.-grad.

Det omfattende interview dækker Kinas forbindelser med USA, Europa (USA–Kina-rivalisering), Rusland (Kina ville støtte Rusland, hvis det blev smidt ud af Swift-betalningssystemet), Europa og Afrika (Kinas udviklingsprogram er en hjælp for Europa i forbindelse med flygtningeproblemet), Latinamerika (Kina har fremmet den økonomiske udvikling i USA's baghave, mens USA har været fokuseret på krige og farverevolutioner), Afghanistan (med helhjertet støtte til Operation Ibn Sina) og andre udviklingslande.

Det omfatter også, hvad professor Li Xing ville sige til præsident Biden om forbindelserne med Kina, Xi Jinpings Davos-tale, Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og Xinjiang-spørgsmålet. Han opfordrer USA og Europa til at samarbejde med Kina om deres respektive nødvendige infrastrukturudvikling, for at fremme udviklingen af de underudviklede lande og for at droppe den geopolitiske taber-strategi. Han slutter med at rose Schiller Instituttets udviklingsprogrammer for verden.

Interviewet, der blev foretaget af Michelle Rasmussen, vil blive transskriberet til offentliggørelse i EIR og er nu tilgængeligt på Schiller Instituttets YouTube-kanal i Danmark.

Here is a pdf version published in Executive Intelligence Review, Vol. 49, No. 5 ([www.larouchepub.com/eiw](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw)). We encourage you to subscribe.:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

## **INTERVIEW**

## **Professor Li Xing**

### **Cooperate with China – It Is Not the Enemy**

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Prof. Li Xing, PhD, conducted on Jan. 26 by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Dr. Li is a professor of Development and International Relations at the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Aalborg University. Li Xing was born in Jiaxing, China, near Shanghai. He earned his BA at the Guangzhou Institute of Foreign Languages. He came to Denmark from Beijing in 1988 for his MA and later completed his PhD studies at Aalborg University.

Subheads have been added. A video of the interview is available here . <https://youtu.be/rulmlczmaTE>

Michelle Rasmussen: Welcome, Professor Li Xing, thank you so much for allowing me to interview you.

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you too.

Michelle Rasmussen: Li Xing, as we speak, there is an overhanging threat of war between the United States and NATO against Russia and China, countries which the war faction in the West sees as a threat to the disintegrating, unipolar Anglo-American world dominance.

On the other hand, the Schiller Institute has led an international campaign to try to get the U.S. and Europe to cooperate with Russia and China to solve the great crises in the world, especially the pandemic, the financial and economic crises, the underdevelopment of the poor countries, and the cultural crisis in the West. Our international president, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, has stated that the U.S.-China relationship will be the most important relationship in the future.

You recently gave a lecture at the Danish Institute for International Studies about the U.S.-China rivalry. And you are a contributor to the book *The Telegram: A China Agenda for President Biden* by Sarwar Kashmiri, which was published in 2021 by the Foreign Policy Association in New York City. The book is composed of statements by the contributors of what each would say if they were granted a personal meeting with President Biden. What would your advice be to President Biden regarding China?

### **Advice to President Biden**

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you for giving me this chance for this interview. If I had the chance to meet the President, I would say to him:

Hello, President Biden. I think that it is a pity that you didn't change Trump's China policy, especially regarding the trade war and the tariff. We can see from the current situation that in the U.S., the shortages issue, the inflation issue, these are all connected with tariff issue. Many congressmen and senators are calling for the removal of the tariffs. So, I really think that the president should give second thoughts to continuing the trade war. Contrary to this, though, the data from 2020 and 2021 shows that the China-U.S. trade actually surged almost 30%, compared with early years. So, the trade war didn't work.

The second issue is the competition in the area of high technology areas, especially regarding the chip industry. I'd say to him:

Mr. President, the U.S. has the upper hand in that technology, and China has the largest market. I think that if the U.S. continues to use a technology sanction on Chinese chips, then the whole country and the whole nation will increase the investment on the chips. Once China has the technology, then the U.S. would both lose the market, and also lose the

advantage in that technology.

So, this is the second issue, I think the president should give a thought to.

The third issue, which I think is a very touchy issue, is the Taiwan issue. I would really advise the President:

Mr. President, to play the Taiwan card needs caution, because Taiwan is the center of Chinese politics, in its historical memory, and the most important national project in the unification process. So, to play the Taiwan card really needs caution.

But still, I would also say to the President:

Mr. President, China and the U.S. have a lot of areas for cooperation. For example, climate change; for example, North Korea, Iran, Afghanistan; and last but not least, because China has great technology and skill in terms of infrastructure, so you, Mr. President, should invite China to come to the U.S. and play a role in the U.S. infrastructure construction projects. That would be an ideal situation to promote bilateral relations.

### **Attitude of the U.S. Toward China**

Michelle Rasmussen: In your statement in the book, *The Telegram*, you address whether the United States should consider China as an enemy or as rival. What would you say to the American people about the attitude that the United States should have towards China?

Prof. Li Xing: I don't think that the U.S. should regard China as an enemy, but as a rival. I think there is a truth in that because China is obviously a rival to the United States on many, many grounds, both in materials and also in ideation. Nevertheless, it is not an enemy. China and the U.S. have so many areas of cooperation as you point out, that this

bilateral relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world. Were this relationship turned into an enemy relationship, it would be a disaster for the world.

Michelle Rasmussen: On January 17, Chinese President Xi Jinping addressed the World Economic Forum in Davos. What do you think is most important for people in the West to understand about his speech?

Prof. Li Xing: Xi Jinping was invited to the World Economic Forum, and he sent some messages. In his address he admitted that economic globalization has created problems, but that this should not constitute a justification to write off everything regarding globalization, regarding international cooperation. So, he suggested that the world should adapt and guide globalization.

He also rejected the protectionist forces on the rise in the West, saying that history has proved time and time again that confrontation does not solve problems; it only invites catastrophic consequences.

President Xi also particularly mentioned protectionism, unilateralism, indirectly referring to the U.S., emphasizing that this phenomenon will only hurt the interest of others as well as itself, meaning that the U.S. trade war, or sanctions against China, will hurt both. It's not a win-win, it's a lose-lose. President Xi delivered a message that rejects a "zero sum" approach. I think it was a very constructive message from President Xi Jinping. He totally rejects, if I interpret his address correctly, the Cold War mentality. He doesn't want to see a Cold War mentality emerge in either the U.S., or in China.

## **The Belt and Road Concept**

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on now to the question of the Belt and Road Initiative. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Schiller Institute



has worked to establish a new Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, and many of these economic principles have been coming to life through China's Belt and Road Initiative. Li Xing, in 2019 you wrote a book, Mapping China's One Belt One Road Initiative, and have lectured on this. How has the Belt and Road Initiative created economic development in the underdeveloped countries?

Prof. Li Xing: First of all, I think that we need to understand the Belt and Road concept—the historicity behind the Belt and Road; that the Belt and Road is not an international aid program. We have to keep that in mind. It is an infrastructure project attempting to link Eurasia. It has two routes. One is a land route, consisting of six corridors. Then, it has another route called the Maritime Silk Road. Globally, about 138 countries, ranging from Italy to Saudi Arabia to Cambodia, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China. Just recently another country in Latin America signed up with the Belt and Road.

The idea of the Belt and Road is founded on two basic Chinese economic strengths. One is surplus capital. China has a huge amount of surplus capital in its banks, which it can use for investments. The second is that after 40 years of infrastructure development in China, China has huge technology and skill, particularly in the infrastructure development area. So, the Belt and Road is basically an infrastructure development project.

The driving force of China's Belt and Road is that after 40 years of economic development, China is experiencing a similar situation experienced by the advanced countries in world economic history—for example, rising wages, overproduction, overcapacity, and a lot of surplus capital.

So, China is looking for what the Marxist analytical lens calls a "spatial fix," as in its domestic market, the mass production manufacturing is getting extremely large. In

looking beyond Chinese territory at Chinese neighbors, China has discovered that all the countries around China are actually very, very far behind in infrastructure development. So, it's kind of a win-win situation. The idea behind the Belt and Road is a kind of a win-win situation.

Historically, the Post World War II Marshall Plan in Europe, and the military aid to East Asia, were, you could say, like Belt and Road projects, helping those countries to enhance economic development. I recently came across a World Bank study pointing out that if the Belt and Road projects were successfully implemented, the real income level throughout the entire region would rise between two or four times. At the global level, the real income can rise between 0.7 -2.9%. So, you can say, the international financial institutions, and economic institutions like World Bank, are also very positive toward the Belt and Road.

However, the Belt and Road also has four areas which we need to be concerned about. Number one: the debt trap, which has been discussed quite a lot at the global level. Number two: transparency, whether the Belt and Road projects in different countries are transparent. This, too, is an issue for debate. Number three: corruption, whether Chinese investments in countries creates corruption by local officials. The number four area for concern is the environmental and social cost. So, these definitely need to be taken care of, both by China and those countries.

As a whole, I think the Belt and Road project is huge. It's very constructive. But we also need to consider its potential to create bad effects. We need to tackle all these effects collectively.

### **'Debt Trap' Diplomacy**

Michelle Rasmussen: When you spoke just now about a debt trap, our correspondent Hussein Askary, who covers the Muslim world,

and also developments in Africa, has argued against the idea that China is creating a debt trap, pointing out that many of the countries owe much more money to Western powers, than they do to China, and that China has done things like forgiving debt, or transferring physical assets to those governments, because the debt trap accusation has been used as the primary argument against the Belt and Road. Do you think that this is a legitimate argument or that this is overplayed to try to just create suspicion about the Belt and Road?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I fully agree, actually, with the comment you just quoted from another study. It is true that the “debt trap” has been used by Western media, or those politicians who are against the Belt and Road, as an excuse, as a kind of a dark picture. But, according to my research, China actually understands this problem, and very often, the Chinese government uses different measures, or different policies, to tackle this problem. One is to write off the debt entirely, when the borrowing country would really suffer, if it had to repay. For example, the Chinese government announced that during the pandemic, debt service payments from some poor countries is suspended until their economic situation improves.

China is a central-government-based country. State policy plays a bigger role than in the political system of the West, where different interest groups drive their countries’ policies into different directions. Therefore, the Chinese central government is able to play a bigger role than Western governments in tackling debt problems.

Michelle Rasmussen: What has this meant for the underdeveloped countries, for example, in Africa, and other poor countries in Asia, in Ibero-America? What has the Belt and Road Initiative meant for their economic development?

Prof. Li Xing: The increasing number of countries that have signed up with the Belt and Road, shows that the Belt Road

project is comparatively quite welcomed. I have also followed many debates in Africa, where many African leaders were asked the question and they completely agree. They say that the situation regarding the debt of the old time, their experiences with the colonial countries, is quite different from the debt incurred with China's investment projects or development projects. So, they still have confidence in China's foreign development policies, especially in the Belt and Road project. From the many studies and reports I have read so far; they have strong confidence in that.

### **Infrastructure Means Development**

Michelle Rasmussen: What would you say about the role of infrastructure development in China in creating this unprecedented economic growth and lifting people out of poverty? What role has infrastructure played in the incredible poverty elimination policy that China actually succeeded in achieving this year?

Prof. Li Xing: The entire 40-year history of China's economic growth and economic development, and China's prosperity, is based on the lesson that infrastructure is one of the most important factors leading to China's economic success. China has a slogan: "If you want to get rich, build a road."

Infrastructure is connected with every aspect of national economy. The raw materials industry, the metal industry, you name it. Cement industry, etc. Infrastructure is really the center of a nation's economy, which can really get different areas of the country running. So, I think this experience of China is really a good lesson, not only for China itself, but also for the rest of the world, especially for developing countries.

That's why China's Belt and Road project, identified as infrastructure projects, is really welcomed by many people, and especially President Biden. Even though his budget was not passed, because of the resistance, or even if it's shrunken,

the idea about improving U.S. infrastructure, became a kind of hot spot. I think that the U.S. needs to increase its infrastructure investment as well. Definitely.

## **Europe-China Relations**

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on to Europe and China relations. You have edited the book China-U.S. Relations at a Crossroads: "Systemic Rivalry" or "Strategic Partnership." What is your evaluation and recommendation about European-Chinese relations? When we spoke earlier, you had a comment about how the impact of African development, if there would be development or not in Africa, would impact Europe. Could you also include your idea about that?

Prof. Li Xing: EU-China relations are increasingly complex, and affected by a number of interrelated factors, such as China's rise, the growing China-U.S. rivalry, U.S. global withdrawal, especially under the Trump administration, the trans-Atlantic split, the Brexit, and at the same time, the China-Russia comprehensive alliance. Under these broad transformations of the global order, EU-China relations are also getting very complex. Right now, I feel that the EU and China are struggling to find a dynamic and durable mode of engagement, to achieve a balance between opportunities on the one side, and challenges on the other, and also between partnership and rivalry.

For instance, China and the EU successfully reached what is called the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment treaty in December 2020. It was a joyful moment. However, in 2021, due to the Hong Kong events, the Xinjiang issue, and mutual sanctions in 2021, this investment treaty was suspended. Not abandoned but suspended. You can see that the relationship can be hurt by events. It's really difficult to find a balance between strategic partnership and systemic rivalry. "Systemic rivalry" was the official term used in a European Commission document, "EU-China—A Strategic Outlook,"

issued March 12, 2019. That document states that China is “simultaneously ... an economic competitor in the pursuit of technological leadership, and a systemic rival promoting alternative models of governance.”

So, you can see that a systemic rival means alternative normative values. That’s why it’s a new term, when used in that way. It shows that China’s development has both a material impact, and, also, an ideational impact—that many countries are becoming attracted by the Chinese success. For that reason, the Chinese, and the rise of China is increasingly regarded as a systemic rival.

On the other hand, the message from my book is also that the EU must, one way or another, become autonomous, and design an independent China policy. Sometimes I feel that the EU-China policy is somehow pushed around or carried by U.S. global interests, or affected by the U.S.-China competition. I really think Europe needs an independent China policy. You know, the EU is thinking of developing “defence independence.” That is, it is pursuing autonomy in defense. But that’s something else.

According to data from Kishore Mahbubani, a very well-known Singaporean public intellectual and professor, the Belt and Road has special meaning for Europe in relation to Africa. This is of importance to your question about Africa.

According to his data on the demographic explosion in Africa, Africa’s population in the 1950s was half of that of Europe. Today, Africa’s population is 2.5 times that of Europe. By 2100, Africa’s population will be 10 times of that of Europe. So, if Africa still suffers from underdevelopment, if any crisis appears, where will African refugees migrate? Europe!

From Kishore’s point of view, the Belt and Road is doing Europe a “favor,” so Europe should be very supportive of China’s Belt and Road project. I totally agree with that. What he says is also a part of the message of my book.

## A 'Differentiated' Europe

Michelle Rasmussen: You were speaking about Europe becoming more autonomous in its relations with China. Former German Chancellor Angela Merkel has stated openly that Germany should not be forced to choose between the United States and China, that Germany needs to have relations with both. Can you say more about that? Is China Europe's biggest trading partner?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, since November last year.

Michelle Rasmussen: There's differentiation inside Europe. For example, the Eastern European countries have a forum called "16+1," where 16 Eastern European countries, plus China, have a more developed Belt and Road cooperation with China, than the Western countries. And there's differentiation in the western European countries. You mentioned that some are making Hong Kong and Xinjiang into obstacles to improving European relations to China. What would you say to these concerns?

Prof. Li Xing: China-EU relations are being affected by many, many factors. One is, as you mentioned, about 16+1, but now it's 17+1, because, I think two years ago, Greece became a part of 16+1, so now it's 17+1. And the western part of the EU, was quite worried about the 17+1 because some think that the Belt and Road plays a role in dividing Europe. Because Europe has this common policy, common strategy, and common action toward the Belt and Road, they also see the 17+1 grouping as somehow playing a divisive role. So, the EU is not very happy about that. Because you're right, the Belt and Road is more developed in the eastern part of the EU. This is one issue.

The second issue is that the EU has to make a balance between China on the one side, and the U.S. on the other. Right now, my assessment is that the EU is somehow being pushed to choose the U.S. side. It's fine with me, from my analytical point of view, that the EU, most of the countries in the West, the

traditional U.S. allies—like including Denmark—if they choose the U.S., that's fine. But my position is that their choosing sides should be based on their own analysis, their own national interests, not purely on the so-called values and norms, that the U.S. and EU share norms, and therefore should have a natural alliance. I think that is not correct. I always advise Western politicians, thinktanks, and policy makers that they should study China-U.S. relations or EU-China-U.S. relations and try to find their own foreign policies. What is the correct direction? And based on their own judgment, based on their own research results, not based on what the U.S. wants them to do.

Michelle Rasmussen: One of Denmark's top former diplomats, Friis Arne Petersen, has been Denmark's ambassador to the United States, to China, and to Germany. At the Danish Institute for International Studies, he recently called for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative. Why do you think it would be in the interest of Europe and the United States to join or cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative, instead of treating it as a geopolitical threat?

Prof. Li Xing: Well, on the Belt and Road, as we have already discussed, we must first understand what it is. I fully agree with Friis Arne Petersen. When he was Ambassador to Beijing, I met him at one of the international conferences. He was always very positive towards Denmark-China cooperation. I fully agree with his point on the Belt and Road. But we have to understand, first of all, why the West is nervous about the Belt and Road. This is very important, because the European's or the American's worry is based on two perspectives. One is geopolitics. The second is norm diffusion. Geopolitics means that through the Belt and Road, China's economic political influence will gradually expand to cover all of Eurasia, which is not in the interest of the West. This is a geopolitical rationale.

Then the second perspective is norm diffusion, which means



that through the Belt and Road, the Chinese development model spreads. As I mentioned before, because of the global attraction to China, the Chinese development model will be consolidated and extended through the Belt and Road, and that is also not in the interest of the West. That's why China is a "systemic rival," because it has a norm diffusion effect. We have to understand these two aspects.

But why should Europe support the Belt and Road? I have already discussed this issue in my answer to your previous question regarding the importance of infrastructure development, and regarding why Europe should support the Belt and Road, especially in the context of Africa.

Michelle Rasmussen: And you also spoke about the need for infrastructure development in the United States. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the United States a grade point average of C- for the state of its infrastructure. Looking at high speed rail in China and in the United States, there's nothing to compare.

Prof. Li Xing: No, no.

Michelle Rasmussen: In its 14th Five-Year Plan, China has committed itself to increase its high-speed rail lines by one third, from the present 38,000 kilometers to 50,000 kilometers by 2025. The U.S. has maybe a hundred and fifty kilometers.

Prof. Li Xing: I was told by American friends that the U.S. has not invested heavily in infrastructure for many, many decades, about half century, something like that. I was shocked to hear that. So, I think Biden's idea of infrastructure investment is great, but somehow the bill could not be agreed on by the Congress, and also the Senate, due to partisan conflict.

Michelle Rasmussen: And it was not very ambitious in any case.

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, totally.

## Reordering the World Order

Michelle Rasmussen: It was a step in the right direction, but was not very ambitious.

Let's move on to Latin America, which we in the Schiller Institute call Ibero-America. That's because our members say that the Spanish language did not proceed from Latin. The Iberian Peninsula is Portugal and Spain, so Ibero-America is a better term. In any case, Li Xing, you are working on a study, China-U.S. Rivalry and Regional Reordering in Latin America. Can you please share the main idea with us?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes. I'm working on this book, together with a group of Latin American scholars from different countries in the region. The objective of the book is to provide a good conceptualization, first, of the changing world order, and the reordering process. When we talk about that the world order is changing because of the U.S.-China rivalry, at the same time, we also suggest that the world is experiencing a reordering process, that we do not know the future order, or the new order, but the world is in the process of reordering, driven by the China-U.S. rivalry.

The book will also try to convey that the U.S.-China rivalry, according to our conceptualization, is "intra-core. According to the world system theory, you have a core which is the advanced economy countries, then you have a semi-periphery, and then you have a periphery. The semi-periphery is between periphery and the core, and the periphery is the vast number of developing countries. So the China-U.S. rivalry, competition, especially in high technologies in the security areas, is between these two core countries, or is intra-core.

The China-U.S. rivalry also represents a struggle between two types of capitalism. On the one side is Chinese state capitalism, very centralized, state led, with central planning. On the other side is the U.S. free market,

individual capitalist economy. Somehow the China model is gradually appearing to be more competitive. Of course, the U.S. doesn't agree with that assessment, at least from the current perspectives.

So, this rivalry must have a great impact on the whole world, especially on the developing world we call the Global South. Here we've tried to focus on the U.S.-China rivalry, and its impact on the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The message of the book is, first, that global redistribution of power is inevitable. It's still in process, and the emerging world order is likely to be dominated by more than one superpower, so the world order will likely look like a polycentric world, with a number of centripetals competing for high positions or strong positions. This is the first message.

The second message is that the situation shows that the world is in a reordering process driven by the competition between the two superpowers, and it poses opportunities, and also constraints, to different regions, especially for the Global South, such as Latin America, because Latin America is the U.S. backyard; it is the subject of American doctrines—that North America and South America, are a sphere of U.S. influence.

## **The Monroe Doctrine**

Michelle Rasmussen: You're talking about the Monroe Doctrine?

Prof. Li Xing: The Monroe Doctrine. Thank you very much. North America and South America have to be within the U.S. hegemonic influence. No external power is allowed to have a hand in, or interference in these two regions. You can say that China's relations with Latin America has really been increasing tremendously during the past two decades.

At the same time, the U.S. was busy with its anti-terrorism wars, and its creation of color revolutions in other parts of

the world. If you look at the investment in infrastructure, and also imports of agriculture, China-Latin American trade and Chinese investment in Latin America are increasing tremendously, dramatically, which becomes a worry, a really deep worry, to the U.S.

The different scholars, the book's chapter authors, will use different countries and country cases as examples to provide empirical evidence to our "theoretical conceptualization." This book will be published around summertime by Brill, a very good publisher in Holland.

Michelle Rasmussen: Well, actually, the Monroe Doctrine was adopted in 1823, in the very early history of the United States. This is after the United States had become a republic and had freed itself from the British Empire. It was actually John Quincy Adams—

Prof. Li Xing: Exactly.

Michelle Rasmussen:—who was actually involved in the idea, which was that the United States would not allow imperialism, imperial powers to bring their great power games into Latin and South America, but that the United States would help those countries become independent republics. So the question becomes, will Chinese policy strengthen the ability of the Ibero-American countries to be republics and enjoy economic development, or is China's intention also a kind of imperialism?

Prof. Li Xing: Based on your definitions, on your conceptualization of the Monroe Doctrine, you can say that there are two implications. One is that the U.S. should defend these two regions from imperialist intervention. The U.S. itself was not an imperial power at that time. The U.S. didn't have intentions to become a global interventionist then, but today it is a different situation.

Second, that the U.S. definitely interprets Chinese investment

and infrastructure cooperation, and economic investment in Latin America as “helping,” to consolidate the country’s independence? No, I don’t think that is the case. That would be a kind of positive-sum game. Today, unluckily, these two countries are trapped into a zero-sum game. Whatever China is doing in the South American region, is interpreted as not being good for United States. That’s a very unfortunate situation.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, we in the Schiller Institute have said that if the United States were to join with China to have even better economic development in Ibero-America; that would be a win-win policy. You spoke about the immigration challenge from Africa to Europe. It’s the same thing from Ibero-America to the United States. People would much rather stay in their own countries if there were jobs, if there were economic development,

Prof. Li Xing: Yes.

Michelle Rasmussen: And if the United States would join with China, then instead of—

Prof. Li Xing: —building the wall! Instead of building the wall!

Michelle Rasmussen: Exactly, exactly.

Prof. Li Xing: Yeah, I agree with you.

## **Operation Ibn Sina**

Michelle Rasmussen: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the President of the Schiller Institute, has stated that one very important way to lessen the war danger between the United States, Russia and China would be for these countries to join forces to save the people of Afghanistan, where there is the worst humanitarian crisis in the world now, after the war, the drought, and the freezing of Afghanistan’s central bank assets by the western

countries. She has proposed what she calls Operation Ibn Sina, named after the great physician and philosopher from that region, to build a modern health system in Afghanistan to save the people from disease, and as a lever to stimulate economic development.

I know that when we spoke about Afghanistan before, you also referred to very important discussions now going on in Oslo, for the first time, between the Taliban and Western governments, including in the United States.

But what do you think about this idea of China and the United States, and also Russia and other countries, joining hands to act to alleviate the terrible crisis for the people of Afghanistan?

Prof. Li Xing: It's a superb idea. This is one of the initiatives by the Schiller Institute. When I read your website, you have many development projects, and this one is a great idea. This is one of the areas I mentioned where the U.S. and China have a common interest. Unfortunately, what is happening today is the Ukraine crisis and the China-U.S. rivalry—so many battle fronts—puts Afghanistan more into the background.

Right now, the Taliban delegation is talking with the West in Oslo, and I really hope there will be a constructive result, because after the U.S. withdrew from Afghanistan, Afghanistan's Taliban government immediately went to China. And it was a Chinese interest. It was in China's fundamental interest to help Afghanistan, because if Afghanistan is safe and prosperous, then there will be no terror and terrorism coming from Afghanistan across the border. Many of the terrorists in Xinjiang actually based themselves in Afghanistan. So it is in China's national interest to help Afghanistan.

Right now, I don't know whether it is still in the U.S.

interest to help Afghanistan. The U.S. might be tired of that region, because the U.S. lost two trillion dollars in the Afghanistan war, without any positive results. So, I do not know. I cannot tell the what the U.S. politicians' feelings are, but the U.S. holds \$9.5 billion of Afghanistan assets. And I think that money has to be released to help in the country's rebuilding.

And particularly, the Schiller Institute's suggestion of a health care system is the priority. When people are in good health, then people can work, and earn money. When people have a job or have a family, normally, people do not move. According to refugee studies, people normally do not move just because of a shortage. People move because of a situation devastated by war, by climate change, by various crises. Otherwise, people are relatively stable and want to stay in their homeland.

## **Xinjiang**

Michelle Rasmussen: You mentioned Xinjiang again now. Do you have something to say about Xinjiang for people in the West?

Prof. Li Xing: I think that there are a lot of misunderstandings between the West and China, especially the misunderstanding from the Western side concerning Xinjiang. The other day, I saw a debate at Oxford University between an American former politician and a British former politician, about whether China is a friend or a foe. The American representative put forward the claim that in Xinjiang, we are experiencing what is called genocide. But later, at the end of his discussion, he admitted that there is no genocide, but he deliberately used genocide as a kind of provocation in order to receive attention from the world. The British representative asked if this view caused such a bad misunderstanding, misperception, then why not just give it up?

Do not use genocide. You can criticize China for human rights

abuses. You can criticize China for its minority policies, etc. But to deliberately defame China is not a good way. I don't think it's a good way. We also have to be fair.

On the one side, you can criticize China's policy treating problems in the minorities and others. But you have to also condemn terrorist actions because there were a lot of terrorist bomb killings in that region, especially from 2012-2015, around that time.

I was in Xinjiang as a tourist in 2011, and I was advised to not pass by some streets, because there could be some risks. You can see that it was a very tense situation because of a lot of bombings. People pointed out to me, here were some bombings, there were some bombings. You don't understand. So, the West should be fair and condemn these things, while at same time, also advising the Chinese government to develop a more constructive policy to resolve the problem, rather than using harsh policies. It has to be fair. This is the first point.

Second, is that genocide not only defames China, it's also contrary, it's opposite to the facts. Twenty years ago, 30 years ago, Xinjiang's Uighur population was about five million or eight million. But after 30 years, I think it's about 11-13 million. I do not know exactly, but there has been a growth of population. How can you claim genocide, when the local population is increasing? Do you understand my point? So, this is not a good attitude. It is not a very good way to discuss with China and it makes China much more resistant in talking with you, when China fears that it is being defamed.

When some Western sources, in particular one German scholar, use a lot of data from a Turkish scholar, who is connected to the "minority resistance" from Xinjiang, then the credibility, reliability of the source is in question. You understand my point. So, the Xinjiang issue is rather complicated, but the West and China should have a dialogue, rather than use in this



specific discourse rhetoric to frame China in a way that China is the bad guy. It should be condemned. I think this is not constructive.

## **The SWIFT System**

Michelle Rasmussen: Going back to the war danger, what do you think the impact on China and on the world economy would be, were the U.S. to force Russia out of the SWIFT international payment system, or similar draconian measures?

Prof. Li Xing: Let me tell you that Olaf Scholz, the current German Chancellor, already expressed it very well, saying that if Russia were sanctioned and pushed out of the SWIFT payment system, then Europe could not pay Russia for its gas and oil. "If we can't pay Russia, then Russia will not supply us. Then what should we do?"

I read in the news today that the U.S. said, "We could supply most of Russia's oil and gas." Then Europe began to ponder: "Well then, this war has become your war, you know—a very egoistical interest, because you actually want to replace Russia's gas and oil supply. That's why you want to instigate the war."

So, I think it's the U.S. that has to be very cautious in its sanctions, because the only sanctions possibilities for the United States today against major powers is financial, is payment—it's the U.S. dollar. That's the intermediate currency, the SWIFT system.

And when China sees this, that only strengthened China's conclusion to develop what we call electronic currency. China is using a lot of energy today investing in electronic currency. This electronic currency is a real currency. It's just electronic. It's being implemented in some big cities in test trials.

Then, back to the SWIFT system, [if a country were thrown out]

it would be rather impossible or would rather create a lot of problems in the international payment system, then the whole system will more or less collapse, because most countries watch this, and they will try to think about how they should react in the future if the U.S. uses the same system of sanctions against them. I just mentioned China, but also many other countries as well. They have to find an alternative.

One other alternative is to use currencies other than the U.S. dollar as much as possible. I just read in the news today that the Chinese yuan has surpassed the Japanese yen as the fourth international [reserve] currency. And the situation will accelerate in that direction. So, I think that the U.S. should think twice.

On China-Russia relations, I definitely think that China will help Russia in case the U.S. really implements a sanction of pushing Russia out of the SWIFT payment system. China definitely will help Russia, because both face the same pressure, the same struggle, the same robbery from the U.S.

So, it is very bad. It is extremely bad strategy from the U.S. side to fight, simultaneously, on two fronts with two superpowers. This is what Henry Kissinger had said many times during the entire Cold War period. The U.S. was able to keep relatively stable relations between U.S. and China and between U.S. and the Soviet Union, keeping the Russia and China fighting against each other. But now it's the opposite situation. The U.S. is fighting with two big powers simultaneously. I don't know what is in the mind of the U.S. politicians. I really think that the U.S. needs to redesign its strategic foreign policy.

## **The Schiller Institute**

Michelle Rasmussen: Yeah. We've been speaking mostly about the U.S., but the British really are an instigator in this: the British Old Empire policy of trying to drive a wedge between

the United States, Russia and China. That also has a lot to do with the current situation. We spoke before about that the Schiller Institute is trying to get the United States' population to understand that the whole basis for the existence of the United States was the fight against the British Empire, and against this divide and conquer strategy, and, rather, to cooperate with Russia and China.

In conclusion, this conversation has been very wonderful. Do you have any parting words for our audience? We have many people in Europe and in the United States. Do you have any parting words of advice as to how we should look at China and what needs to be different about our policy?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I think that I want my last words, actually, to be invested in talking about the Schiller Institute. I think that some of your programs, some of your projects, and some of your applications are really interesting. The Schiller Institute has a lot of ideas. For example, you just mentioned your campaign for an Afghanistan health care system, but not only in Afghanistan. You promote these ideas for Africa, in developing countries. I really think that the Schiller Institute should continue to promote some of the ideas—a health care system in every country, especially now, considering the pandemic. The rich countries, including China, are able to produce vaccines, but not the developing countries. The U.S. has more vaccine doses stored up than necessary [for itself]. But Africa still has only a very low percentage of people [who have been vaccinated].

Michelle Rasmussen: I think 8%.

Prof. Li Xing: And we claim the Omicron variant of the coronavirus came from Africa. That's an irony. That's an irony, because it's definite that one day, another variation will come from Latin America, or from some other part of the world.

So, it's rather important for the West, and for China, to think about some of the positive suggestions by your Institute. I'm glad that you invited me for this interview, and I expect to have more cooperation with you. Thank you very much.

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing.

---

## **NYHEDSORIENTERING    DECEMBER 2021-JANUAR 2022: 2022 er Lyndon LaRouches år// Kan vi undgå krig med Rusland?**

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

---

## **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20. januar 2022: Vil Vesten have krig eller**

# **fred med Rusland og Kina? Finanskollaps på vej. FE- skandaler m.m. Video, lyd og resumé.**

med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/tg-20.1.22.mp3>

Resumé:

USA's og Ruslands udenrigsministre mødes i morgen. Er USA og NATO villige til at give Rusland de nødvendige sikkerhedsgarantier på skrift eller går man konfrontationsvejen? Rusland bakker ikke ned. Man gør op med årtiers svigt fra Vesten, hvor Vesten har ført krig imod Rusland og dets interesser med farvede revolutioner m.m. Nu er Rusland militært og økonomisk stærk mens Vesten er svag. Rusland og Kina kan klare sig uden Vesten, men Europa kan ikke klare sig uden russisk gas og kinesiske varer.

Eksperter advarer at hvis USA og NATO overskrider Ruslands røde linjer kan Rusland angribe fra Hviderusland og Kaliningrad med SS-26 Skander kortdistance atommissiler i hele Østeuropa. USA kan trues med ubådsbaserede Zircon atommissiler, der flyver 5-10 gange lydens hastighed, som USA ikke kan forsvare sig imod. Hvis det bliver krig mellem Rusland og USA vil Kina indtage Taiwan og Nordkorea angribe Sydkorea uden at USA kan gøre noget. Få derfor langsigtede fredsaftaler med Rusland og Kina, som alle kan leve med i stedet for konfrontation og krig. Rusland deltager i militærøvelser i Hviderusland fra den 9. februar så tag

snakken med Rusland, evt. med et topmøde mellem Biden og Putin, inden de Olympiske Vinterlege i Beijing fra den 4.-20. februar er afsluttet og scenen sat for eskalation og mulig krig.

USA's inflation på 7 % og USA's Federal Reserve bliver tvunget til at hæve renten. Resultatet vil være en nedsmeltning på de finansielle markeder. Nedflyvningen er startet så spænd sikkerhedsbælterne. Europa er ikke bedre stillet. Forbered implementering af LaRouches fire økonomiske love så realøkonomien og samfundet kan beskyttes imod konsekvenserne af nedsmeltningen.

COVID-19: Pga. den høje vacinetilslutning er Omikron-variantens indtog en gamechanger på trods af sin meget større smitbarhed. Største problem for sundhedsvæsenet er ikke Coronapatienter men hjemsendelse og karantæne for ikke-syge ansatte. Vi må reducere karantænetiden, men vente en uge eller to inden vi sætter fuld fart på genåbningen, til vi har set konsekvenserne af at der er 4 gange så mange daglige smittede som for en måned siden.

FE-skandalen viser i lighed med mink-skandalen en stor villighed hos regeringen til at ville bestemme, men en dårlig evne til at sikre sig den fornødne rådgivning og ekspertise inden man træffer drastiske beslutninger med store og vidtrækkende konsekvenser. Efter hybris kommer nemesis. Det kan true regeringens fremtid. Det er ikke kun regeringens medlemmer der handler hurtigt og overilet, uden tanke på de langsigtede konsekvenser, men hele den nuværende regerende elite. Husk at hovmod står for fald.

Grib ind i historien. Vær med til at sikre et globalt sundhedssystem. Lad os samarbejde om at stoppe sultkatastrofen i Afghanistan og få opbygget hele verdens økonomiske sundhed. Gå med i Schiller Instituttets kampagne. Tænk som LaRouche.

---

# Verden har brug for Lyndon LaRouche universiteter, af Tom Gillesberg

Fra 2017:

**Bidrag af Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, til et festskrift i anledning af Lyndon LaRouches 95 års fødselsdag.**

Verden har brug for Lyndon LaRouche universiteter, af Tom Gillesberg På engelsk fra 2017:

Contribution from Tom Gillesberg, President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, to the Festschrift for Lyndon LaRouche on his 95th birthday Her er den tale, der blev holdt for at præsentere Lyndon LaRouche ved åbningen af LaRouche-universiteterne den 8. september 2022.

Kære præsidenter, statsministre, Deres Excellencer, lærere, studerende, mine damer og herrer.

Før jeg giver ordet til Lyndon LaRouche ved denne meget, meget specielle lejlighed, som ikke blot fejrer, at han har nået milepælen på hundrede år, men også etablerer et sikkert fundament for menneskehedens kommende generationer, vil jeg kort gennemgå sammen med jer, hvordan det kunne lade sig gøre, at vi i dag åbner LaRouche-universiteter i New York, Beijing, Moskva, New Delhi, København, Stockholm, Berlin, Paris, Milano, Tirana, Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Sao Paulo, Pretoria, Cairo, Damaskus, Teheran og Sanaa.

Det hele begyndte i 2017, straks efter Lyndon LaRouches 95-års fødselsdag. Universitets- og regeringskredse i Kina reflekterede over den dybe betydning, som idéerne fra LaRouche

og hans bevægelse havde haft for omdannelsen af Kina og etableringen af den internationale Bælte & Vej-politik, og det faktum at LaRouche nu var 95 år gammel, mens mange af hans mangeårige medarbejdere, som f.eks. hans kone Helga Zepp-LaRouche, nærmede sig eller var i halvfjerdsene. De spurgte sig selv, om de kunne være sikre på, at der i fremtiden fortsat ville være en LaRouche-bevægelse, der kunne levere de nødvendige nye kreative input og idéer, der var nødvendige for Kinas og verdens udvikling, på et tidspunkt hvor Kina i stigende grad skulle lede verden ind i nye områder og opdagelser, som mennesket aldrig før havde prøvet. En proces, der krævede nye, unikke, kreative løsninger og ikke blot en kopi af noget, som mennesket allerede havde prøvet før. Alle var enige om, at der hurtigt måtte gøres noget.

Der blev nedsat hurtigt arbejdende udvalg på alle de forskellige videnskabelige, politiske og kulturelle områder for at få en plan for de nødvendige ændringer i pensum og for oprettelsen af supplerende kurser, som var nødvendige for at anvende LaRouches videnskabelige arbejde på de forskellige indsatsområder. Et kursus i Lyndon LaRouches fysisk økonomi blev obligatorisk for alle studerende i statskundskab og økonomi, og det blev besluttet at udvikle et studieprogram for specialister inden for området fysisk økonomi og LaRouche-Riemann-metoden.

Inden for de fysiske videnskaber blev LaRouche obligatorisk som hjælp til at udvikle de studerendes kreative kræfter til videnskabelig opdagelse, med fokus på LaRouches opdagelse og de videnskabelige tankeobjekters historie. Inden for samfundsvidenskaberne skulle eleverne undervises i princippet om potentiel relativ befolkningstæthed, stigende energigennemstrømningstæthed og menneskets naturlige udvikling i universet, set gennem Vernadskijs og LaRouches arbejde. LaRouches skrifter om metafor-princippet og andre vigtige skrifter blev obligatoriske inden for de forskellige kunstarter, og der blev foretaget ændringer inden for alle de



forskellige uddannelsesområder.

Rusland, der ikke ville lade sig overgå, fulgte hurtigt trop og udviklede et lignende program, og mange andre nationer fulgte trop. Selv i USA, LaRouches eget land, blev dette et spørgsmål, der blev taget op på mange niveauer, herunder i Det Nationale Sikkerhedsråd. Kunne USA tillade andre stormagter at øge deres erkendelsesevne med stormskridt gennem fornuftens kraft, styret af LaRouches ideer, mens USA selv sakkede bagud? Der blev iværksat et nødprogram under præsidentens direkte tilsyn for at sikre, at USA ville få et lignende program på benene og atter blive førende i verden inden for LaRouches videnskabelige metode.

Efter et par år, hvor den bemærkelsesværdige effekt af LaRouches idéer begyndte at gøre sig gældende, fik politiske ledere og førende intellektuelle i mange forskellige lande samtidig øjnene op for idéen: Bør der ikke oprettes særlige universiteter, der uddanner de studerende i selve Lyndon LaRouches kreativitet?

Bør der ikke være akademier, der er dedikeret til at forsøge at efterligne Lyndon LaRouches genialitet ved at beherske den metode, hvormed han opnåede så meget?

Og ville det ikke være passende, at disse nye universiteter åbner deres døre den 8. september 2022, dagen hvor LaRouche ville fejre sin 100-års fødselsdag?

Så således gik det til, at vi i dag har samtidige åbninger af LaRouche-universiteter i New York, Beijing, Moskva, New Delhi, København, Stockholm, Berlin, Paris, Milano, Tirana, Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Sao Paulo, Pretoria, Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Cairo, Damaskus, Teheran og Sanaa.

LaRouche vil, på grund af de fysiske begrænsninger, ikke være i stand til at være fysisk til stede ved alle disse samtidige fejring, men ved hjælp af moderne teknologi har vi sørget for at få hologrammer af LaRouche alle steder på én gang, og

vi venter nu ivrigt på Lyndon LaRouche og hans kone Helga, som vil holde tale og erklære alle disse nye universiteter for åbne.

Med tanke på den tidligere mexicanske præsident Lopez Portillos berømte ord: »Nu er tiden inde til at lytte til LaRouches kloge ord«, kan vi i dag fejre, at »endelig lyttede verden til Lyndon LaRouches kloge ord«, og vi kan alle se, hvor meget lysere en fremtid det betyder for hele menneskeheden.

---

## **Pressemeddelelse den 6. januar 2021:**

**Hvorfor USA og NATO bør  
underskrive traktaterne  
foreslåede af Putin.**

**Interview med rusland-ekspert  
Jens Jørgen Nielsen til  
Schiller Instituttet i  
Danmark**

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

KØBENHAVN – I lyset af den eskalerende spænding mellem USA/NATO og Rusland, som kan føre til en varm krig, ja endog atomkrig, foretog Schiller Instituttet i Danmark et timelangt

engelsksproget video/lydinterview med Rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen den 30. december 2021.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er cand. mag. i idéhistorie og historie, og var i slutningen af 1990'erne Politikens Moskva-korrespondent. Han er forfatter til flere bøger om Rusland og Ukraine, leder af Russisk-Dansk Dialog og lektor i kommunikation og kulturelle forskelle på Niels Brock handelshøjskole. Jens Jørgen Nielsen underviser på Folkeuniversitetet og andre steder, ligesom han arbejder med danske eksportvirksomheder, der vil ind på det russiske, ukrainske og hviderussiske marked. Han har i mange år arrangeret rejser til Rusland.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen, med mange års erfaring i at analysere Rusland, Ukraine og vestlige holdninger og handlinger i forhold til Rusland, taler tydeligt om konsekvenserne, hvis ikke Vesten er villig til seriøst at forhandle en diplomatisk løsning på de "røde linjer", som Putin og andre førende russiske talsmænd har udtalt er ved at blive krydset: Hvis Ukraine tilslutter sig NATO, og hvis NATO's ekspansion mod øst fortsætter, og hvorfor USA og NATO burde underskrive Putins foreslåede traktater om disse spørgsmål.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen tager fat på de ændringer, der er nødvendige på den vestlige side, som vil afgøre, om de kommende forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland om disse "røde linjer" den 10.-13. januar vil lykkes med at trække verden tilbage fra randen af krig.

Interviewet er endnu vigtigere efter bekendtgørelsen den 3. januar 2022 for første gang af en fælles erklæring fra stats- og regeringscheferne for de fem atomvåbenstater, som også er de permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd om, at "atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes", og dermed anerkendelsen af hvad der er på spil under den nuværende krise.

---

Nogle højdepunkter:

Et højdepunkt er Jens Jørgen Nielsens personlige diskussion i 1989 med Mikail Gorbatsjov om NATO-udvidelse mod øst:

“Faktisk havde jeg en lang snak med Mikhail Gorbatsjov, den tidligere leder af Sovjetunionen, i 1989, lige da NATO begyndte at bombe Serbien, og da de indlemmede Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn i NATO. Man bør huske på at Gorbatsjov er en meget rar person. Han er en meget livlig person, med godt humør og en erfaren person. Men da vi begyndte at snakke, spurgte jeg ham om NATO-udvidelsen, som foregik præcis den dag, hvor vi snakkede. Han blev meget dystert, meget trist, fordi han sagde: Altså, jeg talte med James Baker, Helmut Kohl fra Tyskland og flere andre personer, og de lovede mig alle ikke at flytte en tomme mod øst, hvis Sovjetunionen ville lade Tyskland forene DDR (Østtyskland) og Vesttyskland, for at blive ét land, og komme til at blive medlem af NATO, men ikke bevæge sig en tomme mod øst.’... Det stod ikke skrevet, for, som han sagde, “Jeg troede på dem. Jeg kan se, at jeg var naiv.”

Et andet vigtigt afsnit er, hvad Jens Jørgen Nielsen ville sige til Biden, og andre NATO-statschefer, i en privat diskussion før de kommende forhandlinger mellem USA/NATO og Rusland. “Jeg ville sige, ‘Se, Joe, jeg forstår dine bekymringer. Jeg forstår, at du ser dig selv som en forkæmper for frihed i verden, ... men ser du, det spil, du nu spiller med Rusland, er et meget, meget farligt spil. Og russerne, som et meget stolt folk, man kan ikke tvinge dem’, angående USA’s og nogle europæiske landes politik, til at skifte Putin ud med en anden præsident. “Jeg kan forsikre dig, Joe Biden, vær sikker på, at hvis det lykkes, eller hvis Putin dør i morgen, eller de på en eller anden måde får en ny præsident, kan jeg forsikre dig om, at den nye præsident vil være lige så hård som Putin, måske endda hårdere... Jeg tror,□□det ville være klogt for dig, lige nu, at støtte Putin, eller at handle med

Putin, engagere sig med Putin og lave noget diplomati, fordi alternativet er en mulighed for krig, og du burde ikke gå over i historien som den amerikanske præsident, der sikrede menneskehedens udryddelse. Det ville være et dårligt, meget dårligt eftermæle for dig.'

Han forholder sig til den reelle mulighed for, at vi søvngængeragtigt går ind i atomkrig, som før 1. Verdenskrig, som svar på Schiller Instituttets memorandum Er vi søvngængeragtigt på vej til atomkrig 3. verdenskrig? den 24. december 2021.

"[Man] kan forestille sig, hvad der vil ske, hvis Kina, Iran og Rusland havde en militær alliance, der gik ind i Mexico, Canada, Cuba, måske også opstillede missiler dér... [T]anken om en atomkrig er forfærdelig for os alle, og det er derfor jeg synes, at politikere må komme til fornuft... for milliarder vil dø i dette. Og det er et spørgsmål, om menneskeheden vil overleve. Så det er et meget, meget alvorligt spørgsmål. Og jeg tror vi bør spørge om Ukraines ret til at have NATO-medlemskab, som dets egen befolkning egentlig ikke ønsker, er det virkelig værd at risikere en atomkrig for? Sådan vil jeg sige det."

---

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

Fuld støtte til seriøse forhandlinger med Rusland og underskrivelse af de to foreslåede traktater, som opfordret af Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Forkerte forestillinger i vesten om Rusland og Putin, og manglen på vilje til at håndtere andre kulturer som ligeværdige, medmindre de er ligesom os.

Hvordan pro-vestlige holdninger i Rusland, herunder af Jeltsin og Putin, blev afvist, og Rusland derefter vendte sig mod Kina.

Hvordan Ukraine-krisen ikke startede med "annekteringen" af Krim, men med det han kalder "et kup" mod den ukrainske præsident Janukovitj, som ønskede økonomiske forbindelser både med EU og Rusland; plus baggrunden for Krim-spørgsmålet.

Vigtigheden af en dialog mellem kulturer, herunder "Musikalsk dialog mellem Kulturer"-koncerterne i København, arrangeret af Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog og Det kinesiske Kulturcenter i København.

Jens Jørgen Nielsens opbakning til mange af Schiller Instituttets idéer og indsatser.

Mere information, eller for at aftale et nyt interview, kontakt:

Michelle Rasmussen fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark: 53 57 00 51, [si@schillerinstitut.dk](mailto:si@schillerinstitut.dk), [www.schillerinstitute.com](http://www.schillerinstitute.com); [www.schillerinstitut.dk](http://www.schillerinstitut.dk)

Afskrift på engelsk: (Kortet på side 15 viser NATO, hvis Ukraine og Georgien bliver medlemmer.)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Interview med Rusland ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen:**

**Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive traktaterne foreslået af Putin.**

**Interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen:**

**Why the U.S. and NATO should sign the treaties proposed by Putin?**

Udgivet på Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) tidsskrift bind 49, række 2 den 14. januar 2022. Her er en pdf-version:

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Kortet på side 15 viser NATO udvidelse, hvis Ukraine og Georgien bliver medlemmer.

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen, by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Demark, conducted December 30, 2021. Mr. Nielsen has degrees in the history of ideas and communication. He is a former Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s. He is the author of several books about Russia and the Ukraine, and a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization. In addition, he is an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Hello, viewers. I am Michelle Rasmussen, the Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. This

is an interview with Jens Jørgen Nielsen from Denmark.

The Schiller Institute released a [[memorandum]] December 24 titled "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III." In the beginning, it states, "Ukraine is being used by geopolitical forces in the West that answer to the bankrupt speculative financial system, as the flashpoint to trigger a strategic showdown with Russia, a showdown which is already more dangerous than the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, and which could easily end up in a thermonuclear war which no one would win, and none would survive."

Jens Jørgen, in the past days, Russian President Putin and other high-level spokesmen have stated that Russia's red lines are about to be crossed, and they have called for treaty negotiations to come back from the brink. What are these red lines and how dangerous is the current situation?

%%Russian 'Red Lines'

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Thank you for inviting me. First, I would like to say that I think that the question you have raised here about red lines, and the question also about are we sleepwalking into a new war, is very relevant. Because, as an historian, I know what happened in 1914, at the beginning of the First World War—a kind of sleepwalking. No one really wanted the war, actually, but it ended up with war, and tens of million people were killed, and then the whole world disappeared at this time, and the world has never been the same. So, I think it's a very, very relevant question that you are asking here.

You asked me specifically about Putin, and the red lines. I heard that the Clintons, Bill and Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry, and many other American politicians, claim that we don't have things like red lines anymore. We don't have zones of influence anymore, because we have a new world. We have a new liberal world, and we do not have these kinds of things.



It belongs to another century and another age. But you could ask the question, "What actually are the Americans doing in Ukraine, if not defending their own red lines?"

Because I think it's like, if you have a power, a superpower, a big power like Russia, I think it's very, very natural that any superpower would have some kind of red lines. You can imagine what would happen if China, Iran, and Russia had a military alliance, going into Mexico, Canada, Cuba, maybe also putting missiles up there. I don't think anyone would doubt what would happen. The United States would never accept it, of course. So, the Russians would normally ask, "Why should we accept that Americans are dealing with Ukraine and preparing, maybe, to put up some military hardware in Ukraine? Why should we? And I think it's a very relevant question. Basically, the Russians see it today as a question of power, because the Russians, actually, have tried for, I would say, 30 years. They have tried.

I was in Russia 30 years ago. I speak Russian. I'm quite sure that the Russians, at that time, dreamt of being a part of the Western community, and they had very, very high thoughts about the Western countries, and Americans were extremely popular at this time. Eighty percent of the Russian population in 1990 had a very positive view of the United States. Later on, today, and even for several years already, 80%, the same percentage, have a negative view of Americans. So, something happened, not very positively, because 30 years ago, there were some prospects of a new world.

There really were some ideas, but something actually was screwed up in the 90s. I have some idea about that. Maybe we can go in detail about it. But things were screwed up, and normally, today, many people in the West, in universities, politicians, etc. think that it's all the fault of Putin. It's Putin's fault. Whatever happened is Putin's fault. Now, we are in a situation which is very close to the Cuban Missile Crisis, which you also mentioned. But I don't think it is that

way. I think it takes two to tango. We know that, of course, but I think many Western politicians have failed to see the compliance of the western part in this, because there are many things which play a role that we envisage in a situation like that now.

The basic thing, if you look at it from a Russian point of view, it's the extension to the east of NATO. I think that's a real bad thing, because Russia was against it from the very beginning. Even Boris Yeltsin, who was considered to be the man of the West, the democratic Russia, he was very, very opposed to this NATO alliance going to the East, up to the borders of Russia.

And we can see it now, because recently, some new material has been released in America, an exchange of letters between Yeltsin and Clinton at this time. So, we know exactly that Yeltsin, and Andrei Kozyrev, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs at this time, were very much opposed to it. And then Putin came along. Putin came along not to impose his will on the Russian people. He came along because there was, in Russia, a will to oppose this NATO extension to the East. So, I think things began at this point.

And later on, we had the Georgian crisis in 2008, and we had, of course, the Ukraine crisis in 2014, and, also, with Crimea and Donbass, etc.

And now we are very, very close to—I don't think it's very likely we will have a war, but we are very close to it, because wars often begin by some kind of mistake, some accident, someone accidentally pulls the trigger, or presses a button somewhere, and suddenly, something happens. Exactly what happened in 1914, at the beginning of World War I. Actually, there was one who was shot in Sarajevo. Everyone knows about that, and things like that could happen. And for us, living in Europe, it's awful to think about having a war.

We can hate Putin. We can think whatever we like. But the thought of a nuclear war is horrible for all of us, and that's why I think that politicians could come to their senses.

And I think also this demonization of Russia, and demonization of Putin, is very bad, of course, for the Russians. But it's very bad for us here in the West, for us, in Europe, and also in America. I don't think it's very good for our democracy. I don't think it's very good. I don't see very many healthy perspectives in this. I don't see any at all.

I see some other prospects, because we could cooperate in another way. There are possibilities, of course, which are not being used, or put into practice, which certainly could be.

So, yes, your question is very, very relevant and we can talk at length about it. I'm very happy that you ask this question, because if you ask these questions today in the Danish and Western media at all—everyone thinks it's enough just to say that Putin is a scoundrel, Putin is a crook, and everything is good. No, we have to get along. We have to find some ways to cooperate, because otherwise it will be the demise of all of us.

## %%NATO Expansion Eastward

Michelle Rasmussen: Can you just go through a little bit more of the history of the NATO expansion towards the East? And what we're speaking about in terms of the treaties that Russia has proposed, first, to prevent Ukraine from becoming a formal member of NATO, and second, to prevent the general expansion of NATO, both in terms of soldiers and military equipment towards the East. Can you speak about this, also in terms of the broken promises from the Western side?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Actually, the story goes back to the beginning of the nineties. I had a long talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, the former leader of the Soviet Union, in 1989, just when NATO started to bomb Serbia, and when they adopted

Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO. You should bear in mind that Gorbachev is a very nice person. He's a very lively person, with good humor, and an experienced person.

But when we started to talk, I asked him about the NATO expansion, which was going on exactly the day when we were talking. He became very gloomy, very sad, because he said,

[[[begin quote indent]]]

Well, I talked to James Baker, Helmut Kohl from Germany, and several other persons, and they all promised me not to move an inch to the East, if Soviet Union would let Germany unite the GDR (East Germany) and West Germany, to become one country, and come to be a member of NATO, but not move an inch to the East.

[[[end quote indent]]]

I think, also, some of the new material which has been released—I have read some of it, some on WikiLeaks, and some can be found. It's declassified. It's very interesting. There's no doubt at all. There were some oral, spoken promises to Mikhail Gorbachev. It was not written, because, as he said, "I believed them. I can see I was naive."

I think this is a key to Putin today, to understand why Putin wants not only sweet words. He wants something based on a treaty, because, basically, he doesn't really believe the West. The level of trust between Russia and NATO countries is very, very low today. And it's a problem, of course, and I don't think we can overcome it in a few years. It takes time to build trust, but the trust is not there for the time being.

But then, the nature of the NATO expansion has gone step, by step, by step. First, it was the three countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—and then, in 2004, six years later, came, among other things—the Baltic republics, and Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. And the others came later

on-Albania, Croatia, etc. And then in 2008, there was a NATO Summit in Bucharest, where George Bush, President of the United States, promised Georgia and Ukraine membership of NATO. Putin was present. He was not President at this time. He was Prime Minister in Russia, because the President was [Dmitry] Medvedev, but he was very angry at this time. But what could he do? But he said, at this point, very, very clearly, "We will not accept it, because our red lines would be crossed here. We have accepted the Baltic states. We have retreated. We've gone back. We've been going back for several years," but still, it was not off the table.

It was all because Germany and France did not accept it, because [Chancellor Angela] Merkel and [President François] Hollande, at this time, did not accept Ukraine and Georgia becoming a member of NATO. But the United States pressed for it, and it is still on the agenda of the United States, that Georgia and Ukraine should be a member of NATO.

So, there was a small war in August, the same year, a few months after this NATO Summit, where, actually, it was Georgia which attacked South Ossetia, which used to be a self-governing part of Georgia. The incumbent Georgian president, Mikheil Saakashvili did not want to accept the autonomous status of South Ossetia, so Georgia attacked South Ossetia. Russian soldiers were deployed in South Ossetia, and 14 of them were killed by the Georgian army. And you could say that George W. Bush promised Georgian President Saakashvili that the Americans would support the Georgians, in case Russia should retaliate, which they did.

The Russian army was, of course, much bigger than the Georgian army, and it smashed the Georgian army in five days, and retreated. There was no help from the United States to the Georgians. And, I think, that from a moral point of view, I don't think it's a very wise policy, because you can't say "You just go on. We will help you"—and not help at all when it gets serious. I think, from a moral point of view, it's not

very fair.

## %%A Coup in Ukraine

But, actually, it's the same which seems to be happening now in Ukraine, even though there was, what I would call a coup, an orchestrated state coup, in 2014. I know there are very, very different opinions about this, but my opinion is that there was a kind of coup to oust the sitting incumbent President, Viktor Yanukovych, and replace him with one who was very, very keen on getting into NATO. Yanukovych was not very keen on going into NATO, but he still had the majority of the population. And it's interesting. In Ukraine, there's been a lot of opinion polls conducted by Germans, Americans, French, Europeans, Russians and Ukrainians. And all these opinion polls show that a majority of Ukrainian people did not want to join NATO.

After that, of course, things moved very quickly, because Crimea was a very, very sensitive question for Russia, for many reasons. First, it was a contested area because it was, from the very beginning, from 1991, when Ukraine was independent—there was no unanimity about Crimea and its status, because the majority of Crimea was Russian-speaking, and is very culturally close to Russia, in terms of history. It's very close to Russia. It's one of the most patriotic parts of Russia, actually. So, it's a very odd part of Ukraine. It always was a very odd part of Ukraine.

The first thing the new government did in February 2014, was to forbid the Russian language, as a language which had been used in local administration, and things like that. It was one of the stupidest things you could do in such a very tense situation. Ukraine, basically, is a very cleft society. The eastern southern part is very close to Russia. They speak Russian and are very close to Russian culture. The western part, the westernmost part around Lviv, is very close to Poland and Austria, and places like that. So, it's a cleft

society, and in such a society you have some options. One option is to embrace all the parts of society, different parts of society. Or you can, also, one part could impose its will on the other part, against its will. And that was actually what happened.

So, there are several crises. There is the crisis in Ukraine, with two approximately equally sized parts of Ukraine. But you also have, on the other hand, the Russian-NATO question. So, you had two crises, and they stumbled together, and they were pressed together in 2014. So, you had a very explosive situation which has not been solved to this day.

And for Ukraine, I say that as long as you have this conflict between Russia and NATO, it's impossible to solve, because it's one of the most corrupt societies, one of the poorest societies in Europe right now. A lot of people come to Denmark, where we are now, to Germany and also to Russia. Millions of Ukrainians have gone abroad to work, because there are really many, many social problems, economic problems, things like that.

And that's why Putin—if we remember what Gorbachev told me about having things on paper, on treaties, which are signed—and that's why Putin said, what he actually said to the West, “I don't really believe you, because when you can, you cheat.” He didn't put it that way, but that was actually what he meant: “So now I tell you very, very, very, very clearly what our points of view are. We have red lines, like you have red lines. Don't try to cross them.”

And I think many people in the West do not like it. I think it's very clear, because I think the red lines, if you compare them historically, are very reasonable. If you compare them with the United States and the Monroe Doctrine, which is still in effect in the USA, they are very, very reasonable red lines. I would say that many of the Ukrainians, are very close to Russia. I have many Ukrainian friends. I sometimes forget

that they are Ukrainians, because their language, their first language, is actually Russian, and Ukrainian is close to Russian.

So, those countries being part of an anti-Russian military pact, it's simply madness. It cannot work. It will not work. Such a country would never be a normal country for many, many years, forever.

I think much of the blame could be put on the NATO expansion and those politicians who have been pressing for that for several years. First and foremost, Bill Clinton was the first one, Madeline Albright, from 1993. At this time, they adopted the policy of major extension to the East. And George W. Bush also pressed for Ukraine and Georgia to become members of NATO.

And for every step, there was, in Russia, people rallying around the flag. You could put it that way, because you have pressure. And the more we pressure with NATO, the more the Russians will rally around the flag, and the more authoritarian Russia will be. So, we are in this situation. Things are now happening in Russia, which I can admit I do not like, closing some offices, closing some media. I do not like it at all. But in a time of confrontation, I think it's quite reasonable, understandable, even though I would not defend it. But it's understandable. Because the United States, after 9/11, also adopted a lot of defensive measures, and a kind of censorship, and things like that. It's what happens when you have such tense situations.

We should just also bear in mind that Russia and the United States are the two countries which possess 90% of the world's nuclear armament. Alone, the mere thought of them using some of this, is a doomsday perspective, because it will not be a small, tiny war, like World War II, but it will dwarf World War II, because billions will die in this. And it's a question, if humanity will survive. So, it's a very, very



grave question.

I think we should ask if the right of Ukraine to have NATO membership—which its own population does not really want— “Is it really worth the risk of a nuclear war?” That’s how I would put it.

I will not take all blame away from Russia. That’s not my point here. My point is that this question is too important. It’s very relevant. It’s very important that we establish a kind of *modus vivendi*. It’s a problem for the West. I also think it’s very important that we learn, in the West, how to cope with people who are not like us. We tend to think that people should become democrats like we are democrats, and only then will we deal with them. If they are not democrats, like we are democrats, we will do everything we can to make them democrats. We will support people who want to make a revolution in their country, so they become like us. It’s a very, very dangerous, dangerous way of thinking, and a destructive way of thinking.

I think that we in the West should study, maybe, a little more what is happening in other organizations not dominated by the West. I’m thinking about the BRICS, as one organization. I’m also thinking about the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, in which Asian countries are cooperating, and they are not changing each other. The Chinese are not demanding that we should all be Confucians. And the Russians are not demanding that all people in the world should be Orthodox Christians, etc. I think it’s very, very important that we bear in mind that we should cope with each other like we are, and not demand changes. I think it’s a really dangerous and stupid game to play. I think the European Union is also very active in this game, which I think is very, very—Well, this way of thinking, in my point of view, has no perspective, no positive perspective at all.

%%Diplomacy to Avert Catastrophe

Michelle Rasmussen: Today, Presidents Biden and Putin will speak on the phone, and important diplomatic meetings are scheduled for the middle of January. What is going to determine if diplomacy can avoid a disaster, as during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just called this a “reverse missile crisis.” Or, if Russia will feel that they have no alternative to having a military response, as they have openly stated. What changes on the Western side are necessary? If you had President Biden alone in a room, or other heads of state of NATO countries, what would you say to them?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I would say, “Look, Joe, I understand your concerns. I understand that you see yourself as a champion of freedom in the world, and things like that. I understand the positive things about it. But, you see, the game you now are playing with Russia is a very, very dangerous game. And the Russians, are a very proud people; you cannot force them. It’s not an option. I mean, you cannot, because it has been American, and to some degree, also European Union policy, to change Russia, to very much like to change, so that they’ll have another president, and exchange Putin for another president.”

But I can assure you, if I were to speak to Joe Biden, I’d say, “Be sure that if you succeed, or if Putin dies tomorrow, or somehow they’ll have a new President, I can assure you that the new President will be just as tough as Putin, maybe even tougher. Because in Russia, you have much tougher people. I would say even most people in Russia who blame Putin, blame him because he’s not tough enough on the West, because he was soft on the West, too liberal toward the West, and many people have blamed him for not taking the eastern southern part of Ukraine yet—that he should have done it.

“So, I would say to Biden, “I think it would be wise for you, right now, to support Putin, or to deal with Putin, engage with Putin, and do some diplomacy, because the alternative is

a possibility of war, and you should not go down into history as the American president who secured the extinction of humanity. It would be a bad, very bad record for you. And there are possibilities, because I don't think Putin is unreasonable. Russia has not been unreasonable. I think they have turned back. Because in 1991, it was the Russians themselves, who disbanded the Soviet Union. It was the Russians, Moscow, which disbanded the Warsaw Pact. The Russians, who gave liberty to the Baltic countries, and all other Soviet Republics. And with hardly any shots, and returned half a million Soviet soldiers back to Russia. No shot was fired at all. I think it's extraordinary.

"If you compare what happened to the dismemberment of the French and the British colonial empires after World War II, the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact was very, very civilized, in many ways. So, stop thinking about Russia as uncivilized, stupid people, who don't understand anything but mere power. Russians are an educated people. They understand a lot of arguments, and they are interested in cooperating. There will be a lot of advantages for the United States, for the West, and also the European Union, to establish a kind of more productive, more pragmatic relationship, cooperation. There are a lot of things in terms of energy, climate, of course, and terrorism, and many other things, where it's a win-win situation to cooperate with them.

"The only thing Russia is asking for is not to put your military hardware in their backyard. I don't think it should be hard for us to accept, certainly not to understand why the Russians think this way."

And we in the West should think back to the history, where armies from the West have attacked Russia. So, they have it in their genes. I don't think that there is any person in Russia who has forgot, or is not aware of, the huge losses the Soviet Union suffered from Nazi Germany in the 1940s during World War II. And you had Napoleon also trying to—You have a lot of that

experience with armies from the West going into Russia. So, it's very, very large, very, very deep.

Michelle Rasmussen: Was it around 20 million people who died during World War II?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: In the Soviet Union. There were also Ukrainians, and other nationalities, but it was around 18 million Russians, if you can count it, because it was the Soviet Union, but twenty-seven million people in all. It's a huge part, because Russia has experience with war. So, the Russians would certainly not like war. I think the Russians have experience with war, that also the Europeans, to some extent, have, that the United States does not have.

Because the attack I remember in recent times is the 9/11 attack, the twin towers in New York. Otherwise, the United States does not have these experiences. It tends to think more in ideological terms, where the Russians, certainly, but also to some extent, some people in Europe, think more pragmatically, more that we should, at any cost, avoid war, because war creates more problems than it solves. So, have some pragmatic cooperation. It will not be very much a love affair. Of course not. But it will be on a very pragmatic—

%%The Basis for Cooperation

Michelle Rasmussen: Also, in terms of dealing with this horrible humanitarian situation in Afghanistan and cooperating on the pandemic.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Of course, there are possibilities. Right now, it's like we can't even cooperate in terms of vaccines, and there are so many things going on, from both sides, actually, because we have very, very little contact between—

I had some plans to have some cooperation between Danish and Russian universities in terms of business development, things

like that, but it turned out there was not one crown, as our currency is called. You could have projects in southern America, Africa, all other countries. But not Russia, which is stupid.

Michelle Rasmussen: You wrote two recent books about Russia. One is called, *On His Own Terms: Putin and the New Russia*, and the latest one, just from September, *Russia Against the Grain*. Many people in the West portray Russia as the enemy, which is solely responsible for the current situation, and Putin as a dictator who is threatening his neighbors militarily and threatening the democracy of the free world. Over and above what you have already said, is this true, or do you have a different viewpoint?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Of course, I have a different point of view. Russia for me, is not a perfect country, because such a country does not exist, not even Denmark! Some suppose it is. But there's no such thing as a perfect society. Because societies are always developing from somewhere, to somewhere, and Russia, likewise. Russia is a very, very big country. So, you can definitely find things which are not very likable in Russia. Definitely. That's not my point here.

But I think that in the West, actually for centuries, we have—if you look back, I have tried in my latest book, to find out how Western philosophers, how church people, how they look at Russia, from centuries back. And there has been kind of a red thread. There's been a kind of continuation. Because Russia has very, very, very often been characterized as our adversary, as a country against basic European values. Five hundred years back, it was against the Roman Catholic Church, and in the 17th and 18th Centuries it was against the Enlightenment philosophers, and in the 20th century, it was about communism—it's also split people in the West, and it was also considered to be a threat. But it is also considered to be a threat today, even though Putin is not a communist. He is not a communist. He is a conservative, a moderate

conservative, I would say.

Even during the time of Yeltsin, he was also considered liberal and progressive, and he loved the West and followed the West in all, almost all things they proposed.

But still, there's something with Russia—which I think from a philosophical point of view is very important to find out—that we have some very deep-rooted prejudices about Russia, and I think they play a role. When I speak to people who say, "Russia is an awful country, and Putin is simply a very, very evil person, is a dictator," I say, "Have you been in Russia? Do you know any Russians?" "No, not really." "Ok. But what do you base your points of view on?" "Well, what I read in the newspapers, of course, what they tell me on the television."

Well, I think that's not good enough. I understand why the Russians—I very often talk to Russian politicians, and other people, and what they are sick and tired of, is this notion that the West is better: "We are on a higher level. And if Russians should be accepted by the West, they should become like us. Or at least they should admit that they are on a lower level, in relation to our very high level."

And that is why, when they deal with China, or deal with India, and when they deal with African countries, and even Latin American countries, they don't meet such attitudes, because they are on more equal terms. They're different, yes, but one does not consider each other to be on a higher level.

And that's why I think that cooperation in BRICS, which we talked about, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, I think it's quite successful. I don't know about the future, but I have a feeling that if you were talking about Afghanistan, I think if Afghanistan could be integrated into this kind of organization, one way or another, I have a feeling it probably would be more successful than the 20 years that the NATO countries have been there.

I think that cultural attitudes play a role when we're talking about politics, because a lot of the policy from the American, European side, is actually very emotional. It's very much like, "We have some feelings—We fear Russia. We don't like it," or "We think that it's awful." And "Our ideas, we know how to run a society much better than the Russians, and the Chinese, and the Indians, and the Muslims," and things like that. It's a part of the problem. It's a part of our problem in the West. It's a part of our way of thinking, our philosophy, which I think we should have a closer look at and criticize. But it's difficult, because it's very deeply rooted.

When I discuss with people at universities and in the media, and other places, I encounter this. That is why I wrote the latest book, because it's very much about our way of thinking about Russia. The book is about Russia, of course, but it's also about us, our glasses, how we perceive Russia, how we perceive not only Russia, but it also goes for China, because it's more or less the same. But there are many similarities between how we look upon Russia, and how we look upon and perceive China, and other countries.

I think this is a very, very important thing we have to deal with. We have to do it, because otherwise, if we decide, if America and Russia decide to use all the fireworks they have of nuclear [armament] power, then it's the end.

You can put it very sharply, to put it like that, and people will not like it. But basically, we are facing these two alternatives: Either we find ways to cooperate with people who are not like us, and will not be, certainly not in my lifetime, like us, and accept them, that they are not like us, and get on as best we can, and keep our differences, but respect each other. I think that's what we need from the Western countries. I think it's the basic problem today dealing with other countries.

And the same goes, from what I have said, for China. I do not know the Chinese language. I have been in China. I know a little about China. Russia, I know very well. I speak Russian, so I know how Russians are thinking about this, what their feelings are about this. And I think it's important to deal with these questions.

%%'A Way to Live Together'

Michelle Rasmussen: You also pointed out, that in 2001, after the attack against the World Trade Center, Putin was the first one to call George Bush, and he offered cooperation about dealing with terrorism. You've written that he had a pro-Western worldview, but that this was not reciprocated.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes. Afterwards, Putin was criticized by the military, and also by politicians in the beginning of his first term in 2000, 2001, 2002, he was criticized because he was too happy for America. He even said, in an interview in the BBC, that he would like Russia to become a member of NATO. It did not happen, because—there are many reasons for that. But he was very, very keen—that's also why he felt very betrayed afterward. In 2007, at the Munich Conference on Security in February in Germany, he said he was very frustrated, and it was very clear that he felt betrayed by the West. He thought that they had a common agenda. He thought that Russia should become a member. But Russia probably is too big.

If you consider Russia becoming a member of the European Union, the European Union would change thoroughly, but they failed. Russia did not become a member. It's understandable. But then I think the European Union should have found, again, a *modus vivendi*.

Michelle Rasmussen: A way of living together.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, how to live together It was actually a parallel development of the European Union and NATO, against



Russia. In 2009, the European Union invited Georgia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, to become members of the European Union, but not Russia. Even though they knew that there was really a lot of trade between Ukraine, also Georgia, and Russia. And it would interfere with that trade. But they did not pay attention to Russia.

So, Russia was left out at this time. And so eventually, you could say, understandably, very understandably, Russia turned to China. And in China, with cooperation with China, they became stronger. They became much more self-confident, and they also cooperated with people who respected them much more. I think that's interesting, that the Chinese understood how to deal with other people with respect, but the Europeans and Americans did not.

%%Ukraine, Again

Michelle Rasmussen: Just before we go to our last questions. I want to go back to Ukraine, because it's so important. You said that the problem did not start with the so-called annexation of Crimea, but with what you called a coup against the sitting president. Can you just explain more about that? Because in the West, everybody says, "Oh, the problem started when Russia annexed Crimea."

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, if you take Ukraine, in 2010 there was a presidential election, and the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe] monitored the election, and said that it was very good, and the majority voted for Viktor Yanukovich. Viktor Yanukovich did not want Ukraine to become a member of NATO. He wanted to cooperate with the European Union. But he also wanted to keep cooperating with Russia. Basically, that's what he was like. But it's very often claimed that he was corrupt. Yes, I don't doubt it, but name me one president who has not been corrupt. That's not the big difference, it's not the big thing, I would say. But then in 2012, there was also a parliamentary election in Ukraine,

and Yanukovych's party also gained a majority with some other parties. There was a coalition which supported Yanukovych's policy not to become a member of NATO.

And then there was a development where the European Union and Ukraine were supposed to sign a treaty of cooperation. But he found out that the treaty would be very costly for Ukraine, because they would open the borders for European Union firms, and the Ukrainian firms would not be able to compete with the Western firms.

Secondly, and this is the most important thing, basic industrial export from Ukraine was to Russia, and it was industrial products from the eastern part, from Dnipropetrovsk or Dniepro as it is called today, from Donetsk, from Luhansk and from Kryvyj Rih (Krivoj Rog), from some other parts, basically in the eastern part, which is the industrial part of Ukraine.

And they made some calculations that showed that, well, if you join this agreement, Russia said, "We will have to put some taxes on the export, because you will have some free import from the European Union. We don't have an agreement with the European Union, so, of course, anything which comes from you, there would be some taxes imposed on it." And then Yanukovych said, "Well, well, well, it doesn't sound good," and he wanted Russia, the European Union and Ukraine to go together, and the three form what we call a triangular agreement.

But the European Union was very much opposed to it. The eastern part of Ukraine was economically a part of Russia. Part of the Russian weapons industry was actually in the eastern part of Ukraine, and there were Russian speakers there. But the European Union said, "No, we should not cooperate with Russia about this," because Yanukovych wanted to have cooperation between the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia, which sounds very sensible to me. Of course, it should be like that. It would be to the advantage of all three parts.

But the European Union had a very ideological approach to this. So, they were very much against Russia. It also increased the Russian's suspicion that the European Union was only a stepping-stone to NATO membership.

And then what happened was that there was a conflict, there were demonstrations every day on the Maidan Square in Kiev. There were many thousands of people there, and there were also shootings, because many of the demonstrators were armed people. They had stolen weapons from some barracks in the West. And at this point, when 100 people had been killed, the European Union foreign ministers from France, Germany and Poland met, and there was also a representative from Russia, and there was Yanukovych, a representative from his government, and from the opposition. And they made an agreement. Ok. You should have elections this year, in half a year, and you should have some sharing of power. People from the opposition should become members of the government, and things like that.

All of a sudden, things broke down, and Yanukovych left, because you should remember, and very often in the West, they tend to forget that the demonstrators were armed. And they killed police also. They killed people from Yanukovych's Party of the Regions, and things like that. So, it's always been portrayed as innocent, peace-loving demonstrators. They were not at all. And some of them had very dubious points of view, with Nazi swastikas, and things like that. And Yanukovych fled.

Then they came to power. They had no legitimate government, because many of the members of parliament from these parts of the regions which had supported Yanukovych, had fled to the East. So, the parliament was not able to make any decisions. Still, there was a new president, also a new government, which was basically from the western part of Ukraine. And the first thing they did, I told you, was to get rid of the Russian language, and then they would talk about NATO membership. And

Victoria Nuland was there all the time, the vice foreign minister of the United States, was there all the time. There were many people from the West also, so things broke down.

%%Crimea

Michelle Rasmussen: There have actually been accusations since then, that there were provocateurs who were killing people on both sides.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Yes, exactly. And what's interesting is that there's been no investigation whatsoever about it, because a new government did not want to conduct an investigation as to who killed them. So, it was orchestrated. There's no doubt in my mind it was an orchestrated coup. No doubt about it.

That's the basic context for the decision of Putin to accept Crimea as a part of Russia. In the West, it is said that Russia simply annexed Crimea. It's not precisely what happened, because there was a local parliament, it was an autonomous part of Ukraine, and they had their own parliament, and they made the decision that they should have a referendum, which they had in March. And then they applied to become a member of the Russian Federation. It's not a surprise, even though the Ukrainian army did not go there, because there was a Ukrainian army. There were 21,000 Ukrainian soldiers. 14,000 of these soldiers joined the Russian army.

And so, that tells a little about how things were not like a normal annexation, where one country simply occupies part of the other country. Because you have this cleft country, you have this part, especially the southern part, which was very, very pro-Russian, and it's always been so. There's a lot of things in terms of international law you can say about it.

But I have no doubt that you can look upon it differently, because if you look it at from the point of people who lived in Crimea, they did not want—because almost 80-90% had voted

for the Party of the Regions, which was Yanukovych's party, a pro-Russian party, you could say, almost 87%, or something like that.

They have voted for this Party. This Party had a center in a central building in Kiev, which was attacked, burned, and three people were killed. So, you could imagine that they would not be very happy. They would not be very happy with the new government, and the new development. Of course not. They hated it. And what I think is very critical about the West is that they simply accepted, they accepted these horrible things in Ukraine, just to have the prize, just to have this prey, of getting Ukraine into NATO.

And Putin was aware that he could not live, not even physically, but certainly not politically, if Sevastopol, with the harbor for the Russian fleet, became a NATO harbor. It was impossible. I know people from the military say "No, no way." It's impossible. Would the Chinese take San Diego in the United States? Of course not. It goes without saying that such things don't happen.

So, what is lacking in the West is just a little bit of realism. How powers, how superpowers think, and about red lines of superpowers. Because we have an idea in the West about the new liberal world order. It sounds very nice when you're sitting in an office in Washington. It sounds very beautiful and easy, but to go out and make this liberal world order, it's not that simple. And you cannot do it like, certainly not do it like the way they did it in Ukraine.

Michelle Rasmussen: Regime change?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, regime change.

%%The Importance of Cultural Exchanges

Michelle Rasmussen: I have two other questions. The last questions. The Russian-Danish Dialogue organization that you

are a leader of, and the Schiller Institute in Denmark, together with the China Cultural Center in Copenhagen, were co-sponsors of three very successful Musical Dialogue of Cultures Concerts, with musicians from Russia, China, and many other countries. You are actually an associate professor in cultural differences. How do you see that? How would an increase in cultural exchange improve the situation?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, it cannot but improve, because we have very little, as I also told you. So, I'm actually also very, very happy with this cooperation, because I think it's very enjoyable, these musical events, they are very, very enjoyable and very interesting, also for many Danish people, because when you have the language of music, it is better than the language of weapons, if I can put it that way, of course. But I also think that when we meet each other, when we listen to each other's music, and share culture in terms of films, literature, paintings, whatever, I think it's also, well, it's a natural thing, first of all, and it's unnatural not to have it.

We do not have it, because maybe some people want it that way, if people want us to be in a kind of tense situation. They would not like to have it, because I think without this kind of, it's just a small thing, of course, but without these cultural exchanges, well, you will be very, very bad off. We will have a world which is much, much worse, I think, and we should learn to enjoy the cultural expressions of other people.

We should learn to accept them, also, we should learn to also cooperate and also find ways—. We are different. But, also, we have a lot of things in common, and the things we have in common are very important not to forget, that even with Russians, and even the Chinese, also all other peoples, we have a lot in common, that is very important to bear in mind that we should never forget. Basically, we have the basic values we have in common, even though if you are Hindu, a

Confucian, a Russian Orthodox, we have a lot of things in common.

And when you have such kind of encounters like in cultural affairs, in music, I think that you become aware of it, because suddenly it's much easier to understand people, if you listen to their music. Maybe you need to listen a few times, but it becomes very, very interesting. You become curious about instruments, ways of singing, and whatever it is. So, I hope the corona situation will allow us, also, to make some more concerts. I think it should be, because they're also very popular in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. As Schiller wrote, it's through beauty that we arrive at political freedom. We can also say it's through beauty that we can arrive at peace.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes.

## %%The Role of Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, its founder and international President, are leading an international campaign to prevent World War III, for peace through economic development, and a dialogue amongst cultures. How do you see the role of the Schiller Institute?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, I know it. We have been cooperating. I think your basic calls, appeals for global development, I think it's very, very interesting, and I share the basic point of view. I think maybe it's a little difficult. The devil is in the details, but basically, I think what you are thinking about, when I talk about the Silk Road, when I talk about these Chinese programs, Belt and Road programs, I see much more successful development that we have seen, say, in Africa and European countries developing, because I have seen how many western-dominated development programs have been distorting developments in Africa and other parts of the world. They distort development.

I'm not uncritical to China, but, of course, I can see very positive perspectives in the Belt and Road program. I can see really, really good perspectives, because just look at the railroads in China, for instance, at their fast trains. It's much bigger than anywhere else in the world. I think there are some perspectives, really, which I think attract, first and foremost, people in Asia.

But I think, eventually, also, people in Europe, because I also think that this model is becoming more and more—it's also beginning in the eastern part. Some countries of Eastern Europe are becoming interested. So, I think it's very interesting. Your points of your points of view. I think they're very relevant, also because I think we are in a dead-end alley in the West, what we are in right now, so people anyway are looking for new perspectives.

And what you come up with, I think, is very, very interesting, certainly. What it may be in the future is difficult to say because things are difficult.

But the basic things that you think about, and what I have heard about the Schiller Institute, also because I also think that you stress the importance of tolerance. You stress the importance of a multicultural society, that we should not change each other. We should cooperate on the basis of mutual interests, not changing each other. And as I have told you, this is what I see as one of the real, real big problems in the western mind, the western way of thinking, that we should decide what should happen in the world as if we still think we are colonial powers, like we have been for some one hundred years. But these times are over. There are new times ahead, and we should find new ways of thinking. We should find new perspectives.

And I think it goes for the West, that we can't go on living like this. We can't go on thinking like this, because it will either be war, or it'll be dead end alleys, and there'll be



conflicts everywhere.

You can look at things as a person from the West. I think it's sad to look at Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and those countries, Syria to some extent also, where the West has tried to make some kind of regime change or decide what happens. They're not successful. I think it's obvious for all. And we need some new way of thinking. And what the Schiller Institute has come up with is very, very interesting in this perspective, I think.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, when you speak about not changing other people, one of our biggest points is that we actually have to challenge ourselves to change ourselves. To really strive for developing our creative potential and to make a contribution that will have, potentially, international implications.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Definitely

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute is on full mobilization during the next couple of weeks to try to get the United States and NATO to negotiate seriously. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche has called on the U.S. and NATO to sign these treaties that Russia has proposed, and to pursue other avenues of preventing nuclear war. So, we hope that you, our viewers, will also do everything that you can, including circulating this video.

Is there anything else you would like to say to our viewers before we end, Jens Jørgen?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: No. I think we have talked a lot now. Only I think what you said about bringing the U.S. and Russia to the negotiation table, it's obvious. I think that it should be, for any prudent, clear-thinking person in the West, it should be obvious that this is the only right thing to do. So of course, we support it 100%.

Michelle Rasmussen: Okay. Thank you so much, Jens Jørgen

Nielsen

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I thank you.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 15.  
december 2021:**

**Kun samarbejde kan besejre  
pandemien og forhindre  
atomkrig**

**Se også 2. del: 3 min.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

2. del: 3 min.

lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/tg151221.mp3>

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19.**

**november 2021:**

# **Er Sputnik chok kommet? USA og Kina taler sammen, og EU anerkender kernekraft som grøn energi**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Emner:

Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference

Vil vesten samarbejde med Rusland og Kina om verdens problemer?

Giv vesten en fremtid, ikke blot en nulstilling og afskaffelsen af det moderne industrisamfund.

Biden-Xi Jinping online-topmøde

Diplomatiske initiativer vedrørende Hviderusland-Polen

COP 26: Modstand mod at afskaffe fossile brændstoffer.  
Udviklingslandene vil have økonomisk udvikling

Mere energi? Byg kernekraftværker og øg fusionskraftsforskning

Fhv. diplomat Friis Arne Petersen: Europa skal tilslutte sig  
Bælte- og Vejinitiativet og lære infrastrukturøkonomi fra Kina

COVID-19

Vores bedste råd til den danske og andre regeringer:

Lyt til Schiller Instituttet og Lyndon LaRouche – vi har  
løsningerne

---

# **Forhenværende dansk diplomat, Friis Arne Petersen, opfordrer Europa til at slutte sig til Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og lære om infrastrukturøkonomi fra Kina**

There is an English version below.

København, 10. november (EIRNS) – Den tidligere danske ambassadør Friis Arne Petersen holdt en yderst vigtig tale i går, hvor han opfordrede Europa til at slutte sig til Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet (BRI), og udfordrede Europa og USA til at lære fra Kina, hvordan man skaber økonomisk vækst ved hjælp af investeringer i storstilet, højteknologisk infrastruktur. Hans konklusion var, at vi bliver nødt til at forstå infrastrukturens rolle i at skabe økonomisk vækst. Hvis vi sørger for vandforsyning, energi og transport, så vil der være vækst, fordi mennesker er kreative.

Friis Arne Petersen var dansk ambassadør til USA, Kina og Tyskland (5 år i hvert land fra 2005 til 2020), såvel som tidligere direktør for det danske udenrigsministerium. Før dette var han direktør for udenrigsministeriets russiske og østeuropæiske afdeling. Han er også økonom.

Konferencen »Geoøkonomi eller Geopolitik«, som både fandt sted fysisk og blev live-streamet, blev afholdt på Dansk Institut

for Internationale Studier (DIIS), den førende udenrigspolitiske tænketank som er tilknyttet det danske udenrigsministerium. Den kan ses på engelsk ovenover eller her: <http://www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics>

En repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet uddelte konferenceindbydelser til alle deltagere og stillede to spørgsmål (ved 1 time 54 minutter). Se nedenfor.

Først forklarede Lars Erslev Andersen, en DIIS-forsker, Halford Mackinders idé om britisk geopolitik og det eurasiske kerneland (11:50 minutter inde). Han stillede spørgsmålet, hvad det betyder for Europa, at Kina investerer i det centralasiatiske kerneland – er det geopolitik eller geoøkonomi?

Her er højdepunkterne fra Friis Arne Petersens tale, som havde titlen »Er Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet geoøkonomi eller geopolitik?« (begynder 30 minutter inde).

Lær af Kina: Vi koncentrerer os ikke nok om, hvordan Kina skabte deres succesfulde økonomiske udvikling. Hvorfor er infrastruktur så vigtigt for Kina, både indenfor og udenfor landets grænser?

Finansiell udvikling: Kineserne var utilfredse med Den internationale Valutafond (IMF) og Verdensbanken, så de oprettede Den asiatiske infrastruktur- og Investeringsbank (AIIB). Til trods for opposition fra USA, efter at Storbritannien tilsluttede sig, og dernæst Frankrig og Tyskland, ringede Friis Arne Petersen til København og sagde, at vi bliver nødt til at varetage nationale interesser og tilslutte os.

Infrastruktur for en forenet nation: Udfordringen for Kina var ikke blot ulighed, men nationens samhørighed. Det vestlige Kina måtte udvikles. Det har også en global indvirkning. De opbyggede industrierne for at forsyne infrastrukturen med

goder. De forsøgte at udvikle de bedste, billigste teknologier og i deres målrettethed forårsagede de en overproduktion, hvilket BRI hjælper dem af med.

Manglen på strategiske visioner indenfor infrastruktur i USA og Europa: Han kritiserede USA's program med kvantitative lempelser, siden Obama og fremefter, for ikke at investere i de nyeste transportteknologier ligesom Kina, der byggede et højhastighedstognet på tusindvis af kilometer. Han henviste til Los Angeles' forældede havn og transportinfrastruktur som den medvirkende årsag til den nuværende forsyningskrise.

Europa: Friis Arne Petersen fortalte en historie om den tid, da SF's formand, transportminister Pia Olsen Dyhr, mødtes med den kinesiske transportminister, imens Friis Arne Petersen var ambassadør. Den kinesiske minister spurgte hende om den nyligt forhandlede (meget uambitiøse) danske togfond og bemærkede, »Tja, det er en begyndelse, men vi eksperimenterer allerede med tog, der kan køre 500 km/t«. De skaber forskningsbaseret innovation. Den danske ambassade i Kina begyndte gradvist at forstå transportøkonomi. Tyskland var et negativt eksempel ved at nægte at hjælpe Danmark med at bygge Femern Bælt-forbindelsen (mellem Danmark og Tyskland).

Tilbagevisningen af beskyldningen om gældsdiplomati: Friis Arne Petersen citerede en rapport fra forskere fra Johns Hopkins University og Harvard Business School, »Kinesiske banker er villige til at omstrukturere betingelserne for de eksisterende lån, og har faktisk aldrig beslaglagt et andet lands aktiver, mindst af alt havnen i Hambantota [i Sri Lanka]«. Han sagde også, at landene langs BRI har en større gæld til vestlige kreditorer, end til Kina. (Den tredje taler ved begivenheden, DIIS-forsker Yang Jiang, satte også spørgsmålstegn ved beskyldningen om gældsdiplomati.)

Den tredje tale, »Centralasien: Konkurrencen om Kernelandet«, givet af Yang Jiang, omhandlede forskellige asiatiske lande, samt Tyrkiets investeringer i Centralasien.

Spørgerunden: Efter at have identificeret sig selv, takkede en repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet, Michelle Rasmussen, Friis Arne Petersen for hans vigtige tale og sagde, at Schiller Instituttet har kørt en kampagne for at Danmark, Europa og USA tilslutter sig BRI, frem for at betragte det som en trussel. Hun henviste til sin uddeling af flyveblade og sagde, at videokonferencen denne uge vil besvare nogle af disse spørgsmål.

Hun stillede to relaterede spørgsmål. Det første var, hvordan vi kan få USA og Europa til at holde op med at betragte Kina, og særligt BRI, som en trussel, og i stedet se fordelene ved et økonomisk samarbejde. Vores motto er Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling, fordi fortsættelsen af at betragte Kina og Rusland som trusler, og forfølgelsen af en konfrontationspolitik, fører til faren for krig.

Det andet spørgsmål var, hvad han mente om at integrere Afghanistan med BRI – kineserne er beredte på at gøre dette. Ville det ikke være vigtigt for USA og Europa – særligt de lande der var engagerede i krigen – at håndtere denne skrækkelige økonomiske krise i Afghanistan gennem et samarbejde med Kina?

Friis Arne Petersen svarede, at der er for mange opdelinger, snak om rivalisering eller de mange usikkerheder, som findes i forbindelse med Asiens fremgang. På samme tid som der er en vækst i den vestlige handel med Asien, for eksempel USA's køb af mange kinesiske produkter nu efter pandemien, er vi fuldstændig besat af ideen om politisk konfrontation og systemiske udfordringer.

Jeg betragter verdensordenen gennem økonomi. Fremskridtet i retningen af FN's udviklingsmål, takket være Asiens

økonomiske præstation, giver mig en optimisme mht., at disse alarmister og folk, som ønsker at politisere og se farer og militære modstandere overalt, vil tabe. Vi bliver nødt til at betragte vores nationers samlede interesser.

På den ene side har Kina, med sine 14 nabolande, en større strategisk udfordring end USA, men Kina ser altid disse nabolande som muligheder, ligesom det som BRI for eksempel kunne opnå i Afghanistan. USA og Vesten har en meget klar interesse i at Afghanistans naboer, som for eksempel Kina, Pakistan og Indien, forsøger at tage vare på deres region, fordi de muligvis kan gøre dette bedre, end vi gjorde det i løbet af de sidste 20 år.

---

English:

COPENHAGEN, Nov. 10 (EIRNS) – Former Danish ambassador Friis Arne Petersen gave an extremely important speech yesterday calling for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative, and challenging Europe and the U.S. to learn from China how to generate economic development through large scale, high-technology infrastructure investment. His conclusion was we have to understand the role of infrastructure in growth economics. If we ensure water, power and transportation, there will be growth, because humans are creative.

Friis Arne Petersen was the Danish ambassador to the U.S., China and Germany (5 years in each country from 2005-2020), as well as the former director of the Danish Foreign Ministry, and, before that, director for the Foreign Ministry's Russia/Eastern Europe division. He is also an economist.

The event, "Goeconomics or geopolitics," both on-site and streamed, was held at the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), the leading foreign policy think tank, affiliated with the Danish Foreign Ministry. See it, in English,



here. ([www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics](http://www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics))

A Schiller Institute representative distributed conference invitations to all attendees, and asked two questions (at 1 hour 54 minutes), see below.

First, Lars Erslev Andersen, a DIIS researcher, explained Halford Macindera's idea of British geopolitics and the Eurasian heartland (at 11:50 minutes). He posed the question, what does it mean for Europe, that China is investing in the Central Asian heartland, is it geopolitics or geoeconomics?

Here are highlights from Friis Arne Petersen's speech, entitled, "Is the Belt and Road Initiative geoeconomics or geopolitics?," (at 30 minutes).

Learn from China: We are not concentrating enough on how China created their successful economic development. Why is infrastructure so important for China, both inside and outside the country?

Financing development: The Chinese were dissatisfied with the IMF and World Bank, so they created the AIIB. Despite opposition from the U.S., after the UK joined, then France and Germany, Friis Arne Petersen called Copenhagen and said that we have to take care of our national interest and join.

Infrastructure for a unified nation: The challenge for China was not just inequality, but the cohesion of the nation. Western China had to be developed. It also has global impact. They simultaneously built up the industries to provide the products for the infrastructure, trying to develop the best, cheapest technologies, and in their zeal, causing overproduction, which the BRI helps alleviate.

Lack of strategic infrastructure vision in the U.S. and Europe: The U.S.: He attacked the U.S. stimulus programs from Obama onwards, for not investing in the newest transportation technologies, like China, which built thousands of miles of

high-speed rail. He referenced the Los Angeles port's antiquated harbor and transportation infrastructure as the contributing cause for the current bottleneck.

Europe: Friis Arne Petersen told an anecdote about the time SF's chairman Pia Olsen Dyhr met with the Chinese transportation minister while Friis Arne Petersen was ambassador. The Chinese minister asked her about the newly negotiated (very unambitious) Danish train plan, and he replied, "Well, that's a beginning, but we are experimenting with trains that can run 5-600 miles per hour." The Danish Embassy in China gradually started to understand transportation economics. Germany was a negative example for refusing to help Denmark build the Fehmarnbelt tunnel (between Denmark and Germany).

Debunking the debt diplomacy accusation: Friis Arne Petersen cited a report from researchers from Johns Hopkins University and Harvard Business School, "Chinese banks are willing to restructure the terms of existing loans and have never actually seized an asset from any country, much less the port of Hambantota [Sri Lanka]." He also said that BRI countries owe much more to Western lenders, than China. (The third speaker at the event, DIIS researcher Yang Jiang, also challenged the debt diplomacy accusation.)

The third speech was "Central Asia: competing for the Heartland," about investment in Central Asia by different Asian countries and Turkey by Yang Jiang.

Q&A: After identification, Schiller Institute organizer Michelle Rasmussen thanked Friis Arne Petersen for his important speech, and said that the Schiller Institute has been campaigning for Denmark, Europe, and the U.S. to join the BRI, instead of looking at it as a threat. She referenced her leaflet distribution, and said that our video conference this weekend will answer some of these questions.

She posed two related questions. One is, how can we get the U.S. and Europe to stop looking at China, and specifically the BRI, as a threat, and to see the advantages of economic cooperation? Our slogan is peace through development, because if we continue to regard China and Russia as threats, and pursue a confrontation policy, we are threatened with war.

The other question is what you think about integrating Afghanistan into the BRI – the Chinese are ready to do that. Wouldn't it be important for the U.S. and Europe, especially the countries in the war, to deal with this terrible economic crisis in Afghanistan, through cooperating with China?

Friis Arne Petersen said that there are too many division lines, talk of rivalry, or the many uncertainties that lie in the advance of Asia. At the same time that there is an increase of western trade with Asia, for example, the U.S. buying so many Chinese products now after the pandemic, we are totally obsessive about political confrontation, and systemic challenges.

I approach the world order through economy. The progress towards the UN development goals due to the economic performance of Asia makes me optimistic that these alarmists, and people who want to politicize and see danger and military adversaries everywhere, will lose. We have to look at the total interests of our nations.

On the one hand, China, with its 14 neighboring countries, is more strategically challenged than the U.S., but China always sees the neighboring countries as opportunities, like what the BRI will do in Afghanistan. The U.S. and the West have a very clear interest in having Afghanistan's neighbors, like China, Pakistan and India, try to manage their region, because they, possibly, can do that better than we did during the last 20 years.

---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING SEPTEMBER- OKTOBER 2021:**

## **Rapport fra seminaret i København:**

### **Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling**

Indholdsfortegnelse:

Overbliksrapport s. 1

Tom Gillesberg: Krigsførende til fredsskabende s. 3

Hussein Askary: Gør en ende på kynismen: Imperiets grusomme  
»store spil« er dødt s. 4

Professor Pino Arlacchi: En succesfuld strategi til at udrydde  
opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan s. 9

H.E. Ambassadør Ahmad Farooq fra Pakistan: Et perspektiv på at  
flytte Afghanistan fremad s. 15

Udtalelse fra Kinas og Irans ambassader i Danmark s. 17-18

Opråb om menneskesyn og klimaspørgsmålet s. 18

Invitation til Schiller Institutets internationale videokonference den 13.-14. november: bagsiden

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Afskrift, Video, lyd, rapport: Afghanistan seminar: Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. den 11. oktober 2021 i København**

(Denne opdateret video inkluderer udtalelser fra de kinesiske og iranske ambassader i Danmark og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som begynder 1 time 50 min. ind i videoen.)

(This updated video includes statements from the Chinese and Iranian embassies in Denmark and Helga Zepp-LaRouche at 1 hour 50 min.)

Lydfil af præsentationerne på engelsk (videoen inkluderer diskussionen):

Audio of the presentations in English (The video includes the discussion):

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/211011presentations-cut-mp32.mp3>

Afskriftet på engelsk findes nedenunder.

The transcript in English is below.



For English, find the flag below.

Afghanistan: Hvad nu?

Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Et seminar/webcast afholdt af Schiller Instituttet i Danmark  
af Michelle Rasmussen

Afghanistan: Hvad nu?

Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Et seminar/webcast afholdt af Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Introduktion af Michelle Rasmussen

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark afholdt et succesfuldt, kombineret seminar og webinar under overskriften: "Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling", som fandt sted den 11. oktober 2021 i København. Videoen af begivenheden kan ses her: <https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=31793>

Nu, hvor krigen i Afghanistan er forbi, og mange i Vesten er rystede over hændelserne, er vi konfronteret med en enestående mulighed for at forandre en politik baseret på regimeskifte og militære interventioner til en politik for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Dette er tilfældet for Afghanistan og også resten af verden. Alle på denne klode kan nu se den massive fiasko af Vestens krige for regimeskifte siden 2001. De har kostet millioner

af liv og billioner af dollars.

Dette paradigmeskifte kunne ikke være mere presserende i lyset af den humanitære krise i Afghanistan. En omfattende nødhjælpsindsats er absolut nødvendig, som kræver at den afghanske regerings finansielle midler, nu indefrosset i USA og i andre lande, bliver frigivet, og at det internationale samfund af regeringer og hjælpeorganisationer reagerer.

Men det kræver også en langsigtet indsats i opbygningen af Afghanistans interne infrastruktur og at forbinde landet med Den nye Silkevej (Bælte- og Vejinitiativet), såvel som forbedringen af landets uddannelses- og sundhedssystem. Det er ligeså en gylden mulighed for at opgive geopolitik og at etablere et samarbejde til gensidig fordel mellem USA og Europa på den ene side, og Kina, Rusland og andre nationer på den anden.

Derfor tog Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, med kort varsel, initiativet til at organisere dette seminar/webinar med særlige gæster samlet i København. Diplomater fra Sydvestasien, Nordafrika og Asien, samt medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet deltog i seminaret, der var Schiller Instituttets første fysiske møde siden starten af COVID-19. Yderligere var der deltagere fra Asien, Sydvestasien, Afrika og Europa via en live stream.

[Indbydelsen](#) indeholdt en indsigt i de afgørende spørgsmål på spil nu fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifteren og præsident af det internationale Schiller Institut.

Alle talerne har været aktivt involverede i spørgsmålet om Afghanistan. De var:

**Hussein Askary**, Schiller Instituttets Koordinator for Sydvestasien og bestyrelsesmedlem af [Belt and Road Institute in Sweden](#), forfatter af [Geøkonomiens dagry – Udvidelsen af Bælte og Vej til Afghanistan](#), medforfatter af [Udvidelsen af Den nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: En vision for en økonomisk Renæssance](#), og arabisk oversætter af [Den nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen](#). Hussein Askary, oprindeligt fra Irak, har for nyligt deltaget i mange webcasts

og er blevet interviewet på fjernsynet i forskellige lande.

Hussein Askary beskrev den humanitære nødsituation, som det afghanske folk er konfronteret med, og potentialet for at Schiller Instituttets og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches program for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling kunne blive en realitet for Afghanistan og for verden efter sammenbruddet af det gamle system med vedvarende krige. En vigtig pointe, som han understregede, var, at hvis de vestlige regeringer fortsætter med at indefryse Afghanistans finansielle midler og tilbageholde deres hjælp til genopbygningen af Afghanistan, blot for at bevise at Taliban var ude af stand til at lede nationen, ville det føre til katastrofale resultater. Afghanistan har været et isoleret hul i kortet i midten af den spændende økonomiske udvikling, som Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ har skabt, og nu er det på tide at bringe den udviklingsdynamik til Afghanistan. Han opfordrede Europa og USA til at samarbejde for at opnå det mål.

**Prof. Pino Arlacchi**, administrerende direktør for FN's Agentur for narkotikabekæmpelse og kriminalitetsforebyggelse (1997-2002), tidligere EU-rapportør for Afghanistan og i øjeblikket sociologiprofessor ved Skolen for politikvidenskab på Sassari Universitet i Italien ([Prof. Arlacchis hjemmeside](#)). Prof. Arlacchi deltog i to af Schiller Instituttets tidligere webcasts om Afghanistan.

Seminaret havde muligheden for at høre den person, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har foreslået bliver udpeget til repræsentant for de vestlige lande i Afghanistan. Prof. Arlacchi gav deltagerne en personlig, insider-beretning om, hvordan han succesfuldt forhandlede med Taliban, hvilket resulterede i tilintetgørelsen af opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan før 2001; hvordan USA og Storbritannien besluttede at gøre en ende på den politik efter krigens påbegyndelse; hvad der nu skal gøres for at tilintetgøre opiumproduktionen; og hvad de vestlige landes rolle overfor Afghanistan burde være nu. Prof. Arlacchi understregede, at Vestens rolle burde begynde med at anerkende den nye regering, og acceptere at de har kontrollen over landet. Hvis de behandles med respekt, som vinderne i konflikten, kan alle vigtige



spørgsmål blive forhandlet, begyndende med spørgsmålet om kvinders rettigheder.

**H. E. Ahmad Farooq**, ambassadør for Pakistan til Kongeriget Danmark siden april 2020. 2013-2016: Rådgiver/stedfortrædende permanent repræsentant for Pakistan ved Den permanente mission for Pakistan til FN-agenturer i Rom. 2010-2013: Rådgiver for Pakistans permanente mission til De forenede Nationer i New York. Medlem af Pakistans Sikkerhedsråd i løbet af Pakistans medlemskab for FN's sikkerhedsråd fra 2012 til 2013. 2018-2020: Generaldirektør indenfor terrorbekæmpelse ved FN og andre multilaterale fora. 2016-2018 og 2008-2010: en FN-direktør indenfor FN's generalforsamling, FN's sikkerhedsråd, terrorbekæmpelse, FN's fredsmissioner og andre politiske og freds- og sikkerhedsspørgsmål.

H. E. ambassadør Farooq talte om det komplekse forhold mellem Pakistan og Afghanistan og beskrev i detaljer, hvordan de sidste 40 års uro i Afghanistan har påvirket Pakistan. I lang tid var det klart, at den amerikansk ledede militære tilgang ville slå fejl. Han sagde, at vi har brug for en geoøkonomisk strategi, og, som Pakistans statsminister, Imran Khan, opfordrede til dette, at udvikle Afghanistan og forbinde det med de omkringliggende lande. H. E. ambassadør Farooq konkluderede med idéer fra Pakistans nationale digter, Muhammad Iqbal, som kaldte Afghanistan for "Asiens hjerte". Iqbal udtalte, at hvis der er fred i Afghanistan, er der fred i Asien, og hvis der er uro i Afghanistan, er der uro i Asien.

Ordstyrer var **Tom Gillesberg**, formand for **Schiller Instituttet i Danmark** og chefen for Executive Intelligence Review i København. Tom Gillesberg afholder et webcast hver anden uge for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og er en tidligere parlaments- og byråds kandidat.

Tom Gillesberg kommenterede på den danske deltagelse i krigene for regimeskifte og opfordrede til, at Danmark og andre regeringer i koalitionen burde skifte fra krigsstiftelse til fredsbevaring.

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche** sendte en meddelelse til seminaret, hvor hun bebudede, at Schiller Instituttet ville have en aktionsdag

torsdag den 14. oktober for at stoppe indefrysningen af afghanske finansielle midler og opfordrede andre til at deltage.

Den **kinesiske ambassade i Danmark** sendte en udtalelse til seminaret. Den **afghanske ambassade i Oslo** i Norge indsendte også en udtalelse, og talerne tog nogle af de nævnte spørgsmål op. En diplomat fra **Irans ambassade i Danmark** præsenterede en udtalelse til seminaret om deres anstrengelser for at optage de afghanske flygtninge, hvilket er besværliggjort under de uretfærdige amerikanske sanktioner. Dermed havde seminaret deltagelse af diplomater fra Afghanistan og Afghanistans umiddelbare østlige nabo, Pakistan, den vestlige nabo, Iran, og den nordvestlige nabo Kina.

De to ugers intensive organiseringsproces inkluderede personlige besøg hos 38 ambassader, hvilket resulterede i flere spontane møder, samt henvendelsen til yderligere ambassader og danske politiske og forsvarsrelaterede institutioner. Derudover uddelte Schiller Instituttet i Danmark sin særlige nyhedsorientering om Afghanistan og indbydelsen til seminaret ved en begivenhed, som blev ledt af den danske udviklingsminister, Flemming Møller Mortensen, afholdt i Dansk institut for internationale Studier. Begivenheden var organiseret for at rådgive ministeren om det, som han beskrev som dilemmaet, der involverer Afghanistans akutte humanitære krise, nu efter at Taliban har overtaget magten.

Talerne fra seminaret, og dele fra diskussionen kommer også i Executive Intelligence Review. Vi håber at videoen og afskrifterne vil give dig en bedre indsigt i hvad vi må gøre nu, for at lette nøden for den afghanske befolkning og påbegynde en ny kurs for verdens politiske, strategiske og økonomiske fremtid.

## **Afskrifter:**

Tom Gillesbergs introduktion til Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan-seminar den 11. oktober 2021:

Følgende afskrifter blev udgivet i Executive Intelligence Review den 22. oktober 2021. Vi er igang med at oversætte

talerne og udtalelserne til dansk:

Hussein Askarys tale ved Afghanistan seminaret i København:  
Gør en ende på kynismen: Imperiets grusomme "store spil" er dødt

## **Pino Arlaachi: En succesfuld strategi til at udrydde opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan**

## **Udtalelse fra Den kinesiske Ambassade til Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan seminar den 11. oktober 2021**



Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

### **Invitationen:**

Nu, hvor krigen i Afghanistan er forbi, og mange i vesten er rystet over begivenhederne, er der en mulighed for at udskifte den politik, der har været baseret på regimeskifte og militære interventioner, til en politik for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Det gælder for Afghanistan og også for resten af verden.

Og det haster, fordi der er en akut humanitær krise i Afghanistan. Der kræves både en stor nødhjælpsindsats, men også en langsigtet indsats for at opbygge Afghanistans infrastruktur i forbindelse med Den nye Silkevej (Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet), og landets uddannelsessystem og sundhedsvæsen.

Det bør være anledning til at forlade geopolitik og etablere et samarbejde mellem USA/Europe og Kina, Rusland og andre nationer.

Læs mere nedenunder.

Vi håber, at du kan deltage i seminaret.

---



Invitation in English:

**The Schiller Institute cordially invites you to attend our seminar:**

**Afghanistan: What Now?**

**Peace through economic development**

**Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 Time: 13:00 – 16:00**

**Place: In the center of Copenhagen**

**Free admission. Registration necessary (Lunch will not be served.)**

**A Corona pass is required for the protection of all participants.**

**For more information and to register, contact:**

Michelle Rasmussen: 53 57 00 51 or

Feride Gillesberg: 25 12 50 33 or

si@schillerinstitut.dk

**Speakers:**



**Hussein Askary:** the Schiller Institute's Southwest Asia Coordinator, board member of the Belt and Road Institute in Sweden, author of Dawn of Geo-Economics – Extending the Belt and Road to Afghanistan, and co-author of Extending the New Silk Road to West Asia and Africa: A Vision of an Economic Renaissance, Arabic translator of The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge, originally from Iraq



**Prof. Pino Arlacchi:** Executive Director of the UN Office for

Drug Control and Crime Prevention (1997-2002) (who negotiated an almost total elimination of opium production with the Taliban before 2001), and former EU Rapporteur on Afghanistan. Currently professor of Sociology at the School of Political Science of the University of Sassari in Italy. Prof. Pino Arlacchi's homepage.

✖ **H.E. Ahmad Farooq, Ambassador of Pakistan to Kingdom of Denmark:** Ambassador in Denmark since April 2020. 2013-2016: Counsellor/Alternate Permanent Representative of Pakistan at the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the Rome-based UN Agencies, Rome. 2010-2013: Counsellor Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations, New York. Member of Pakistan's Security Council team during Pakistan's membership of the UN Security Council from 2012 to 2013. 2018-2020: Director General (Counter Terrorism) dealing with counter terrorism at the United Nations and other multilateral forums. 2016-2018 and 2008-2010: Director United Nations, dealing with UN General Assembly, UN Security Council, Counter Terrorism, UN Peacekeeping and other political and peace and security issues.

**Moderator: Tom Gillesberg:** Chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, Bureau Chief for Executive Intelligence Review in Copenhagen.

### **Background:**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and international chairman of the Schiller Institute stated in a webcast on August 21, just a few days after the Taliban took control of Kabul, "Exactly three weeks ago, we had a seminar here on this [Schiller Institute] channel on the situation in Afghanistan. I compared it in terms of importance to the fall of the [Berlin] Wall in 1989, which was the beginning of the end of the Soviet Union. I said it may not be quite as big as the collapse of the entire Soviet Union, but what is happening in Afghanistan is of the same nature, because it is the end of a system."

The new system has to be defined by a peace through development strategy for Afghanistan and the entire region. On August 17 Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, "It's very good that the war has ended, and I think it is, on the contrary, the real chance to integrate Afghanistan into a regional economic development perspective, which is basically defined by the Belt and Road Initiative of China. There is a very clear agreement of Russia and China to cooperate in dealing with this situation. The interest of the Central Asian republics to make sure there is stability and economic development, there is the possibility to extend the CPEC, the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor, into Afghanistan, into Central Asia, so I think it's a real opportunity. But it does require a complete change in the approach...

"If the European nations and the United States would understand that this is a unique chance, if they cooperate, rather than fight Russia and China, and their influence in the region, and they join hands in the economic development there – there needs to be a perspective for the reconstruction of Afghanistan in a serious way, as it was not done in the last 20 years, for sure – then this can become a very positive turning point, not only for Afghanistan, but also for the whole world."

Peace through economic development is a policy which the Schiller Institute has been campaigning for since its founding in 1984, and which the late Lyndon LaRouche's political movement has been advocating since the 1970's, by designing economic development programs for most of the world. Our efforts intensified after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, proposing a policy called the Eurasian Land-Bridge, or the New Silk Road, later extended to become the World Land-Bridge concept. There is a reflection of some of the key elements of this policy in the Belt and Road Initiative announced by Xi Jinping in 2013.

Now, after 20 years of war, Afghanistan is facing an appalling

humanitarian catastrophe. Helga Zepp-La-Rouche wrote in "Can "the West" Learn?: What Afghanistan Needs Now" on September 5: "World Food Program Director David Beasley, who visited Afghanistan last week in August, announced that 18 million Afghans are starving—more than half the population—and 4 million are at risk of starvation next winter without massive help. The WHO fears a medical disaster in view of the scarcely existing health system in the midst of the COVID pandemic, and only around 1 million people are vaccinated so far...."

The necessary economic development emphatically includes building a modern health system, as well as educational expansion, extending the Belt and Road Initiative's infrastructure connectivity projects, industrial development projects, and agricultural programs designed to eliminate opium production."

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche has proposed that Italian Prof. Pino Arlacchi, Executive Director of the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (1997-2002), and former EU Rapporteur on Afghanistan, be appointed as coordinator for the western countries' economic development efforts in Afghanistan. He had negotiated an almost total elimination of opium production with the Taliban before 2001, which then was reversed under the ensuing years during the U.S. and NATO military operations. Arlacchi again proposed a plan in 2010, which was thwarted by the EU, Britain, and the United States.

Zepp-LaRouche: "Afghanistan is the one place where the United States and China can begin a form of cooperation that can be a baby step toward strategic cooperation putting humanity's common goals in the foreground. Ultimately, its realization indicates the only way that the end of mankind in a nuclear Armageddon can be prevented."

Afghanistan is the test case of whether the West is able to learn from its mistakes, and join with the rest of the world for a peace through economic development policy – the path to

a new paradigm for all humanity.

We sincerely hope that you will be able to join us for this crucial discussion.

**For more information and to register, contact:**

Michelle Rasmussen: 53 57 00 51 or

Feride Gillesberg: 25 12 50 33 or

si@schillerinstitut.dk

**Resources:**

**Homepages:**

Danish: [www.schillerinstitut.dk](http://www.schillerinstitut.dk)

English: [www.schillerinstitute.org](http://www.schillerinstitute.org)

**Articles:**

Nyhedsorientering August 2021: Link: Afghanistan: Hvad nu?: Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Hussein Askary: Dawn of Geo-Economics – Extending the Belt and Road to Afghanistan, August 18, 2021.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: “Can “the West” Learn?: What Afghanistan Needs Now.”, September 5, 2021

**Schiller Institute videos:**

Afghanistan: A Turning Point in History After the Failed Regime-Change Era, July 31, 2021 (two weeks before the Taliban takeover of Kabul.) Link: Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan-konference:

Spred ideen om et fælles udviklingsprogram med det samme

Afghanistan: Opportunity for a new epoch, Interview with Helga Zepp-LaRouche on August 17, 2021, two days after the Taliban took control of Kabul by Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Link: Afghanistan: Potentiale for en ny epoke:

Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 17. august 2021 af Michelle Rasmussen



Tom Gillesberg: POLITISK ORIENTERING EKSTRA den 16. august 2021:

Vil Kabuls fald skabe en ny vestlig politik?

Now, More Urgent Than Ever: Afghanistan—Opportunity for a New Epoch for Mankind, August 21, 2021 Link: Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan opfølgingskonference 21. august 2021:

Tom Gillesberg: POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6. september 2021:  
Efter Afghanistan: Kollaps af Vestens vrangforestillinger  
kan være begyndelsen på en bedre verden

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6. september 2021: Efter Afghanistan: Kollaps af Vestens vrangforestillinger kan være begyndelsen på en bedre verden**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **Schiller Instituttets Venner**

# på TV2 Lorry i serien “RUC undersøger” – De små partier

Se programet her på TV2 Lorrys hjemmeside. (17 min.)

TV2 Lorry: »Hvilke emner har de små partier fokus på, og hvad er det, der driver folkene bag«. Dokumentaren produceret af Rasmus Ahlefeldt Simonsen og Sebastian Hartmann, journaliststuderende fra Roskilde Universitets kandidatuddannelse, blev vist på TV2 Lorry den 1.-4. september 2021. Det 17 minutter lange program satte lys på Schiller Instituttets Venner og Tværpolitisk Forening i Dragør. Spidskandidat Tom Gillesberg blev interviewet, og han fremviste mange af sine berømte valgplakater. »Jeg lever og ånder for visioner, for store idéer, for noget der har betydning – at sætte en dagsorden, som har afgørende betydning for fremtiden«.

Følgende er vores rapport til vores Schiller Institut kollegaer rundt om i verden:

## **Documentary about the Friends of the Schiller Institute's coming election campaign in Denmark shown on a major TV station**

A very good 17-minute documentary about the Friends of the Schiller Institute (SIVE) and one other small party was, and will be, broadcast a total of four times on the local Copenhagen area affiliate of TV2, one of the two national TV programs.

Here is the link: <https://www.tv2lorry.dk/ruc-undersoeger/ruc-undersoeger-de-ukendte-partier-14>

The program is called “The Small Parties,” and was made by two journalist students from Roskilde University's master's degree

program. They chose SIVE out of many small parties and lists which will run in the November municipal elections.

There are several sections of the interview they conducted with Copenhagen mayoral candidate Tom Gillesberg, as well as candidates Feride Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Another highlight is that many of our famous election posters are shown, with and without Tom's explanation. There are also pictures of interesting political and cultural artifacts in our office, including a LaRouche presidential election poster.

A university associate professor is interviewed who describes SIVE as a "serious party," and concludes that while some people think that voting for a small party is a waste of their vote, it can actually be an important way to support issues that voters think are important, which can influence the larger parties.

The election posters shown included: When the bubble bursts – a New Bretton Woods; Economic collapse; Glass-Steagall or chaos; Before a new financial crash – Bank separation; Win-Win with BRICS– not collapse and war; Before the next financial crash – Copenhagen should join the Silk Road; Helium-3 from the Moon for unlimited fusion energy on Earth and Free music education – Create a new renaissance – Classical music for all children.

Here are some excerpts:

Narrator: Some parties have a great vision.

Tom Gillesberg: For us, it is about what kind of future we all will live in.

Narrator: Very big.

Gillesberg: We also want to go out into the universe...

Narrator: SIVE has issues like bank separation, and to get Helium-3 fuel from the Moon.

Narrator: Big political thoughts are thought up in their office... They have run for office since 2005...

Narrator: The amount of votes is not everything for Tom Gillesberg.

Gillesberg: The only reason I wanted to have anything to do with politics was not to get a position or popularity, but because it is about how can we make the world better. ..The level [of the big political parties] is too low. I live and breath for a vision, for great ideas, about things of great importance – to set an agenda, which has crucial meaning for the future. I have not met any party in Denmark, which is close to doing that. Yes, if there were, I would join.

Michelle Rasmussen says that Tom Gillesberg is an excellent candidate because he follows world developments and our campaign initiatives. Feride Gillesberg says that she hopes that Tom were elected, because it is in Denmark's interest. She would like to see him becoming the prime minister's advisor because Denmark has a patriot, a thinker who is engaged in Denmark's future. Use him as inspiration...

Narrator: SIVE is very serious about their campaign, a seriousness that many of the other [small] parties lack. [This led to the section with the university assistant professor.]

Narrator: Just because they don't get a lot of votes, it does not effect their large political engagement, and to try to have influence on something that is important for them.

---

# **Afghanistan                      kommentar: Korthuset falder af Jens Jørgen Nielsen, Rusland ekspert, forfatter, lektor**

20. august 2021 – (Facebook post) 20 års militær indsats i Afghanistan, trillioner af Dollars, 43 danske soldaters liv og mange tusinder dræbte, flygtningestrømme m.m. Det er bare lidt af det, som egentlig skulle være kronen på værket, nemlig en bæredygtig afghansk stat med en moderne hær. På uger har det vist sig at være en illusion. Det hele væltede, som var det et korthus. Situationen minder påfaldende om situationen i Vietnam i 1975.

Diskussionen i medierne har handlet om, hvordan man får reddet mennesker ud af Kabul og om, hvorvidt Taliban er blevet mere moderat og moderne. Fint og relevant. Men vi skal vel have en debat om de store linjer, om hvordan vi i Vesten overhovedet agerer uden for vores kulturkreds. Vi mangler i den grad svar på de store spørgsmål. Hvorfor faldt den afghanske hær totalt fra hinanden, den bestod af ca. 300.000 soldater med alt moderne militært udstyr? Hvorfor har de afghanske soldater eller befolkningen ikke lyst til at kæmpe for den afghanske stat? Og hvorfor flygtede præsidenten, Ashraf Ghani? Og hvorfor støtter en stor del af befolkningen tilsyneladende Taliban?

Jeg har ikke de endegyldige svar. Men vi kan da se lidt langsigtet på tingene. Situationen kan da minde situationen for 30 år siden, da de sovjetiske styrker forlod Afghanistan i 1989. Jeg mødte tilfældigvis nogle sovjetiske soldater i Tadsjikistan, de var på vej hjem fra Afghanistan. De havde

ingen illusioner. Men dengang holdt Kabul regeringen i det mindste stand mod islamisterne i over 2 år, før Mohammad Najibullah blev fjernet i 1992 og senere hængt. Men efter at de vestlige styrker begyndte at trække sig tilbage, har vi reelt ikke set nogen modstand fra den afghanske hær side. Skyldes det, at de ikke ser nogen grund til at kæmpe for en regering der fleste anser for at være korrupt? Hvis ja, hvorfor har vi så støttet disse regeringer. Præsident Ashraf Ghani flygtede – rygter siger med mange penge. Rygter siger også, at de løbende regeringer har været voldsomt korrupte. I medierne har vi hørt mere om korruption i Rusland end i Afghanistan. En forklaring kunne også være, at mange afghanere modtog penge for at være soldater, men reelt ikke deltog. Eller at soldaterne ikke fik penge eller meget få. Hvorfor har efterretningsvæsenerne og forskellige institutter og tænketanke ikke kunne levere konkret viden om det?

Hvorfor har Taliban tilsyneladende ret stor opbakning i landet? Ikke i Kabul naturligvis, hvor der bor mange moderne og pro-vestlige afghanere. Men omkring 80 % af de 38 millioner indbyggere i landet er fattige bønder, som ser anderledes på det. Da Sovjetunionen invaderede Afghanistan i 1979, begyndte USA straks at støtte mujahedin bevægelsen, den kom fra hele Mellemøsten, ikke mindst fra Saudi Arabien og andre arabiske lande plus Pakistan o.a. De fik mange våben fra USA, og en af lederne var Osama bin Laden. Mujahedin'erne begyndte senere at kæmpe indbyrdes. Taliban var en ren afghansk, især pashtun bevægelse, som begyndte at skabe en vis form for orden i landet. Meget tyder på, at bønderne satte pris på, at udenlandske styrker blev jaget ud. Nej, jeg mener ikke, at Taliban var søde, men vi skal vide hvorfor en del afghanere støtter dem. Taliban sad ved magten indtil terrorangrebet i 2001 med islamistiske regler for kvinder om tildækning m.m. Men det var mange af bønderne formentlig ligeglade med. Så kom NATO landene med den hidtil største militæroperation. Opgaven var til at begynde med at finde Osama bin Laden, som angiveligt skulle befinde sig i Afghanistan. Taliban

accepterede Osama bin Laden, men havde ikke noget med terrorangrebet at gøre. NATO-landene skulle fange og uskadeliggøre Osama bin Laden.

Men hvad skulle vores opgave ellers bestå i – i Afghanistan? I 2011 fandt amerikanerne Osama bin Laden, og dræbte ham. Vel at mærke i Pakistan. Hvad skulle vi så? Skulle vi indføre demokrati, sikre kvinders rettigheder, skulle vi yde humanitær bistand? Eller ville amerikanerne sikre, at der ikke kom en pro-russisk eller en pro-kinesisk leder til magten i Afghanistan? Eller var Danmark i Afghanistan, fordi vi ville vise solidaritet med USA, og fordi det var vigtigt for os, at være afholdt i Washington? Hvis vi skulle opbygge et normalt demokratisk samfund, hvor var så projekterne, vejene, infrastrukturen, hospitalerne? Og hvor var analytikerne, efterretningsvæsenerne, som kunne give en nøgtern ikke-ideologisk vurdering af situationen i stedet for komiske Ali beretninger? Og hvorfor har det amerikanske efterretningsvæsen i øvrigt ikke delt sin viden om Talibans hurtige fremmarch med sine allierede?

Rækken af spørgsmål er lang. Jeg er ikke sikker på, at vi får svar på dem alle. Men det er blevet tid for refleksion over dels, hvorfor det gik galt og dels, hvordan vi skal ændre vores adfærd fremadrettet. For det første kunne man godt få den tanke, at det ville være en god idé for Danmark og andre NATO allierede at foretage egne vurderinger og ikke blindt tro på alt, hvad USA kommer med. Danmark og andre NATO-lande kommer til at fremstå som underdanige vasalstater.

For det andet kunne det være, at en gang for alle skulle lægge 1990'ernes fremherskende ideologi på hylden. Efter Sovjetunionens fald blev det en udbredt opfattelse i vestlige politiske kredse, at den vestlige liberale ideologi og tolkning var den eneste rigtige og universelle tilgang. Alle verdens lande skulle følge den angelsaksiske model og blive demokrater på samme måde. I og med, at Sovjetunionen var væk som ideologisk og militær stormagt var vejen banet for en

verden i USA's billede. Grundlæggende var det en arrogant opfattelse, som ignorerer forskelle i kultur og historie. Hvad værre er, når man gennemfører dette projekt at eksportere demokrati med militær, går det som regel fundamentalt galt, ja disse aktioner fremmer i virkeligheden det de vil forhindre. Det er vanskeligt at komme til andre konklusioner efter Talibans lyn-sejr. Den vestlige ideologi gør os blind for virkeligheden i et land som Afghanistan. Mange af dem, NATO-alliancen støttede i Afghanistan, var i virkeligheden dybt korrupte narkosmuglere, som udnyttede bønderne. Ja selv den amerikanske hær har formentlig været en del af narko-business. Det flød med penge til latterlige formål, og mange vestlige firmaer og også militærfolk har haft snablen nede i disse kasser. Hvordan kan det være anderledes, når der vælter penge ind over et fattigt land? Enkeltstående isolerede pigeskoler som prestigeprojekter gør ikke nogen forskel, hvis samfundet ellers er korrupt, og der mangler strukturer, som kan støtte op om det.

Jeg har venner, som har været udstationeret, ligesom jeg har undervist soldater, der skulle udstationeret i Afghanistan. Jeg er imponeret over deres beredvillighed til at kæmpe for det gode, selv med livet som indsats. I mange tilfælde har de opsøgt dialog med lokale og støttet projekter i overensstemmelse med vores nationale værdier. Men deres opgave har været principielt umulig. Og det er politikernes ansvar, ikke soldaternes.

Om fremtiden: Jeg tror ikke, der er nogen tvivl om, at Afghanistan vil komme ind i kredsen omkring organisationen Shanghai Cooperation Organization, hvor Kina og Rusland spiller første violin. Rusland og Kina vil formentlig i endnu højere grad blive dominerende magter i Asien. USA's meget pinlige exit – og billedet af afghanere, der falder fra flyvende fly i døden på landingsbanen, vil blive symbolet på et inkompetent USA på vej ned. I SCO deltager både Iran, Pakistan, Indien, de centralasiatiske lande. Vi i Vesten



kommer ikke uden om at tænke det igennem og efter min mening vænne os til, at verden ikke er vores alene. Der er andre lande og kulturer, som tænker anderledes, men som er effektive på deres egen måde. Vi er ikke verdens navle, som vi har troet i snart 500 år. Vi kan glæde os over det eller begræde det, men det er en realitet, som vi skal forholde os til.

USA har nedsat en kommission til at undersøge den civile opbygning. SIGAR, hedder den. Den sidste rapport er en sønderlemmende kritik af den amerikanske politik og korrupsion i Afghanistan. Bare vi havde sådan en i Danmark: Klik her.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er cand.mag. i idéhistorie og historie, tidligere nyhedskorrespondent (Politiken) i bl.a. Rusland og taler flydende russisk [og forfatter af flere bøger om Rusland og Ukraine]. Han er konsulent og underviser i kommunikation og kulturforskelle. Derudover er han kulturguide i bl.a. Polen, Irland og Tjekkiet og har tidligere arbejdet for FOA samt den danske ambassade i Estland. (kort biografi fra frydenlund.dk)

---

## **New Chapter in NSA-Danish Intelligence Scandal: NSA Targetted Denmark's Own Allies. EIR artikel af Michelle Rasmussen**

Abonnér her på EIR-Online, en gang om ugen. LaRouche-bevægelsens internationale tidsskrift.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Collage: Michelle Rasmussen. World: Gerd Altmann/Pixabay NSA: U.S. government, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons; FE: By Skjoldbro – Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0;

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 31. maj 2021: Hvad er Danmarks interesser?**

## **At være spion for NSA imod Danmarks naboer? Eller noget helt andet?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Resumé:

Rettet:

COVID-19: USA hamstrer vacciner mens Rusland og Kina sender vacciner til fattige lande.

Vi kan ikke besejre pandemien, med mindre vi sikrer vacciner

til alle lande uanset om de kan betale for dem. USA, Rusland, Kina og andre nationer må samarbejde om at bygge et moderne sundhedsvæsen i alle lande.

NSA-FE og Operation Dunhammer:

Efter Tom Gillesberg beskrev DR's afsløring, stillede han spørgsmålet "Hvad er Danmarks interesser?

Er det regimeskiftepolitik, som i Afghanistan, Irak, Libyen, Syrien og Iran?

Eller Ukraine, Rusland, Kina og Hviderusland?

Er det at medvirke til at spionere mod Tyskland, Frankrig, Sverige og Norge på vegne af NSA, USA's overvågningstjeneste?

Eller skal vi arbejde for et nyt paradigme, hvor USA og Europa samarbejder med Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre nationer for at skabe økonomisk udvikling – at løse konflikterne gennem at gå op i en højere enhed/modsætningernes sammenfald, hvor vi løser problemerne gennem at finde vores fælles interesser.

Hviderusland: Aktivist Roman Pratasevich, der blev arresteret efter hans fly blev tvunget til at lande i Hviderusland, har været aktiv militært i Ukraine med den højreekstremistiske Azov-batallion. Havde møder på højt niveau i USA og fik masser af støtte derfra. En britisk-amerikansk efterretningsoperatør?

USA-Rusland: Topmøde mellem Biden og Putin den 16. juni i Schweiz. Et skridt i den rigtige retning, hvis det ikke bliver saboteret.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches talte til Moskvas Akademiske Økonomisk Forum bla. om den blindgyde grøn omstilling og grøn New Deal er, da det er et fatalt tilbageskridt at sænke energikildernes og samfundets energigennemstrømningstæthed i stedet før at øge

den.

Den grønne New Deal betyder en massiv sænkning af levestandarden, især i de fattige lande. Vi har brug for økonomisk udvikling i stedet for.

Finansverdenen: Centralbankernes massive pengepumpning begynder at vise sig i stigning i råstofpriserne. Hvis de hæver renten for at bekæmpe inflationen, går mange firmaer, som lever på lånte penge, konkurs. Vi har brug for LaRouches fire økonomiske love, begyndende med en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling.

Følg med i Schiller Instituttets onlinekonference den 26.-27. juni og organiserer andre til at gøre det samme. Kontakt os og bliv aktiv.

Schiller Instituttet · Hvad er Danmarks interesser? At være spion for NSA imod Danmarks naboer? Eller noget helt andet?