

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 Denmark, 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 Yanukovich, and replace him with one who was very, very keen on getting into NATO. Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich's party also gained a majority with some other parties. There was a coalition which supported Yanukovich'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 (Kryvoj 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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich, 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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich'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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich, 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.

Mobiliser for gensidigt sikret overlevelse – mod nedtælling til 3. verdenskrig

Foto: Geneva

På engelsk:

Dec. 27 (EIRNS)–According to the latest available reports, talks between Russia and the United States, and Russia and NATO will begin before mid-January, on the texts of the two draft agreements on security guarantees presented by Russia to the U.S. and NATO on Dec. 15. January 12 in Geneva is under consideration for the NATO-Russia talks, and before that, possibly January 10, for the bilateral U.S.-Russia meeting. This is critical diplomacy, which Russia has initiated. But also critical to stopping the countdown to World War III is the activation of citizens everywhere against the policy of brinkmanship and encroachment against Russia and China.

A barrage of warnings has come from Russia in the past 36

hours. President Vladimir Putin told Rossiya-1 TV on Dec. 26, that the talks dare not have a “destructive agenda” in which the United States and NATO, “will indulge in endless talk about the necessity of negotiations, but will do nothing but pump a neighboring country with state-of-the-art weapons systems and build up threats to Russia, and we will have to do something with these threats.”

Putin explicated the meaning of the “red line” which he has set. He said, “I want everyone both in our country and abroad, our partners to clearly understand: the matter is not in a line we don’t want anyone to cross. The matter is that we have nowhere to step back.” He stressed, “They have driven us to such a line, excuse my language, that we have nowhere to move.” He pointed to the risks of new missile systems deployed at a distance of four to five minutes’ flight to Moscow. “Well, where are you going to go now? They have simply driven us to the state when we must say: stop!” Putin went on, that this is the reason Russia’s initiative on security guarantees was made public for all nations to see.

Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov spoke sternly on Dec. 26, saying that January “is when it will become clear whether the Americans are ready to give a substantive response, or they will opt for protracting the process and for seeking to initiate a policy of years-long talks.” We need “an urgent, concrete solution....”

Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov said today, in an interview published today in the Russian {Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn} ({Foreign Policy}) journal, among other points, that, “when we say that NATO facilities and all kinds of activities which are provocative for Russia need to be rolled back to the positions that existed in 1997, when the NATO-Russia Founding Act was signed, we are not bluffing.”

Reviewing these remarks and other developments today, Schiller Institute President Helga Zepp-LaRouche stressed that our job

is to make sure that a large portion of people in every country possible, understands what is going on. We are in a countdown of extreme danger, with no “wobble room” left. We are “close to a point of no return.”

The Schiller Institute posted a rush memorandum, “Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III?” on Christmas Eve, for circulation during the holiday period. This is currently being updated as an even more comprehensive dossier of the actual chronology of what created the dangerous strategic showdown with Russia.

Zepp-LaRouche stressed the need to make known the extreme danger, and also that there are solutions. The best anti-war policy involves working together on common, urgent tasks, and that means a modern health system in every nation. Look at the Afghanistan emergency in that way. Afghanistan “is a branching point.” Either there will be the necessary interventions to save lives and save the nation, or it will be an “unmitigated disaster ... that marks a decay into barbarism.” We will lose all of our humanity, knowing what is coming and not doing anything about it. Acting on this, and on other humanitarian crises, as well as on the war danger, is one and the same task, as the Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites addresses.

The situation is grave. The Russian leaders are speaking out in unmistakable terms. If we co-mobilize with a growing number of people, we can bring about MAS—mutually assured survival.

Foto: fr:Utilisateur:Ork.ch

Udenjordiske forpligtelse eller atomkrig?

På engelsk:

Dec. 26 (EIRNS)—“The Extraterrestrial Imperative (udenjordiske forpligtelse) is a driving force in the natural growth of terrestrial life beyond its planetary limits. As such, it is an integral part of the obviously expansionistic and growth-oriented pattern of life’s evolution. This drive caused life to grow from infinitesimal beginnings into a force that encompasses and transforms an entire planet through its biosphere. More basically, the Extraterrestrial Imperative expresses a ‘first message,’ a primordial imperative, bred into the very essence of the universe, driving the evolution of matter from simplest forms (elementary particles) to highly complex structures (e.g., the intelligent brain). A vast amount of cosmic energy is released by stellar matter in the initial phase of this process—the transformation of hydrogen to helium and heavier elements—and bound up in the later phases, involving the formation and evolution of living matter. By these roots, it is possible to identify the Extraterrestrial Imperative as a basic principle that can be derived from a consistent interpretation and generalization of recurring phenomena common to evolutionary processes.”

These words were written in 1971 by Krafft Ehrlicke (1917-84), the German-American visionary and rocket scientist. His concept of Extraterrestrial Imperative asserted that it was the responsibility of humanity to explore space and exploit the resources of the Solar System, in order to sustain the development of the species. There are no external “limits to growth,” Ehrlicke insisted, because while the Earth is a “closed system,” the exploration of space opens the entire universe to humanity. For Ehrlicke, as for his friend Lyndon LaRouche, human creativity has no limits.

This concept received a great boost and an inspiring confirmation on Christmas Day, 2021, with the successful launch of the James Webb Space Telescope, a project which involved the work of over 10,000 people from over 14 countries over 25 years. The telescope will be fully functional in June 2022, provided there is success in achieving the extraordinarily complex process of reaching its orbit 1 million miles away from Earth, while opening the apparatus through "50 major deployments ... and 178 release mechanisms to deploy those 50 parts," according to Webb Mission Systems Engineer Mike Menzel in a video titled "29 Days on the Edge." (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7bz030nyD2A>)

The telescope will look back in time as much as 13.5 billion years. Perhaps it will discover the secret of the Star in the East on a Christmas Day 2021 years ago.

But this burst of progress, and the human optimism and creativity which created it, is confronted by a dark reality on Earth, where multiple crises pose the question of whether or not the human race has the moral fitness to survive. In addition to an out-of-control pandemic, a hyperinflationary explosion and economic disintegration in much of the world, the U.S. and NATO are confronting both Russia and China with thermonuclear war. Certain madmen believe that the U.S. is still the "only superpower," that their warped view of "liberal democracy" is indeed the perfected "end of history," and that their threats will force these two great historic nations, both armed with nuclear weapons, to do the bidding of the would-be lords of the world.

The Schiller Institute released an emergency Memorandum on Dec. 24, titled "Are We Sleepwalking Into Thermonuclear World War III?" (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/12/24/are-we-sleepwalking-into-thermonuclear-world-war-iii/>), with a timeline demonstrating how this economic and strategic crisis point came to be, and why it is the responsibility of every citizen on Earth to work with us

to stop it. Circulate this Memorandum everywhere.

Interview med pianist Lejla Pula fra Kosova og sanger Josipa Bainac fra Kroatien, på tysk af Feride Gillesberg

Billede: Lejla Pula, klaver, med Kosovar Philharmonics (Trincoll2014, CC BY-SA 3.0 via Wikimedia Commons)

På tysk:



Nr. 9, 26. Februar 2014

„Kosovo eine Brutstätte musikalischer Talente“

Interview mit der Pianistin Lejla Pula aus Prishtina

Mag. Lejla Pula, Pianistin und Klavierprofessorin an der Kunstfakultät in Prishtina, ist sowohl Präsidentin der „Kosovo Chopin Assoziation“ als auch Künstlerische Leiterin des „Chopin Piano Fest“ in Prishtina.

Feride Gillesberg: Bei meinem letzten Besuch in Kosovo hat es mich sehr positiv überrascht, daß es in Kosovo eine Handvoll Musiker gibt, die für die klassische Musik brennen. Eine von

diesen bist du. Was möchtest du dazu sagen?

Lejla Pula: Es ist schön und hoffnungsvoll, wenn man so eine Aussage hört. In Kosovo haben wir eine Grundbasis von 40 Jahren höherer Ausbildung im Bereich der klassischen Musik und Kunst, und man kann sagen, daß wir heute Fachschulen für verschiedene Bereiche der musikalischen Künste haben, wie die Interpretation verschiedener Instrumente, die Komposition, das Dirigieren, Musikalische Pädagogik usw. Seit der Studienzeit und danach ab den 80er Jahren als Teil der Unterrichtsgruppe der Kunst-Akademie in Prishtina bin ich bis heute aktiver Teilnehmer an der Ausbildung der Künste. Als Pianistin und Interpret der klassischen Musik war und bin ich fortwährend auf der Bühne in Kosovo präsent, habe aber auch Kosovo auf der internationalen Bühne vertreten.

Gillesberg: Kannst du uns einen Überblick geben, wie es mit der klassischen Musik in Kosovo aussieht?

Pula: Die Realität in der Gesellschaft in Kosovo ist leider so, daß noch die notwendige Offenheit fehlt, welche ermöglichen würde, daß die Künstler, insbesondere die der klassischen Musik, frei atmen können – in dem Sinne, daß die echte Kunst nicht ihren Platz in unserer Gesellschaft bekommt, den sie verdient. Die professionelle Kunst verlangt bestimmte Bedingungen für die szenische Aufführung, die Ausstattung mit Instrumenten, angemessene Konzertsäle sowie andere Arbeitsmittel, die nicht garantiert werden, weil es die erforderliche Bereitschaft, Verständnis und Bewußtsein dafür nicht gibt. Die kulturellen Institutionen bemühen sich um ihre Arbeit. Sie betrachten es als machbar und notwendig, im Rahmen unserer Gesellschaft, wie auch der kulturellen Entwicklung als ganzes, Unterstützung für die Künstler zu finden – diese Hilfe ist jedoch minimal und unzureichend.

Klassische Musik, das künstlerische Schöpfen und Kunst im allgemeinen, spiegelt die Ebene der kulturellen Entwicklung einer Gesellschaft und eines Volkes wider, und es sind sehr

wichtige Segmente für die Gesamtstruktur einer Gesellschaft.

Diese verlangen auf jeden Fall eine besondere Achtung, denn Errungenschaften werden als Teil des kulturellen Erbes einer Nation zurückbleiben.

Gillesberg: Was für eine Rolle hat die klassische Musik für Kultur?

Pula: Mein Volk hat eine Ader und besondere Sensibilität für Musik im allgemeinen, aber auch für klassische Musik. Ich arbeite seit über 30 Jahren als Konzertpianistin, aber auch Ausbilder in diesem Bereich. Ich kann Ihnen sagen, daß Kosovo ein Schatz, eine Brutstätte musikalischer Talente ist. Da ist eine große Begeisterung bei Lehrern im Bereich der Kunst, so wie auch bei den Studenten. Trotz der schweren Bedingungen, dem Mangel an Instrumenten, der perspektivlosen Aussichten dieses Berufs, versuchen wir Festivals und verschiedene Konzerte zu organisieren. Das Epizentrum dieser musikalischen Aktivitäten sind bis heute begeisterte professionelle Musiker, die viele Künstler aus aller Welt einladen, in unserer Hauptstadt zu spielen. Für jedes Festival werden Dutzende von Konzerten mit einheimischen und ausländischen Künstlern mit großer Mühe, Opferbereitschaft und unter großen Schwierigkeiten organisiert. Dieses Mitwirken im Organisieren unseres kulturellen Lebens ist für uns sehr wertvoll und unersetzlich. Eines davon ist auch das Festival „Chopin Piano Fest“, das ich mit meinen Kollegen leite und das jedes Jahr in April statt findet.

Gillesberg: Welche Rolle spielt die klassische Musik für den Aufbau einer Nation?

Pula: Gerade die Pflege der kulturellen Werte einer Gesellschaft ist der Zeiger, der am glaubwürdigsten die Entwicklungsebene einer Zivilisation anzeigt. Es ist bekannt, daß das stolze Volk Kosovos eine sehr schwere Zeit und schwere Ereignisse durchgemacht hat. Wir haben sehr viel in unserem

Bereich gelitten [1991-99]. Alle Unterrichtsgebäude waren geschlossen und wir mußten mit allem improvisieren. Wir haben aber „überlebt“ als Akademie und als Gesellschaft und erfreuen uns des Lebens in unserem unabhängigen Staat. Dank unserer Kriegshelden, aber auch der Arbeitenden, denn wir haben alle unsere Arbeit mit Hingabe, Aufopferung und Selbstlosigkeit unter diesen rauen Umständen gepflegt.

Ich bin aus persönlicher Prüfung, aber auch aus meinen inneren Glauben an den Menschen, fest davon überzeugt, daß man mit gutem Willen, Hingabe und Beharrlichkeit erreichen kann, was unmöglich erscheint.

Gillesberg: Was würdest du gerne den Menschen in Deutschland sagen, denn die meisten dort kennen Kosovo nur aus politischer Sicht?

Pula: Optimismus und Hoffnung sind die Eigenschaften, welche die Künstler ausmachen, denn so eine Kunst ist seelische Nahrung und entwickelt die erhabenen Gefühle der Menschen.

Ich bin davon überzeugt, daß unsere Gesellschaft, und auch unsere Künstler in Kosovo, auf bessere Tage zugehen, weil sie es sich durch harte Arbeit und selbstlose Hingabe verdienen.



Nr. 3, 20. Januar 2016

Klassische Musik richtet sich nach Naturprinzipien

von Feride Istogu Gillesberg

Am 11.-12. Dezember 2015 fand in der dänischen Hauptstadt Kopenhagen ein Symposium statt zum Thema „Fortgeschrittene

Einschätzung der Stimmfunktionen in Europa: Resonanz der menschlichen Stimme & Neurowissenschaft und Stimme“ („Advanced Voice Functions Assessment in Europe – Resonance of the human voice & Neuroscience and voice“). Es war das sechste Symposium dieser Art, das von der Europäischen Kooperation in Wissenschaft und Technologie (European Cooperation in Science and Technology, COST Action 2103) veranstaltet wurde. Ärzte, Künstler und Musiker aus verschiedenen Nationen waren vertreten. Das Programm war sehr kompakt. U.a. hielt dort Josipa Bainac einen Vortrag über die wissenschaftliche Stimmung, die ein wichtiger Bestandteil der menschlichen Stimme ist. Ihre Rede beruhte auf zweijährigen Untersuchungen der Autorin. Ich hatte die Freude, Frau Bainac für die *Neue Solidarität* interviewen zu können.

Neue Solidarität: Frau Josipa Bainac, ich hatte die Möglichkeit, Ihren spannenden Vortrag auf dem Symposium in Kopenhagen anzuhören. Wollen Sie sich kurz vorstellen?

Josipa Bainac: Vor ungefähr zwei Jahren habe ich meinen Abschluß an der Universität für Musik in Zagreb, Kroatien, als klassische Sängerin und Pädagogin gemacht. Seit 2014 studiere ich Lied und Oratorium im Masterstudium an der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien. Seit meinen Studien in Kroatien habe ich mich intensiv für verschiedene Interpretationstechniken interessiert und mich viel mit Stimmeigenschaften und Gesangstechnik beschäftigt.

Neue Solidarität: Wie sind Sie darauf gekommen, mit der wissenschaftlichen Stimmung zu arbeiten?

Bainac: Als klassische Gesangsstudentin habe ich viele Konzerte gesungen, von Orchestern, Klavier, Cembalo oder Orgel begleitet. Nach jahrelangen Erfahrungen habe ich bemerkt, wie sich das subjektive Gefühl für die Stimme und die Gesangstechnik ändert, wenn ich mit verschiedenen Begleitinstrumenten oder Ensembles aufträte. Bald habe ich erfahren, welche Rolle die Stimmung und die Standardtonhöhe in

der historische Musikpraxis hat, und durch Gespräche mit meinen Kollegen – Sänger und Sängerinnen – habe ich erfahren, daß sie manchmal bei der Interpretation unter verschiedenen Stimmschwierigkeiten leiden, z.B. wegen der zu hohen Standardtonhöhe -, wenn der Künstler lange Proben oder Auftritte singen muß.

Als mein Masterarbeitsthema habe ich deswegen geschrieben über „Die historische Entwicklung der Temperatursysteme und die Standardtonhöhenauswahl im Zusammenhang mit der Gesangstechnikentwicklung und Stimmgesundheit“. Am Anfang war ich leider in den Untersuchungsmöglichkeiten begrenzt. Das war aber nur der Anfang meiner Arbeit zu dieser Frage, die ich als eine Pilotstudie in Kopenhagen präsentiert habe.

Neue Solidarität: In Ihrem Vortrag wurde erwähnt, daß in Kroatien Aufnahmen gemacht wurden, um den Unterschied der verschiedenen Stimmungen zu demonstrieren. Warum findet so ein Prozeß in Kroatien statt, gibt es ein besonderes Interesse in diesem Feld?

Bainac: Ich habe mit dem Studium dieses Themas in Kroatien angefangen. Und während des Studiums war ich im Kontakt mit Wissenschaftlern und Persönlichkeiten, die die technischen Möglichkeiten haben, wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zu machen. Leider gibt es in Kroatien nicht so viel Interesse zu diesem Thema, und deswegen war es kompliziert, meine Arbeit wirklich zu entwickeln, aber hier in Wien habe ich mehr Unterstützung.

Neue Solidarität: Das Schiller-Institut führt seit Jahrzehnten eine Kampagne für die wissenschaftliche Stimmung. Wie sehen Sie die Bedeutung der Verdi-Stimmung?

Bainac: Wenn man über die Stimmung spricht, muß man zwei wichtige musikalische Aspekte ins Auge fassen: die Standardtonhöhe („Kammerton“) und das Temperationssystem. Beide haben sich im Lauf der Zeit unabhängig voneinander

entwickelt und oft gewechselt.

Man sagt oft, im Zusammenhang mit der historischen Interpretation, daß das Temperationssystem eine große Bedeutung für das Verständnis der harmonischen Struktur und anderen Musikkomponenten hat.

Leider vergessen wir oft die Bedeutung der Standardtonhöhe. Die Instrumente wurden im Laufe der Zeit für die neuen, oft höheren Standardtonhöhen umgebaut oder optimiert. Mit der Stimme ist es leider nicht so einfach, und bei der Interpretation von Repertoire, das für eine andere Standardtonhöhe komponiert war, kann dies zu Schwierigkeiten und in extremen Fällen zu Verletzungen führen. Die ästhetischen Fragen werden heute, aufgrund der Art, wie heute Musik konsumiert wird, übersehen.

Giuseppe Verdi war nicht nur Komponist, sondern auch Sänger – ein Bariton, der die Gesangstechnik gemeistert hat und mit diesem Wissen sehr sorgfältig die Musik für Sänger geschrieben hat. Es ist bekannt, daß er auch sehr genau und streng mit seinen Mitarbeitern – Librettisten usw. – gearbeitet hat.

Während den Überlegungen, was die universale Standardtonhöhe sein sollte, hat sich Verdi für die französische Standardtonhöhe ($a' = 435$ Hz) eingesetzt. Er wurde aber kurz danach für die Standardtonhöhe $a' = 432$ Hz gewonnen, wegen ihrer wissenschaftlicher Genauigkeit, wie in seinem Briefwechsel nachzulesen ist.

Nach vielen Besprechungen mit Wissenschaftlern und Mathematikern kam ich zu der Meinung, daß es wirklich keine wissenschaftlichen Beweise gibt, die bestätigen könnten, daß eine Frequenz gegenüber einer anderen Vorteile hat.

Ich habe dann mit renommierten Sängern und ihrem Repertoire experimentiert. Und aufgrund von objektiven und subjektiven Bewertungen habe ich dann festgestellt, daß die Standardtonhöhe von 432 Hz, wenn sie z.B. bei der

Interpretation von Verdis und Mozarts Opernarien verwendet wird, viele Vorteile vor den heutigen 443 Hz hat.¹ Für ausgezeichnete Sänger, die keine technischen Probleme haben, sind auch immer die Passagionoten zwischen den Stimmregistern problematisch. Wenn man den Kammerton von 432 Hz nimmt, werden die Vokale runder und natürlicher gesungen – coperto. Das verschiebt die Formanten tiefer und macht den Weg zu den Passagionoten günstiger, denn die Stimmqualität des Passagionbereichs zwischen den Stimmregistern kommt in dieser Stimmung früher. Das ist natürlich auch mit dem Text verbunden, der so vertont ist, daß die Bedeutung durch Registerwechsel unterstrichen ist.

Bei 443 Hz kommt die Passaggio in der Stimme abrupt, weil die Sänger oft in dieser Stimmung hellere Vokale – auch in der Passagiotransition – singen. Natürlich versuchen die Sänger immer, den Formantenbereich mit den Obertönen zu verbinden, aber in der tieferen Stimmung macht der Körper das unbewußt und ganz natürlich durch die Rundung des Vokaltrakts. Die Sänger bewerten diese Standardtonhöhe von 432 Hz als die, die ihnen mehr Stimmfreiheit, Flexibilität, schönere Farbe, Stimmleichtigkeit anbietet. Bei 443 Hz macht der Sänger das alles bewußt – mehr oder weniger erfolgreich.

Neue Solidarität: Unsere Organisation legt großen Wert auf die klassische Kultur. Wie sehen Sie die Rolle der klassischen Musik, welche Bedeutung hat sie für die Entwicklung einer Gesellschaft?

Bainac: Musik ist immer ein bedeutender Aspekt jeder Zivilisation, ob man über Ritualmusik oder über unsere raffinierte und durch Jahrhunderte entwickelte europäische Musik spricht. Das sind alles im einfachsten Sinne Kombinationen von Frequenzen, die nach der Kenntnis des Komponisten so arrangiert sind, daß sie eine gewisse Wirkung auf den Zuhörer haben. Meiner Meinung nach werden diese Grundprinzipien der europäischen Musik heute von den

Interpreten und auch von den Komponisten ignoriert. Man kann auch oft die sinnlose Phrase hören, daß im Bereich der klassischen Musik schon alles gesagt sei, alles schon komponiert sei, und deswegen muß der Zuhörer heute verschiedenste intellektuelle Durchfälle von den Komponisten dulden. Das kommt leider seit dem 20. Jahrhundert aus dem Bedürfnis, alles zu quantifizieren – am besten gleich auf Profit umrechnen. Und die Komponisten und Interpreten haben sich nur auf den leichtgewonnenen Affekt des Publikums und persönlichen Erfolg ausgerichtet.

Die Tatsache, daß Musik ein Naturphänomen ist, das schon lange vor der Menschlichkeit existiert hat, muß man wieder entdecken. Dann sehen wir, daß diese Quelle unerschöpflich ist. Deswegen würde ich klassische Musik nicht nur als Musik aus einer gewissen Periode bezeichnen, sondern als Musik, die sich nach Naturprinzipien richtet, die eine objektive und positive Wirkung auf uns hat.

Neue Solidarität: Haben Sie noch eine paar abschließende Gedanken für unsere Leser?

Bainac: Wie immer haben auch wir in unserer Zeit gewisse kulturelle Probleme und Fragen. Die klassische Musik ist heute ganz populär und für die Massen zugänglich geworden. Das könnte auf den ersten Blick auf die Welt der klassischen Musik eine gute Wirkung haben. Leider hat es sich aber gezeigt, daß das breite Publikum sich nur auf die oberflächlichen Aspekte der Musik orientiert. Und die natürliche Wahl der Künstlern – Interpreten oder Komponisten – ist damit verschwunden. Deswegen liegt heute bei uns, wie wir Musik und alle anderen Künste unterstützen; daß wir wirklich nur das hinterlassen, was wir für die nächsten Generationen wertvoll finden.

Neue Solidarität: Vielen Dank für das Interview!

Anmerkung

1. International sind z.T. noch höhere Stimmungen üblich, aber bei den Untersuchungen in Wien wurden akustisch nur 432 Hz und 443 Hz detailliert analysiert.

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer NATO og USA til at underskrive de to strategiske traktater, som Rusland har foreslået

Den 22. december (EIRNS) – I sin ugentlige webcast i dag opfordrede Schiller Instituttets stifter, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, USA, NATO og Europas nationer til øjeblikkeligt at underskrive de to strategiske traktater præsenteret af Vladimir Putins russiske regering, som et presserende første skridt til at få verden væk fra sin nuværende bane mod atomkrig.

”Jeg tror det er en absolut presserende nødvendighed for NATO, USA og europæiske lande at blive enige om at underskrive en sådan juridisk bindende aftale med Rusland”, sagde Zepp-LaRouche. “Det Rusland nu kræver i skriftlige juridiske termer, er intet andet end det der blev lovet dem i 1990 af USA og NATO”, løfter, som aldrig blev holdt. I stedet blev NATO ved med at udvide sig østpå op til selve Ruslands grænser; og defensive og offensive våbensystemer samt tropper, har ledsaget denne udvidelse.

“Situationen er ekstremt bekymrende”, sagde hun, “fordi der er mennesker, der er fast besluttet på denne balancegang på randen af krig, i håb om at Rusland og Kina vil trække sig. Men jeg tror ikke, at det ligger i kortene. Politikken med at

omringe Rusland og Kina fortsætter, selv om Rusland har sagt, at deres røde streger er nået... Der må være en erkendelse af, at vi er på en frygtelig farlig vej, og folk må udtrykke deres modstand mod denne politik, højt og klart, før det er for sent.”

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede sine lyttere til at bruge denne juleperiode til at hjælpe med at organisere andre til at udtale sig imod denne truende katastrofe og relaterede kriser – såsom faren for at titusindvis af millioner af mennesker sulter i Afghanistan som følge af Storbritanniens, USA's og NATO's finanskrigsførelse – og at mobilisere til fordel for de politiske alternativer, som Lyndon LaRouche længe slog til lyd for.

The Brinkmanship of Trans-Atlantic Cannot Be Tolerated

Weekly Strategic Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche,

Wednesday December 22, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly dialogue with Schiller Institute founder and Chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's Dec. 22, 2021.

And Helga, as we've been reporting over the recent weeks, the drumbeat for war continues coming from trans-Atlantic powers. The Russians are making proposals to try and address it. They seem to be getting little or no response from the West. What's the latest that you have on this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it is extremely worrisome, because it seems there are people committed to make a brinkmanship. Obviously, they hope that Russia, and China for that matter, will back down, but I don't think that that's in the cards. So two weeks ago, we spoke about this unbelievable statement by Sen. Roger Wicker, that he doesn't want to take the first use of nuclear weapons off the table.

Now, in the meantime, the whole thing has escalated. There was a CNN report, with an unnamed U.S. high-ranking official, the suspicion was that it was National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan, who said we only have a window of four weeks left before we have to get a breakthrough, and somehow referring to a possible plan of Russia to invade Ukraine. Which Russia has denied many times, emphatically. But if you look at the chronologically of the last several weeks—it started much earlier—but let's take the visit of the Director of the Office of National Intelligence of the United States Avril Haines to Brussels, where she briefed the NATO ambassadors about so-called hard evidence intelligence that Russia would plan and invasion of Ukraine at the beginning of 2022.

As I said, it was denied by Russia. Then there are obviously troops being gathered at the Russian side of the Ukrainian border, which has been commented on many times by Russia, that it's their good right to do on their territory whatever they want. According to Maria Zakharova, the spokeswoman of the Foreign Ministry, there are at least 10,000 troops from NATO in Ukraine, 4,000 from the U.S. and 6,000 from other countries; and in the middle of all of that—I mean, there was the discussion between Putin and Biden on Dec. 7 on videoconference—which again looked as if this would move forward. But then, immediately, the people around Biden went back to their bellicose statements, so one never knows exactly what the U.S. policy is exactly.

And then Putin proposed two treaties, to the U.S. and to NATO. Now, these are not proposals for negotiations but ready-made treaties, one for the United States to sign, that they will basically not insist that Ukraine be in NATO, and the other one for NATO to sign, that NATO will not move any farther eastward. And the Russians, Putin, they said this is not negotiable; this pertains to the very national security interests of Russia, and they insist that these treaties be signed.

Now the reaction from the West, from [NATO Secretary General Jens] Stoltenberg, from Lambrecht, the new German defense minister, various other people, they said, they will not let Russia dictate what to do, and so forth, but there was no serious response so far. And various Russian spokesmen, Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov, Grushko, Lavrov, and various other people, they all said that this is very serious. If there is no response from the West, and if there is any more move to either move weapons into Ukraine, or to expand NATO in any way more eastward, there will be a military answer coming from Russia. And the bottom line has been reached, the red line has been reached.

So we are sort of in a countdown, where it's very clear that whoever is pulling the strings in NATO in the end, and sometimes one is not quite clear if it's Biden or not, or rather not, they're obviously set that this policy of encirclement against Russia and China continue. And Russia has said, the red line has been reached.

Now, this is very, very dangerous, because –

Oh yeah, then I think it was also Sullivan, said that if there is any move from Russia in respect to Ukraine, that they will punish the economy of Russia so terribly that it—anyway, so there are all these threats in the air.

And there is now a very interesting statement by Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, a former Greek ambassador, who commented on all of that, by basically saying the West should not be so hypocritical (I'm now using my own words), but that the West should recognize that all Russia is demanding, in written, legal terms, is what was promised in 1990 to them by the United States, by NATO, in the negotiations concerning the German reunification. And this is actually a matter of record: There are now documents which everybody can look up, that on Feb. 9, 1990, Secretary of State James Baker promised Gorbachev that NATO would not move “one inch eastward,” and

this was also the content of the famous speech by then German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in his speech in Tutzing, where he basically said the same thing. Naturally, everybody knows these promises, which unfortunately were not made in written form, but just verbally, they were broken almost immediately and altogether 14 countries of the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact were integrated into NATO; and recently, and many times earlier, Russia has made the point that to have Ukraine and Georgia in NATO is unacceptable for the very simple reason that if you look at the border between Ukraine and Russia, it leaves only a few minutes, maybe as little as 5 minutes for a missile system to reach Moscow, which obviously is much too short a time to have an effective defense.

So, Russia makes the point that its national security interest is absolutely threatened by these moves by NATO. So we are on a countdown. And we should just keep in mind, if it comes to any war between Russia and Ukraine, which would involve any kind of—even without Western involvement—and this would escalate, Germany would immediately be the target. And if you have such statements like that of Senator Wicker, that the first use of nuclear weapons cannot be taken off the table, people should be aware of the fact, that if it comes to this, Germany ceases to exist!

So, this is one of the reasons why I have been saying NATO is no longer a security pact which is in the self-interest of Germany, because if in the case of any military conflict, Germany ceases to exist, obviously, this is not a good defense strategy.

So, I think, first of all people must make themselves familiar with this danger. According to the reports, we are in a four-week countdown, and I think it is absolute, urgent necessity that NATO and the United States and European countries do agree to sign such legally binding agreements with Russia, even if Putin, in a just-conducted meeting with some of his

top military people said that even a legally binding, signed document does not give full security, because the United States has now a very long record that they pull out of treaties without any problem, overnight. But there must be a recognition that we are on a terribly dangerous road, and people must voice their opposition to this policy, loud and clear, before it is too late.

SCHLANGER: There have been some voices speaking out in the West, but not nearly enough, and then, instead, they're drowned out by people like Sullivan, who said Russia must deescalate, when the escalation is coming from the West. And the U.S. has not even responded yet to this request for these treaties to be negotiated.

Now, unless you have something more on that, I think we need to move on to the situation in Afghanistan, where there have been some developments with the Organization for Islamic Cooperation meeting over the weekend, a potential for possible motion on unfreezing the funds. I think 46 congress members have written a letter to Biden. What's your sense? Is there some momentum building on this, especially given the reports of the danger to millions of people, including children, of starvation and freezing this winter?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, this is the second, absolutely heartbreaking and extremely upsetting story. You know, the West talks about moral values, value-based order, human rights, democracy, all of these beautiful words, but the reality is quite ugly. Because the World Food Program representatives, I think, the head Beasley and Mary-Ellen McGroarty in Afghanistan, visiting Kabul and Kandahar in the last several days, and they come back and say that 98% of the Afghanistan population is in dire poverty, more than 90% are food insecure, without medical supplies: 24 million people are in danger of dying this winter, 3 million children, babies are dying already—and this is the 21st century and the whole world should know about it, but if you look at the Western media,

after the Taliban took over in August, there was a short period when Afghanistan was in the news, but since several months you hardly hear anything about it.

Now, there was a very important conference over Friday, Saturday, Sunday in Islamabad, Pakistan, of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC); this is with 57 states, the second largest international organization after the United Nations, and they had a meeting which was addressed by the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Imran Khan. I listened to his speech and I was—not that everything was new what he said, but he said it very distinctly. He said, when the Taliban took over and the West withdrew, everybody knew that 75% of the budget of Afghanistan came from international aid, and since that aid was immediately cut—the donor countries cut the aid right away, because the Taliban had taken over—everybody knew that the entire budget of Afghanistan was all of a sudden practically nonexistent. Then you had the freezing of the funds by the U.S. Treasury, by European banks, so there was a complete cash crisis: People could not import anything, they could not pay salaries, the whole thing broke down, and this has been going on for four months, with the result I just mentioned before.

But this is not the Taliban: When you hear the Western media, if they report anything at all, they say, “Oh yeah, the economy is now terrible, because of the Taliban.” It is *not* because of the Taliban! Because if you have, after 20 years of NATO war, NATO leaves, and the United States forces leave in a sudden fashion, the country in which they conducted war for 20 years: They leave the country, nothing has been built, no economy, no infrastructure, nothing is functioning, and then, they cut off the international lifeline, the donor monies, which make up 75% of the Afghanistan budget, they cut this off, they freeze the central bank’s funds, and then naturally a catastrophe erupts which nobody, not the Taliban or anybody else, can handle, because you have sanctions, and

have a complete freeze of everything! And the West knows that!
And they don't react!

I mean, this is unbelievable! If you look at the Afghanistan situation, this is the end of any credibility of the West, and just to think that because the Western media are not reporting that, people should not think that it goes unnoticed. For example, the 57 OIC nations noticed; all the neighbors of Afghanistan noticed; all the third world noticed. So I think if this is not reversed very, very quickly, this will be of a lasting impact of a demise of the West. This is why I have said that the fate of Afghanistan and the fate of humanity are much more closely linked than most people are willing to think through.

I find this absolutely horrendous.

What the OIC conference decided: they will set up a fund, I don't know exactly the amounts that will be available, but they will set up an office in Kabul, and the OIC has offered to coordinate international aid. So something is being done, for sure, but the problem is so gigantic that it really requires all the neighbors of Afghanistan to cooperate, and I think that the United States and the European countries—I mean, they were for 20 years in this country, and then they walk away. This is from the standpoint of international law, completely unacceptable. So Europe and the United States have an absolute moral obligation to reverse that and cooperate with the neighbors of Afghanistan and not only have immediate humanitarian aid, to alleviate the hunger, the lack of medical supplies, but then, participate in the economic buildup of the country, which can only occur by integrating Afghanistan into the Belt and Road Initiative projects—you know, the CPEC corridor from Pakistan to Kabul to Uzbekistan; the building of the Khyber Pass, and other well-defined projects which would immediately start building up the economy.

So that is what needs to be done. There are 39 congressmen who

made an appeal to Biden to unfreeze the funds which are held by the Treasury: I think this is important. Obviously, this must immediately happen because the winter is already there.

SCHLANGER: And toward that end of accelerated humanitarian aid, you made the proposal which you call "Operation Ibn Sina," that is, while specific to Afghanistan, actually reflects the need for the whole world in the midst of the COVID crisis, the economic breakdown, which is the necessity for a world health system, as the front end of a massive infrastructure investment program, which could include the Belt and Road Initiative and so on. How does that look as a prospect from your standpoint?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Operation Ibn Sina, because one has to start with Afghanistan, and Ibn Sina comes from a place nearby Bukhara which is Uzbekistan, but his father was born in Balk, which is Afghanistan, and people are very proud of him. He's probably the greatest doctor who ever lived, so there is no better name to give this effort to build a modern health system in Afghanistan, than to call it after Ibn Sina. And there already has been great interest in this idea coming from several places in the region.

But more largely, we have now a new wave of the COVID-19, the Omicron variant, and, again, there is such an unwillingness by the establishment of the Western system to recognize that we have been on the wrong track, and I said in the very beginning, when it was clear this was a pandemic, in March 2020, I said we need a world health system or else this pandemic will not go away. Since then we've had all these mutations, and now we have Omicron, and there is no guarantee there will not be new mutations. And it's also clear that the idea that the rich countries are producing and hoarding vaccines, and leaving the developing countries without is not helping anybody, because if you leave entire continents without vaccinations and without modern health equipment, then this virus will mutate, as it has done so far, and it will

come back and may even make the existing vaccines obsolete.

So, either we go in earnest, and say that the fact that billions of people do not have modern hospitals is unacceptable, don't have clear water, don't have enough electricity, this is something which could be done; there is no reason why we could not immediately start to build modern infrastructure, like we have it in Germany—it may be rotting, but it's still there because previous generations were a little bit smarter than the present crop of politicians—but there is no reason in the world why not technically, why not technologically, we could not start building hospitals: We need about 30,000 new hospitals around the world. That would be easy! We could even make these hospitals prefabricated, in the United States, in Europe, and then ship the modules to the respective countries. The Chinese proved in Wuhan that you can build a modern hospital in two weeks. It could be done this way.

We could start a crash training program for medical personnel. I have called for the youth, the young people in the world to be trained to help build such an effort, like it was done by Franklin D. Roosevelt with the CCC program in the New Deal. You can train young people on the job, give them a vision and a mission in life.

And I think this is really something—you know, we cannot continue this way! The idea that every time something happens, the rich countries only take care of themselves, and the developing countries are left in the dark, that has to stop and we have to start to really think in terms of a new paradigm if humanity is supposed to come out of this crisis. And given the fact that we have now the Christmas period, the holiday season, people have some days to think. And rather than just going about your business as usual—I mean, this is a breaking point of civilization: Either we really can shape up as a human species, or it may not look so great for our perspective.

SCHLANGER: I think your last point, that in the spirit of Christmas, of generosity and love of mankind, peace and good will toward men, this would be the time to move ahead with the shift to the new paradigm.

Helga, thanks for joining us today, and I know you wish all your viewers a merry Christmas, as do I, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. I wish you a Merry Christmas, and the first topic we discussed, I really want you to think about, because what we face in Europe between Russia, Ukraine, and Europe and NATO, is like a reverse Cuban Missile Crisis. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy pointed to the fact that an island which is only 160 miles from the coast of Florida, the idea that you could deploy nuclear missiles in such a close vicinity, obviously could not be tolerated. But nuclear missiles in NATO, in the Baltic, missile defense system in Poland, in Romania, and the idea to move lethal weapons into Ukraine, from the standpoint of the Russians, this is exactly like the Cuban Missile Crisis.

So, I really want you to use this Christmas period to really work with the Schiller Institute, and help us to stop something which could really be fatal for all of humanity. And at the same time, there are all the resources, there are so many beautiful contributions to civilizations, Beethoven's music, all the great poets, the great philosophers—read these things over these days and rethink how we should go about it, because we definitely need to change course urgently

Ligesom for 60 år siden vokser faren for atomkrig støt

Den 20. december (EIRNS) – Farten på de voksende amerikansk-russiske spændinger over Ukraine tog til over den sidste uge, således at det som lignede et håb om stabilisering for to uger siden, da præsidenterne Biden og Putin afholdt en videokonference, nu til stadighed ligner en nedtælling til krig i Europa mellem de atomare stormagter.

En højtstående embedsmand fra Det hvide Hus – sandsynligvis den nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Jake Sullivan – fortalte CNN søndag den 19. december, at der kun er et »tidsvindue på fire uger« til at forhindre Rusland i at invadere Ukraine. »Det som vi har foretaget os er meget kalkuleret«, sagde embedsmanden. »Men vi har blot cirka et tidsvindue på fire uger fra nu af«. Embedsmanden sagde, at USA's planlagte sanktioner »ville være overvældende, øjeblikkelige og have betydelige omkostninger for den russiske økonomi og deres finanssystem«.

Den næste dag, den 20. december, fortalte den russiske viceudenrigsminister, Sergej Ryabkov, journalister, at Biden-administrationen ikke havde svaret på Rusland foreslåede traktater om sikkerhedsgarantier i løbet af forhandlingerne den 15. december i Moskva mellem Ryabkov og den amerikanske viceudenrigsminister for europæiske og eurasiske anliggender, Karen Donfried. Forslagene inkluderede forsikringen om, at Ukraine ikke ville blive et medlem af NATO, og at yderligere opstillinger af amerikanske og NATO-styrker, samt missilsystemer tættere på Ruslands grænser, ville ophøre...

Og både viceudenrigsminister Alexander Grushko og forhandler af våbenkontrol, Konstantin Gavrilov, henviste ildevarslen til »Ruslands militær-tekniske og militære midler« som

det *eneste* alternativ til forhandlinger om Ruslands traktatforslag. Ukraines egen regering fortsatte, i form af udenrigsminister Dmytro Kuleba, med at tale med *Washington Post* den 19. december og kræve flere »militære midler« og tropper fra USA og Storbritannien og krævede, at USA offentligt gør det klart hvor »overvældende og øjeblikkelig« den skade er, som det amerikanske finansministerium forbereder sig på at påføre den russiske økonomi og finanssystem, og at gøre dette i samarbejde med London, hvad enten de kontinentale, europæiske allierede er enige med dette eller ej.

I oktober 1962 var det USA's sydlige grænse, der var truet, på nært hold, af sovjetiske soldater og missiler i Cuba, som truede med et ødelæggende førsteslag. I dag er det NATO's uophørlige fremmarch, tættere og tættere på Ruslands grænser. (Læs John F. Kennedys udtalelse på engelsk nedenfor.)

Ydermere krævede USA's militærchefer en invasion af Cuba for at ødelægge missilerne og andre styrker, og præsident Kennedy holdte dem tilbage – med megen møge.

Hvis ikke Kennedy og Khrusjtjov havde fundet en forhandlet løsning på Cuba-krisen, hvad ville da sandsynligvis være sket? Hundrede millioner af mennesker verden over var rædselsslagne over en umiddelbar atomkrig.

Hvordan var præsident Kennedys krav anderledes end dem fra præsident Vladimir Putins foreslåede aftale den 7. december til præsident Joe Biden? ...Kennedy og Khrusjtjov ønskede begge en løsning, og ikke én, hvor den anden præsident og hans nation blev ydmyget eller tilintetgjort gennem »overvældende, øjeblikkelig«, national beskadigelse!

Det er det, som nu må forhandles mellem præsident Biden og Putin, ved at tilsidesætte krigshøgene – nogle af dem der er så klinisk sindssyge, at de foreslår et atomart førsteslag mod

Rusland, som senator Roger Wicker gjorde det den 7. december. Men en løsning må og kan opnås, hvis borgere nu rejser sig og kræver dette, og forbliver optimistiske om, at disse to nationer kan blokere den faretruende vej mod optrapning og stormagtskrig. Lad dem i stedet bruge deres energi på at forsyne Afghanistan med mad, sundhedspleje og genopbygning.

For 60 år siden fortalte præsident John F. Kennedy nationen følgende i en direkte, national TV-tale: "Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere." The President concluded: "But this secret, swift, and extraordinary buildup ... in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere ... this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil—is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country..."

**Organisationen for islamisk
Samarbejde forpligter sig til
koordineret støtte til
Afghanistan;**

verden må skride til handling – vores 'historiske mission'

Den 19. december (EIRNS) – I søndags mødtes Ministrenes Råd fra Organisationen for islamisk Samarbejde (OIC) i et ekstraordinært samråd (session) i Pakistan og blev enige om forslag for koordineret humanitær støtte til Afghanistan, samt økonomiske tiltag. Mekanismer for at følge disse til dørs blev fastlagt, således at OIC's beslutninger kunne realiseres. Mere end 70 delegerede deltog, som repræsenterede medlemslande, gæstnationer, internationale, finansielle og FN-relaterede -nødhjælpsagenturer. Med 57 medlemslande er OIC den næststørste sådan organisation efter De forenede Nationer. Men selv med dette, vil det som vil bestemme hvad der sker med den afghanske befolkning og nation, den større omkringliggende region, samt verdenssituationen, være en nødvendig forandring i tilgangen, væk fra den dødelige geopolitik og påbegyndelsen af fælles, positiv handling blandt stormagterne.

Dette blev understreget i fredags – åbningsdagen af det tre dage lange OIC-møde i Islamabad – af Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som deltog i en diskussion, der blev vist på Pakistans nationale TV, PTV, som nøje fulgte OIC-begivenheden. Hun sagde følgende: »I en vis forstand er det at samle alle internationale kræfter for at hjælpe Afghanistan, efter min mening en af de allervigtigste, historiske missioner. På en vis måde tror jeg, at hele menneskeheden er som en laser, koncentreret om hvad der sker i Afghanistan. Så, jeg vil virkelig håbe, at alle de deltagende og berørte nationer vil fordoble og flerdoble deres anstrengelser for at gøre redningen af Afghanistan til et tema for hele verden, fordi det er det lige nu. Og jeg mener, at alle fremgangsmåder må tages i brug: medier, FN, konferencer. Der bør være et trommeslag, et trommeslag for at vække verdens

samvittighed, fordi jeg tror, at dette er en slags bedømmelse af vores evner som menneskehed: er vi i stand til, moralsk, at overleve eller ej?»

Hvad der sker her til aften er, at tilsagn begynder at komme fra OIC-nationer, angående donationernes størrelser, som har til formål at yde den hårdt tiltrængte støtte. Baseret på de første udmeldinger omfatter rammerne for den tildelte bistand flere funktioner. En resolution om, at OIC vil oprette en Humanitær Fond og et Program for Fødevarerikkerhed blev enstemmigt vedtaget. OIC-mødet opfordrede til, at den eksisterende Islamiske organisation for Fødevarerikkerhed (IOFS) arbejder med dette nye Program for Fødevarerikkerhed for Afghanistan, herunder brugen af IOFS-reserver, hvis dette giver mening. Den Humanitære Fond står til at blive operationsklar i løbet af det første kvartal i 2022, under Den islamiske Udviklingsbanks regi.

I Kabul skal den eksisterende OIC-mission styrkes med større logistiske, finansielle og menneskelige ressourcer for at gøre det muligt for den at koordinere operationer med globale agenturer og partnerskaber. Under disse inkluderes de åbenlyse FN-agenturer, fra UNICEF til Verdens Fødevareriprogram, samt andre organisationer. En prioritet vil blive lagt på at samarbejde med Verdens Sundhedsorganisation indenfor vacciner og medicinske forsyninger.

Der vil være støtte til de afghanske flygtninge, som er flygtet til nabolande, og til de internt fordrevne i Afghanistan selv. Det vurderes, at 665.000 mennesker er blevet fordrevet blot imellem januar og september 2021, udover de allerede 2,9 millioner fordrevne i deres nation. Kortfattet: 60% af befolkningen på 38 millioner mennesker trues med -hungersnød og manglen på livets fornødenheder.

Konferencen bød velkommen til Usbekistans tilbud om, i fællesskab med FN, at skabe et regionalt, logistisk knudepunkt i byen Termez for at håndtere fragten af humanitært materiel

til Afghanistan. OIC-mødet godkendte ambassadør Tarig Ali Bakhit Salah, assisterende generalsekretær for humanitære, kulturelle og familiære Anliggender ved OIC-sekretariatet, som OIC's Særlige Udsendte i Afghanistan for OIC's Generalsekretær for at koordinere indsatsen og rapportere til OIC.

Det meddeles af AP Pakistan (APP), at der var en indtrængende appel for at bygge storstilede projekter i det multinationale område for at tilvejebringe genopbygning og udvikling. Overordnet set burde dette inkludere energi-, transport- og kommunikationsprojekter. To af disse var TAPI-rørledningen og TAP-ledningen, som skal overføre strøm mellem Turkmenistan, Afghanistan og Pakistan. Diskussionens deltagere henledte opmærksomheden på vigtigheden af Den økonomiske Samarbejdsorganisations 15. topmøde, som mødtes den 28. november 2021 i Ashgabat i Turkmenistan.

Det andet område af OIC-initiativer, parallelt med arbejdet indenfor humanitær støtte, fødevarerhjælp og anti-pandemiske tiltag, er i skabelsen af bank-, kredit- og relaterede rammebetingelser, som skal tjene en genetableret, - fungerende økonomi, samt til genopbygning. Ifølge APP vedtog Udenrigsministrenes Råd, at de første forhandlinger, »der skulle frigøre finansielle og bank-relaterede veje for at genoprette likviditet, samt - finansiell og humanitær assistance«, burde begynde under vejledningen af OIC's Generelle Sekretariat og Den islamiske Udviklingsbank. APP tilføjede, at deltagere diskuterede at »udforske realistiske måder, hvorpå Afghanistans finansielle aktiver kunne frigøres«.

Det er her, at en direkte konfrontation kommer ind i billedet med London, Washington D.C. og medsammensvorne, der - uberettiget insisterer på at tilbageholde 9,5 milliarder dollars af Afghanistans statsaktiver, som er svært nødvendige for regerings- og økonomiske funktioner. En særlig styg, dobbeltmoralisk offentlighedskampagne finder sted i USA, hvor åbne breve blev offentliggjort i den seneste uge, hvor

krokodilletårer blev fældet, og det blev påstået, at nogle af de 9,5 milliarder dollars burde blive frigivet og brugt til »direkte at afhjælpe det afghanske folk«, men kun hvis de kunne overføres direkte til FN og andre agenturer, hverken relateret til Kabul-regeringen eller Taliban. Et af brevene var fra forhenværende militære personligheder, som står i forbindelse med det berygtede Atlantiske Råd, og det andet brev var fra 39 kongresfolk, enten uvidende, blåøjede, korrupte eller alle tre.

Ingen nation eksisterer uden fungerende institutioner. Ingen uafhængighed er mulig uden økonomisk suverænitet. At tilbageholde finansielle midler, eller på uberettiget vis kontrollere beslutningstagningen over benyttelsen af disse, er ensbetydende med at ødelægge en nation. Dette vil fuldføre opgaven gennem folkemord, hvilket 20 år med militær tilstedeværelse og manglen på udvikling ikke var i stand til i Afghanistan. Dette er en moralsk prøve for Vesten.

Hvad de finansielle midler bør bruges til, samt hvad der generelt må gøres i Afghanistan, er præsenteret i et nyudgivet *EIR*-interview med Dr. Shah Mehrabi, som i 20 år sad i bankbestyrelsen i DA Afghanistan Bank, Afghanistans centralbank.

Vores rolle i at udbrede sådanne politiske tiltag er uundværlig, parallelt med at bringe sandheden om størrelsesordenen af Afghanistans krise, som fuldstændig udelukkes af den transatlantiske presse. Zepp-LaRouches opråb for Operation Ibn Sina, som vil skabe en moderne sundhedsplatform i landet, er en opfordring til at verden agerer. At rette lyset på Afghanistan, og mobilisere for det som må gøres, udbreder forståelse af nødvendigheden for at gøre en ende på grebet fra den imperialistiske udenrigspolitik og det globalistiske finanssystem overalt, som nu bryder sammen og truer med atomkrig.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche afsluttede sine bemærkninger på PTV den 17. december, ved at sammenfatte situationen således: »Så, i en vis forstand tror jeg, at Afghanistans skæbne og menneskehedens skæbne er langt tættere forbundet end de fleste mennesker kan forestille sig.«

Links:

Et *EIR*-interview med Dr. Shah Mohammad Mehrabi, som sidder i den regerende bestyrelse af Afghanistans centralbank (Da Afghanistan Bank), er blevet offentliggjort i video- og tekstformat. Heri går han i dybden med det, som er nødvendigt for at Afghanistan kan fungere økonomisk. Interviewet har titlen: »Amerikansk politik 'kvæler det afghanske folk'«:

<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/12/18/interview-with-dr-shah-mehrabi-u-s-policy-is-suffocating-the-afghan-people/>

Fire repræsentanter for Schiller Instituttet blev interviewet på Pakistans PTV i forbindelse med OIC-konferencen:

Stifteren af Schiller Instituttet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og Hussein Askary:

<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/12/19/pakistan-tv-special-broadcast-on-oic-extraordinary-meeting-on-afghanistan-gets-briefing-from-helga-zepp-larouche-hussein-askary/>

Harley Schlanger:

https://youtu.be/_sb7eD5sLdc

Karel Vereycken:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Td7T64hPNq0>

Putin og Xi tager tyren ved hornene

Den 15. december (EIRNS) – Den russiske præsident, Vladimir Putin, og den kinesiske præsident, Xi Jinping, afholdt det som svarede til et hastetopmøde i dag i en videokonference. Topmødet, offentliggjort for kun to dage siden, tog fat om to forskellige slags »atomkrige«, som de to lande trues med gennem det krigsgale og bankerotte britisk-amerikanske finansetablisement:

1) Opfordringen den 7. december fra senator Roger Wicker (republikaner fra Mississippi) om at overveje militære angreb baseret på »førstebrugen af atomvåben« (»first-use nuclear action«), og bruge krisen omkring Ukraine som retfærdiggørelsen. Wicker er den næsthøjst rangerende - republikaner i Senatets Komité for væbnet Tjeneste. På trods af den storm af protester, fra venstre og højre side af det politiske spektrum, som hans udtalelse udløste, har senatoren stadig ikke trukket sin hovedløse provokation tilbage. Samtidig fortsætter NATO sin østlige udvidelse, samt at væbne Ukraine og andre nationer der ligger helt op til Ruslands grænse – en udvidelse, som ifølge Ruslands advarsler, krydser en rød streg og vil føre til et svar fra russisk side.

2. Gentagne opfordringer til at aktivere den »atomare - valgmulighed« i finansiel krigsførelse mod Rusland – at smide dem ud af det globale finansielle betalingssystem, SWIFT. Dette ville svare til en finansiel belejring af Rusland for at forsøge at sulte dem til at underkaste sig, som dette i øjeblikket gøres mod Afghanistan. Den amerikanske viceudenrigsminister, Victoria Nuland, arkitekten af det nazistiske kup i Ukraine i 2014, opfordrede blot forrige uge til denne »atomare valgmulighed«, og udenrigsminister Tony Blinken truede offentligt med dette lige efter topmødet

mellem Biden og Putin den 7. december. Lignende trusler blev udtrykt af præsident Biden selv umiddelbart før sit møde med Putin i juni 2021.

Hvad diskuterede Putin og Xi i dag, efter pressens kameraer var blevet slukket? De gennemgik naturligtvis krigsfarens og deres fælles forpligtelse i at hjælpe med at styrke hinandens sikkerhed i lyset af truslerne omkring Ukraine og Taiwan. Dertil giver den offentlige gennemgang, leveret af Kreml-rådgiveren, Yuri Ushakov, yderligere indsigt: »Særlig opmærksomhed blev givet af de to ledere på nødvendigheden af at intensivere anstrengelserne for at skabe en uafhængig, finansiel infrastruktur for at muliggøre handelsoperationer mellem Rusland og Kina. Det vil sige at skabe en infrastruktur, som ikke kan påvirkes af tredje lande.«

Betyder dette, at Rusland og Kina snart vil meddele, at de er i færd med at træde ud af dollarsystemet og afkoble deres økonomier fra Vesten? Sandsynligvis ikke. Betyder det, at de har forberedt defensive tiltag for at kunne håndtere en finansiel »atomar valgmulighed«, igangsat mod dem? Sandsynligvis.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche kommenterede i dag, at hvis Rusland og Kina tvinges til at vedtage storstilede modforanstaltninger imod SWIFT-systemet, da kunne dette meget vel være dråben, der fik hele det transatlantiske finanssystems bære til at flyde over. Heldigvis eksisterer potentialet i forbindelse med Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ til at overtage dets rolle, og at erstatte nutidens malthusianske afindustrialiserings- og affolkningspolitik med et nyt system, fokuseret på højteknologisk, fysisk-økonomisk vækst.

Tag et skridt tilbage og overvej Putins nylige diplomatiske initiativer – den samme Putin, som Lyndon LaRouche ofte beskrev som et »strategisk geni«, der ikke burde undervurderes. Putin sørgede for at flankere sit kritiske

topmøde den 7. december med præsident Biden: inden dette, med et topmøde den 6. december i New Delhi med Indiens premierminister Modi, og efter dette, med dagens hastetopmøde med præsident Xi. Et andet emne, diskuteret mellem Putin og Xi, ifølge Ushakov, var intentionen om at afholde et topmøde mellem Rusland, Indien og Kina i den nærmeste fremtid.

Og USA? Præsident Biden, sammen med kredse, der måske kunne beskrives som »realisterne« i Washington, virker tilbøjelige til at søge en forhandlet løsning til krisen omkring Rusland og Ukraine. Men hans politiske paladsgarde – Blinken, Sullivan, Nuland, m.fl. – er ikke, og indtil videre er de de dominerende skikkelser i Washington. Ej heller er ejerne af det vestlige, spekulative finanssystem i forhandlingsstemning – det er ikke en mulighed for dem. Deres system er i gang med at bryde sammen, og deres eneste håb er at gennemtvinge en overgang til en fascistisk, malthusiansk verdensorden.

For at Amerika skal kunne overleve og blomstre, må det vedtage retningen, længe foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche, der etablerer en firemagts-alliance med magten til at indlede et Nyt Paradigme i global udvikling – en alliance blandt USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, som handler på vegne af hele menneskeheden.

Billede: www.kremlin.ru

Operation Ibn Sina: Det

afgørende våben i den nuværende »krig om idéer«

Den 14. december (EIRNS) – De hurtige forandringer i den internationale, strategiske situation kræver, at vi retter vores opmærksomhed på at besvare dette afgørende spørgsmål: Hvordan kan idéer, såsom interventionen fra Komitéen for modsætningernes Sammenfald i verdens sundhedskrise, samt »Operation Ibn Sina«, et militært og strategisk, såvel som filosofisk, alternativ til den dødbringende geopolitik i Sydvestasien, omdanne den nuværende, tydeligvis fejlslagne liste af »troværdige politiske valgmuligheder« for at sikre, ikke blot fortsat menneskelig overlevelse, men sågar en økonomisk velstand uden sidestykke? Med andre ord, er det sandt, at en idé, under visse betingelser, som repræsenterer et dybere, uset, højere »poetisk« princip, kan blive til en virksomhedsfuld politik, måske budt velkommen af store dele, eller sågar hele menneskeheden, således at ufuldkomne personer og ledere »selv imens de benægter og afsværger, alligevel formås til at tjene den magt, som sidder på tronen af deres egne sjæle«?

Tre udviklinger i de sidste 48 timer antyder muligheden for en stor, dybdegående og vedvarende forandring. Disse udviklinger viser også, at dem, der handler fra den kreative fornufts »højere domæne«, ikke blot er klogere, men kan udmanøvrere dem, der ikke gør dette.

Ét: Det russiske afslag, støttet af nationerne, Indien og Kina, hver med »én milliard plus« individer, af FN's sikkerhedsråds resolution, som erklærer, at »klimaforandringer er en global sikkerhedstrussel«. Dette går imod det geopolitiske fremstød, der har været under opsejling i årevis for at sætte sloganet »klimaforandringer« i stedet for »ressourceknaphed« – det tidligere argument, der kan findes i dokumenter som »Det nationale Sikkerhedsstudie 200:

Konsekvenser af verdensomspændende befolkningsvækst for USA's sikkerhed og oversøiske Interesser« (»National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests«). [I studiet stod der, at befolkningsvækst i udviklingslande var en trussel mod USA's nationale sikkerhed, fordi disse lande dermed ville bruge deres egne, vigtigste naturressourcer, som USA havde brug for – *red.*] Disse tre nationer, som repræsenterer 40% af verdens befolkning, forsvarede dem der var for svage, for nedtrådte eller opdelte til at forsvare sig selv.

Rusland og Kina i særdeleshed er klare over, at rapporten, »Den verdensomspændende trusselsvurdering udarbejdet af det amerikanske efterretningssamfund fra 2019«, blev skrevet efter sabotagen af det panel, som skulle have været ledt, efter Præsident Trumps anmodning, af fysikeren, William Happer, som fik en plads i Det nationale Sikkerhedsråd. Panelet havde til hensigt at undersøge den falske, (såkaldt) videnskabelige fortælling om "forbindelsen" mellem CO₂-udledninger og global opvarmning. Trump afviste - Trusselsvurderingen fra 2017, som oprindeligt havde påstået det samme, og han bragte Happer ind i administrationen i 2018. Men før Happers komité overhovedet kunne nå at mødes, blev den saboteret – sandsynligvis fra CIA's side, ifølge én kilde – og gennemgangen blev aldrig foretaget.

Rapporten fra 2019 konkluderede, at klimaforandringer er menneskeskabte og en betydelig trussel mod den nationale - sikkerhed. På side 23 står der: »Global miljømæssig og økologisk nedbrydning, såvel som klimaforandringer, vil højst sandsynligt fremskynde konkurrencen om ressourcer, økonomisk nød og social utilfredshed gennem 2019 og derudover... Aftagende arktisk havis kunne forøge konkurrence – særligt med Rusland og Kina – i adgangen til søruter og naturlige ressourcer«. På side 24, en side senere, under titlen, »Regionale trusler: Kina og Rusland«, står der: »Kina og Rusland vil give

udfordringer for USA og deres allierede indenfor en bred vifte af økonomi, politik, kontraspionage, militær og diplomati. Vi forventer, at de vil samarbejde for at modvirke amerikanske mål, og drage fordel af den stigende tvivl om den liberale, demokratiske model i nogle områder.« Det er det, som rent faktisk blev udmanøvreret af Rusland, Kina og, på en anderledes måde, Indien, gennem deres ageren i FN i mandags.

To: Det atlantiske Råd (Atlantic Council) udgav i mandags et åbent brev til Præsident Biden under overskriften: »Afghanistan er ved at bryde sammen. Her er hvad USA bør gøre ved det«. Det var underskrevet af 13 amerikanske diplomater og militært personel, inklusive Ryan Crocker, James Cunningham, James Dobbins, David Petraeus og andre. Det indeholder følgende afsnit:

»Udover fødevarer og medicin, har Afghanistan brug for en stabil valuta og et fungerende banksystem for at undgå et omsiggribende sammenbrud af økonomien og regeringen. - Sundhedshjælpere, lærere og andre uundværlige arbejdere har brug for at blive betalt, hvis statens mest grundlæggende funktioner skal bevares. Almindelige afghanere fortjener adgang til deres egne penge, nu indefrosset i banker, som er bange for amerikanske og internationale sanktioner, samt det mulige sammenbrud af det afghanske finanssystem.«

Lyder positivt, ikke sandt? Dernæst: »diskussioner er undervejs i Washington og andre steder for at *udforske forskellige måder for at stabilisere den afghanske valuta og at undgå kollapset af banksystemet, uden at forsyne Taliban med ekstra ressourcer, som kunne bruges til ildesindede formål*. Gode idéer til hvordan dette kan gøres er til stede, herunder forslag fra forhenværende ambassadører, USAID-direktører og embedsmænd fra Verdensbanken, blandt andre. *Eftersom et hvilket som helst tiltag i denne retning vil være kontroversielt, og intet kontrolsystem er perfekt, - kræver det mod at handle*«.

Når som helst man hører sætningen »mod til at handle« fra disse kredse, som »handler« overalt i verden, hele tiden, ofte i dit navn og uden din tilladelse, vær påpasselig og fortsæt med forsigtighed. Dem der har læst bogen: »*En økonomisk lejemorders bekendelser*« (»*Confessions of An Economic Hit-Man*«), af John Perkins, kan genkende tankegangen her. Der er rent faktisk intet om nødvendigheden af at stabilisere den afghanske nation her – men der er, på den anden side, en anden vigtig, bevægende faktor. »Jo længere beslutninger udskydes, desto sværere vil det blive at forhindre den overhængende humanitære katastrofe i landet og døden for mange afghanere« – dødsfald, hvis skyld vil ligge hos USA, NATO og dem der har afvist »Operation Ibn Sina«, eller noget som helst reelt nødsamarbejde med nationerne i området. Operation Ibn Sina er et sådant samarbejde, foreslået af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og involverer Pakistan, USA, Kina og Rusland, såvel som Usbekistan og alle nationerne rundt om Afghanistan. Sådant et samarbejde, særligt i lyset af Putin-Biden-diskussionerne om spændingerne, der finder sted på grænsen mellem Ukraine og Rusland, både den russiske og amerikanske militære erfaring i Afghanistan og muligheden for et samarbejde mellem »modsætningerne« i det gode formåls tjeneste, samt medlemmer af andre religiøse overbevisninger, særligt til juletid, burde forfølges så meget desto mere. Operation Ibn Sina, så »usandsynlig« som den måske virker, er en krigsvindende strategi mod de reelle fjender – »fattigdom, sult, sygdom og krigen selv«.

Tre: Bevismateriale, nøje sammenstillet i Danmark og Norge, med hensyn til coronavirussets omikron-variant, viser, at selv dem der har fået to vaccinstik har en meget høj smitterate [Danmarks myndigheder har igangsat en stor indsats for et tredje vaccine-boosterstik, hvilket de håber vil være meget effektivt, som et britisk studie viste – *red.*]. Dette rejser det åbenlyse spørgsmål: Hvad hvis omikron var ligeså dødelig som deltaviruset, hvilket den virker til ikke at være? Hvad ville vi gøre ved det? Selv uden dette, hvad er der ved at ske

med hospitalsvæsenerne verden over, som er ved at blive oversvømmet af omikrontilfælde – og muligvis, hvert eneste dag det skulle være, en endnu mere dødbringende variant? Opråbet fra Dr. Jocelyn Elders til en global dialog og konference for at katalysere en verdensøkonomisk nødplatform, hvor upraktisk det end måtte lyde, er »sejrens hvælving« hvorunder verdens svageste og stærkeste, rigeste og fattigste, må mødes, hvis det skal lykkes at overleve.

Lyndon LaRouche sagde følgende i december 1985: »I en sand republik, er sande borgere personligt ansvarlige overfor Skaberen, for virkeliggørelsen af denne republik; for virkeliggørelsen af det almene vel, da det påvirker alle personer i denne republik; for virkeliggørelsen, således, af hvert personligt liv i denne republik, samt virkeliggørelsen af denne republiks rolle i verden; for menneskehedens almene vel som helhed og hver eneste individuel personlighed, nutidig og fremtidig, af menneskeheden som en helhed. Den individuelle borger af en republik er personligt ansvarlig overfor Skaberen i den grad, at det individ enten har evnen til at påvirke tingenes gang, eller kan udvikle den nødvendige evne til at påvirke tingenes gang.« Måske benægter og afsværges vi, men vi kan også tjene fornuftens og skønhedens højere magt, hvilket, hvis vi er heldige, »selv i vores trods«, vil side og råde på tronen af vore egne sjæle.

Billede: Aga Khan Foundation: Sandra Calligaro

**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>

Er nogle af eliterne ved at komme til fornuft?

Den 10. december (EIRNS) – Måske er det tydeligste bevis på, at Præsident Biden rent faktisk forsøger at stoppe 3. verdenskrig en overskrift i dag i Londons førende avis, *Daily Telegraph*: »Joe Bidens tilbud om NATO-forhandlinger for at undgå en russiske invasion af Ukraine er en stor sejr for Vladimir Putin.«

Bidens meddelelse, efter topmødet med Putin den 7. december, at et møde snart ville finde sted mellem USA, Frankrig, Tyskland, Italien og Storbritannien, sammen med Rusland, for at diskutere Putins opfordring til lovbundne garantier om, at NATO hverken ville bevæge sig tættere på den russiske

grænse eller opstille store våbensystemer på dets grænse, har sendt kuldegysninger gennem de angloamerikanske, imperiale institutioner. Den russiske *Telegraph*-korrespondent, Roland Oliphant, havde følgende at sige: »Russiske diplomater/embedsmænd/hvem som helst fortæller mig, at de har ønsket at have denne samtale bogstavelig talt i årevis. Jeg troede aldrig, at de ville få den, men nu sker det.«

Flere russiske embedsmænd har udtrykt »forsigtig optimisme« om, at den ekstremt farlige fremstormen mod militærkonfrontation kan vendes rundt. Som udtrykt af Senator Vladimir Dzhubarov, viceformand for den Russiske Føderations Udenrigskomité: »Det der er betryggende er, at Biden i sidste ende er en politiker fra den gamle skole... Vi håber, at den kloge Biden vil forhindre, at den røde linje bliver overskredet.«

Fareniveauet kan ikke overdrives. Sergej Ryabkov, Ruslands viceudenrigsminister, fortalte føderationsrådet den 9. december: »Uheldigvis oplever vi, at vores advarsler bliver ignoreret, og NATO's militære infrastruktur rykker så tæt på os som muligt.« Spurgt om dette kunne nå samme niveau som Cuba-krisen i 1962, sagde Ryabkov, at det fuldt ud var muligt, »hvis kammeraterne på den anden side ikke forstår det og fortsætter med at gøre hvad de gør... Det ville være diplomatiets komplette fiasko, en udenrigspolitisk fiasko, men der er stadig tid til at forsøge at nå en aftale baseret på fornuft... Folk indser, at det ikke kan fortsætte længere i den retning.«

I 1962 undgik Præsident John Kennedy og sin bror, Robert, den daværende justitsminister og præsidentens tætteste rådgiver, med nød og næppe krig mod Sovjetunionen gennem klogt, og stille, diplomati, som gjorde en ende på et atomart opgør, gennem kompromis. Oliver Stone, der har udgivet filmen med titlen: »Gensyn med JFK, en dokumentar« (»JFK Revisited, A Documentary«), 30 år efter sin berømte film, »JFK«, fra

1991, påpegede den 6. december, at »efter Kennedy blev dræbt har ingen amerikansk præsident, ikke én – tænk over det – været i stand til at røre det militære kompleks, eller dette efterretningskompleks«. Om »politikeren fra den gamle skole«, Joe Biden, vil være i stand til at gentage Kennedys diplomati i det nuværende atomare opgør – denne gang både med Rusland og Kina – vil afhænge af niveauet af internationalt pres, dels fra en oprørt amerikansk befolkning, som nu begynder at vågne op på grund af det sammenbrud, der finder sted i næsten alle dele af livets facetter i USA selv, samt fra et internationalt samfund, der i stigende grad er blevet klar over, at USA er på vej mod en krig, som kunne gøre en ende på civilisationen, som vi kender den.

Indenfor de sidste to uger har en førende, amerikansk diplomat og en forhenværende ledende CIA-medarbejder ladet sig interviewe af *EIR*, og begge har sendt advarsler gennem denne platform om, at der er galninge i magtpositioner, som forsøger at få landet i krig mod Rusland, Kina og Iran.

Ambassadør Chas Freeman, der spillede en vigtig rolle i påbegyndelsen af relationer med Kina i 1970'erne og i at formulere de amerikanske relationer med både Kina og Taiwan på det tidspunkt, fortalte *EIR* den 29. november, at Trump- og Biden-administrationerne er trådt over den »røde linje«, hvilket kunne fremprovokere en krig mod Kina: »Hvad det ømfindtlige spørgsmål om Taiwan i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer angår, accepterede USA grundlæggende set tre betingelser: ét, at vi ville afslutte relationerne med Taipei; to, at vi ville tilbagetrække alt militærpersonel og anlæg på øen; og tre, at vi ville opgive vores forsvarsforpligtelser til øen. Vi er nu trådt tilbage fra hver eneste af de forpligtelser.«

Graham Fuller, en specialist i Islam, som tjente 20 år i CIA, herunder fire år i Hongkong, fortalte *EIR* den 9. december (et interview der snart vil blive udgivet), at USA's eliter er

blevet ude af stand til at acceptere, at nationen ikke længere er den eneste, herskende magt i verden, og at Kina er opstået som »næsten ligeværdig« konkurrent indenfor næsten hvert eneste område. Hvis USA ikke formår at »dæmpe sin retorik«, advarede han, så kunne konsekvensen blive en katastrofe. Han tilføjede, at det at kalde Iran for en »terrorstat« er grotesk, mens det at anklage Kina for folkemord mod uighurerne var latterligt.

Både Chas Freeman og Graham Fuller tror ikke, at Præsident Biden ønsker en krig, men ingen af dem har tiltro til, at han kan overvinde afhængigheden af krig blandt USA's eliter og det militære industrielle kompleks. Faren er stor, og i sådanne historiske situationer er hvert individs potentielle magt langt større, eftersom en bekymret og skræmt befolkning leder efter sandheden bag løgnene, der kommer fra politikerne og medierne. Det er på tide at lytte til Lyndon LaRouches vise ord.

Picture: NATO Headquarters, Public picture

Psykopater udgør en risiko for vor eksistens! Tyskland må træde ud af Nato! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

I betragtning af den politiske orientering hos den nye regering i Berlin virker det næsten udsigtsløst at kræve en øjeblikkelig tysk udtrædelse af Nato. Men hvis Olaf Scholz mener det alvorligt med den embedsed han aflagde for to dage siden ved sin tiltræden som forbundskansler, nemlig at han vil

dedikere sin "kraft til gavn for det tyske folks vel, virke til gavn for det og beskytte det mod ulykker", så bør han øjeblikkeligt igangsætte denne udtræden. For i Nato og frem for alt i USA og Storbritannien er der indflydelsesrige kræfter, der af geopolitiske grunde leger med Tysklands og derudover også med hele menneskehedens eksistens. Den virkelige årsag til dette globale militære spil med musklerne på flere fronter er af det nyliberale systems forestående kollaps, som man prøver at tilsløre med en kompleks konfettiregn af antirussiske og antikinesiske beretninger.

Gennem flere uger har man opbygget et scenarie i medierne om en påstået forberedelse fra russisk side af en militær invasion i Ukraine, og Avril Haines, chefen for USA's nationale sikkerhedstjeneste, har endda forsøgt at overbevise Nato-ambassadørerne i Bruxelles om det, selv om det udtrykkeligt er blevet tilbagevist af Rusland. Uger igennem har man gennemført en række provokationer som for eksempel en Nato-manøvre, hvor man gennemspillede et atomangreb på Rusland, og hvor amerikanske fly nærmede sig 20 km til den russiske grænse, såvel som droneangreb i Østukraine og provokerende "orienteringsflyvninger" i Sortehavet.

Rusland har beskyldt Nato for at have overtrådt flere "røde linjer" i Ukraine og for ikke at have reageret på klagerne derover. Og op til det af præsident Biden foreslåede virtuelle topmøde mellem Biden og Putin på højdepunktet af spændingerne forlangte Putin retsligt bindende aftaler om, at Nato ikke skulle udvides nærmere mod den russiske grænse, hvilket Biden afviste med, at man ikke accepterede nogle "røde linjer" fra Ruslands side, medens Nato's generalsekretær Stoltenberg betonedede, at Rusland ikke havde nogen ret til at opbygge "indflydelsessfærer".

Midt under de eskalerende spændinger truede vicechefen for det amerikanske senats forsvarsudvalg, senator Roger Wicker fra Mississippi, med et førstehåndsangreb med atomvåben: "Militære aktioner vil sige, at vi overvælder det russiske militær med

ødelæggelse, at vi indsætter amerikanske tropper derovre. Vi udelukker ikke et førstehåndsangreb med atomvåben.”

Tulsi Gabbard, tidligere kongresmedlem fra Hawaii og pensioneret løjtnant i den amerikanske hær, kommenterede Wickers tirade: “Enhver, der foreslår sådan noget eller bare tager det som en mulighed, må være afsindig eller en sociopat eller en sadist.” Dog er Wicker med sine forslag, der ikke blot vil ødelægge det amerikanske folk og hele verden, men også ukrainerne, hvis demokrati, det angiveligt er, der skal beskyttes, ikke noget særtilfælde. Den samme retorik kommer både fra demokrater og republikanere i Kongressen, fra administrationen og medierne, fra de samme neokonservative og neoliberale kræfter, der trak landet ind i regimeskiftskrigen i Irak, Libyen og Syrien.

Man kan kun give Tulsi Gabbard ret. Den der gennem de sidste år har fulgt den stadigt eskalerende propaganda mod Rusland og Kina fra hele det amerikanske politiske spektrums side, bliver mindet om det udsagn, at den, som guderne vil ødelægge, ham driver de først til vanvid.

Indholdet af den to timer lange samtale mellem Biden og Putin er endnu ikke offentliggjort. Dog optog Biden kontakt med fire Nato-partnere angående kravet om en retsligt bindende aftale og lovede yderligere rådføringer med alle Nato-landene. Og naturligvis kender alle Europas regeringer den sande historie om det af Victoria Nuland understøttede kup i Ukraine i februar 2014, om Stephan Banderas nynazistiske gruppes rolle i kuppet og løgnet om Putins påståede besættelse af Krim, som i virkeligheden var en afstemning af Krims befolkning om, at de i betragtning af naziterroren i Kiev foretrak at tilhøre Rusland. Måske ville det være på tide, at de europæiske regeringer indrømmede sandheden om hændelserne i Ukraine, som de naturligvis var meddelagtige i gennem deres sammenslutninger, frem for at den tredje verdenskrig bryder ud på grund af en falsk historie om Putins påståede aggression.

Men selv om den akutte krigsfare kan svækkes midlertidigt – Biden taler om at udskyde Ukraines medlemskab af Nato ti år – så vedvarer den akutte fare for en ny verdenskrig.

Det anden farecenter, hvor en krig kan opstå og udvikle sig, er atomprogrammet i Iran og Trump-administrationens opsigelse af JPCOA-aftalen. Selv om CIA-chefen William Burns netop har bekræftet, at sikkerhedstjenesten ikke på nogen måde er bekendt med, at Iran skulle arbejde på et atomvåbenprogram, så ser Israel også en fare i det civile atomprogram – som Iran har fuld ret til at udvikle i følge folkeretten – sådan som Israels forsvarsminister Benny Gantz understregede det under sit nylige besøg i Pentagon, hvor den amerikanske forsvarsminister Austin bekræftede, at USA var fast besluttet på at hindre Iran i at anskaffe sig atomvåben.

Men den farligste situation er uden tvivl konflikten mellem USA og Kina om Taiwan. Efter at verden har nærmet sig faretruende mod den tredje verdenskrig på grund af tilspidsningen af forholdene i Ukraine, udtalte en række amerikanske politiske eksperter – og dette er nyt – sig om den amerikanske sædvane med at iscenesætte falske begrundelser for militære operationer. Således henviste den tidligere diplomat Peter Van Buren til eksplosionen af krigsskibet USS Maine i Havanas havn i 1898 (hvilket var anledningen til den spansk-amerikanske krig, og ikke var noget terrorangreb, men en eksplosion i selve skibet), til begivenheden i Tonkin-bugten, hvor USA fik et påskud til at påbegynde til længe planlagte vietnamkrig, og naturligvis til Irak-krigen i 2003, hvor alle de indblandede på forhånd var klar over, at påstanden om masseødelæggelsesvåben var en løgn, sådan som Nancy Pelosi indrømmede det offentligt.

Angående Kina skriver Van Buren: “Den næste krig ser ud som om den leder efter en årsag.” Eftersom Kina vægrer sig ved at marchere ind i Taiwan og dermed give USA en grund til at virkeliggøre sin krigsfeber, så er et oprustningskapløb inden for overlydsvåben blot det mindste problem. “Men hvad hvis USA

allerede er fast besluttet på en virkelig krig og blot søger efter en troværdig årsag?", spørger Van Buren og udtaler dermed det, der for længst er blevet indlysende. Kan man antage, at disse og flere andre begivenheder "under falsk flag" er de vestlige regeringer og partier velkendte? Bortset fra måske et par uerfarne partimedlemmer – afgjort! Derfor er de folk, der har deltaget i præsident Bidens "Demokrati-topmøde", som snarere burde kaldes et hyklertopmøde, nogenlunde lige så troværdige som organisatorerne af de berygtede "tæppe-busture", hvor godtroende pensionister pådattes plystæpper som "ægte persiske tæpper".

For ideen om, at det drejer sig en alliance af "gode kræfter", et værdifællesskab, der går ind for menneskerettigheder og frihed, mod de "onde", der undertrykker deres befolkninger, er et blikfang, hvor de udstyrer et fordærvet produkt med kosmetiske indgreb og udbyder det til salg.

Senest efter at den amerikanske administration og dens "forbundsfæller" har efterladt Afghanistan i en absolut katastrofal tilstand efter 20 års krig og har tilbageholdt penge, der tilhører afghanerne, og dermed forstærket den værste humanitære katastrofe på planeten, hvor 24 millioner mennesker trues af sulte- og kuldedød, bør ingen af disse agtværdige demokrater mere tage ordet menneskerettigheder i deres mund. Snarere bør man nævne de millioner af sårede, døde og flygtninge, som de endeløse, på falsk grundlag opbyggede krige har frembragt. Og hvad med Julian Assange, hvis eneste forbrydelse var at have afdækket krigsforbrydelser? Han bliver myrdet med juridiske midler i verdensoffentlighedens påsyn.

Man kunne forlænge denne liste med endnu mere: EU's krigeriske tilbagedrivelsespolitik mod flygtninge, der blot er flygtninge, fordi de er ofre for de "endeløse krige". Flygtningelejrene, som pave Frans har sammenlignet med koncentrationslejrene, følgerne af Klaus Schwab-typernes malthusianistiske politik, der anser forsøgene på at

overviende fattigdommen for den største trussel mod "klimaet", og derfor har kvalt enhver udvikling med deres betingelser gennem årtier?

Sammenlignet hermed tager de "enevældige" regerings succeshistorier sig ikke så dårligt ud. Kina har ikke blot befriet 850 millioner mennesker af sin egen befolkning fra dyb fattigdom og for første gang gjort det muligt for udviklingslandene at overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling. USA har ud af en befolkning på knap 330 millioner mennesker næsten 800.000 corona-døde, medens Kina med 1,4 milliarder mennesker har under 5000 døde. Måske – dette kunne de europæiske tæppesælgere jo engang prøve at tænke over – er menneskeliv mere værd for de "enevældige" regimer.

I Tyskland burde vi virkelig tænke indgående over, at det at forblive i en militærpagt, der i et krisetilfælde vil medføre vor udslettelse, måske ikke er så god en ide alligevel. Der eksisterer virkelig et alternativ til konfrontationspolitikken hos Nato, der siden 1991 faktisk er forældet. Der må oprettes en international sikkerhedsarkitektur, der tager hensyn til alle staters sikkerhed.

Fire minutter i midnat: Hvor tætte er vi egentlig på atomkrig?

Den 8. december (EIRNS) – Både Præsident Joe Biden og Præsident Vladimir Putin kommenterede offentligt i dag angående det egentlige indhold af deres diskussion ved topmødet i går. Biden bekendtgjorde, at han arbejder på at

sætte et yderligere topmøde op for at diskutere de røde linjer, som bekymrer Rusland, i forbindelse med Ukraine og NATO. »Den gode nyhed er, at indtil videre har vores hold haft løbende kontakt«, sagde Biden, og tilføjede at han håber på at kunne meddele før den 10. december, at der vil være et topmøde indenfor kort tid, som involverer Rusland, USA og mindst fire store NATO-allierede lande for at tage hånd om »Ruslands bekymringer i forhold til NATO« og forsøge at »bringe temperaturen ned langs østfronten«.

Præsident Putin forklarede i dag hvad bekymringerne i forbindelse med de røde linjer er: »Det ville være kriminel passivitet fra vores side slapt at betragte, hvad der finder sted« i Ukraine, sagde han, og fortsatte: »Vi har ret til at sørge for vores egen sikkerhed. Amerikanske/NATO-våben er problemet«. Som Putin gentagne gange har forklaret, vil NATO's udvidelse helt op til Ruslands grænse i løbet af de sidste 20 år, og nu den direkte trussel om, at Ukraine kunne tilslutte sig NATO, eller amerikanske og NATO-tropper på dets territorium, gøre Rusland umulig at forsvare – undtagen via brugen af hypersoniske atomvåben. Hver side ville så have atomvåben med en flyvetid indenfor 5 minutter af hinanden, bemærkede Putin.

Eller ville det være fire minutter?

Lige efter gårsdagens topmøde meddelte Kreml-assistenten, Juri Ushakov, pressen, at Biden fortalte Putin ved deres topmøde, at han ville diskutere NATO's østlige udvidelse med sine allierede kollegaer. Det ser ud til at være blevet bekræftet af Bidens egne kommentarer i dag.

Men fra Washingtons side kommer løgnene hurtigt og tætpackede – og signaliserer den enorme fare for krig, der ikke blot stadig eksisterer, men forøges hver time. Krigspartiet har taget initiativet til fuldstændigt at tage kontrollen over den strategiske politik ud af Bidens hænder og øjeblikkeligt optrappe

provokationerne mod både Rusland og Kina til bristepunktet. Udenrigsminister Tony Blinken og den nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Jake Sullivan, deltog i topmødet med Putin og agerede som Bidens støttepædagoger igennem hele forløbet, imens Putin sad alene. Blinken og Sullivan dukkede dernæst frem fra mødet for omgående at løbe til pressen for at udtale sig om hvad der angiveligt skete på topmødet – og undgik at nævne det planlagte møde, der skulle tage hånd om Ruslands bekymringer.

I stedet sagde Sullivan, at Biden læste Loven om Optøjer (Riot Act) op for Putin. Blinken var iskold og klar i sin levering af trusler og advarsler til både Rusland og Kina, og bebrejdede dem for kriserne i henholdsvis Ukraine og Taiwan, og truede med et frygteligt amerikansk svar på nogen form for militære træk, som de lande muligvis kunne fortage sig. Blinken var særlig skamløs angående etablissementets gambit med tilbagetrækningen fra Afghanistan, og argumenterede sågar, at det amerikanske folk stadig har »en appetit... for at genetablere os i udlandet igen, hvis det bliver nødvendigt« – altså, at påbegynde nye flerårige krige; blot, at det denne gang ville være direkte mod Rusland og Kina, præcis som Lyndon LaRouche allerede havde advaret var den sande strategiske hensigt bag provokationerne i Libyen, Irak, Syrien, Afghanistan, m.m.

Medmindre der er en seriøs opposition i USA mod en sådan krig mellem stormagterne, så vil det ske, advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag. Ukraine-krisen er langt fra overstået, og krigspartiet, anført fra London, er i gang med at hæрге, som dette kan ses med Blinkens trusler mod både Rusland og Kina, samt hans utilslørede hensigt om at udsulte den afghanske befolkning indtil de underkaster sig – hvis ikke dét er en Nürnberg-forbrydelse, er der intet der er. Vil amerikanerne bare kigge den anden vej, mens en senator, Robert Wicker fra Mississippi, på nationalt TV udtaler: »Jeg ville

ikke udelukke amerikanske tropper på fastlandet« i Ukraine, og at USA heller ikke skulle »udelukke anvendelsen af atomvåben, som de første« (»first-use nuclear action«) for at afskrække Rusland?

Zepp-LaRouche advarede yderligere, at hvis dette fortsætter meget længere, så vil lande i Europa, hvor atomvåben er opstillet, snart ophøre med at eksistere. På begge sider af Atlanterhavet burde det begynde at gå op for folk, hvad eksistensen af hypersoniske våben rent faktisk betyder.

I sit ugentlige webcast sammenfattede Zepp-LaRouche i dag situationen og opfordrede til handling:

»Min vurdering [af topmødet] er, at vi stadig sidder på en vulkan med en potentiel atomkrig... Jeg mener, at dette alt sammen er ekstremt farligt, og vi har omgående brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur i Europa og i Eurasien, som udelukker den mulige fare for atomkrig... Forhåbentlig vil fornuften sejre og denne utroligt farlige situation forvandles til noget andet.«

Hun mindede lytterne om sit forslag om Operation Ibn Sina, hvor verdens stormagter ville arbejde sammen for at stoppe den faretruende massedød i Afghanistan, og forsyne det land med et moderne sundhedsvæsen, tilstrækkelige fødevarer og den nødvendige infrastruktur for at muliggøre dette.

»Under pandemiens betingelser – hvilket ikke kun berører sundhed, men er en komplet trussel mod økonomien, som vi ser det i mange lande – er den eneste måde at italesætte de mest presserende spørgsmål som menneskeheden står over for, at sige: Vi bliver nødt til at fokusere på menneskehedens fælles mål, navnlig at overvinde pandemien, og vi bliver nødt til at arbejde sammen internationalt. Dette ville være et skridt i retningen af at overvinde denne vanvittige, ekstremt farlige geopolitiske konfrontation.«

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede lytterne til, sammen med Schiller Instituttet, at mobilisere for at stoppe faren for en

atomkrig. »Og samarbejde med os om Operation Ibn Sina, fordi det er et skridt i retningen af at afmontere en ellers ekstremt farlig situation.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale ved Schiller Instituttets videokonference den 6. december 2021: Omikron: Presserende behov for et verdenssundssystem

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Goddag! Jeg tror, at efter næsten to år med pandemi, siden COVID-19 blev opdaget, er det på tide at gennemgå, hvad vi har lært og hvilke fejl blev begået, og hvilke tiltag omgående må tages for at få pandemien under kontrol – for den er ikke under kontrol. I Tyskland har vi nu den fjerde bølge, som nok, i en vis forstand, kunne være undgået, eller det kunne have været en mindre fjerde bølge, eftersom alle advarselsslamperne allerede lyste i sommers. Biologer, epidemiologer fortalte politikerne, at uden visse tiltag kunne dette ske. Vi er nu kommet til det punkt i Tyskland, hvor prioriteringer af patienter diskuteres i flere stater. Prioriteringer er noget, som kun burde ske i tilfælde af uundgåelige naturkatastrofer eller i krigstid; ikke i den fjerde største økonomi i verden. I Frankrig handler det sågar om en femte bølge, og det er tydeligt, at det kunne komme til et sammenbrud af sundhedsvæsenet, fordi dette er, hvad nogle folk fra sundhedssektoren advarer om. Efter højdepunktet

sidste år er der nu omkring 5000 færre hospitalssenge; der er en tredjedel af sundhedspersonalet, som enten er trådt tilbage eller er ved at træde tilbage, simpelthen fordi de er ved at bryde sammen. De er fysisk udmattede, og de har ikke fået nogen kompensation for det enorme arbejde, som de har ydet. Så, vi befinder os bestemt ved et punkt, hvor vi omgående må komme op på hesten igen.

Jeg skrev en artikel i begyndelsen af marts 2020, hvor jeg sagde, at dette er en pandemi, og den eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan overvinde denne pandemi, er, at vi skaber et moderne sundhedssystem i hvert eneste land. Det var meget tydeligt, at man ikke kunne løse problemet i de såkaldte rige nationer, når virusset kunne færdes frit i udviklingslandene. Men efter to år, hvad er situationen? På nuværende tidspunkt har de ti rigeste lande fået omkring 60% af vaccinedoserne, hvorimod Afrika, eksempelvis, kun har vaccineret 7% af dets befolkning. Selvom det er for tidligt at sige noget deltaleret om denne nyeste mutation, omikron, ser det ud til, at den er mere smitsom; det er ikke klart om den er mere dødelig end deltavarianten. Men dette er i hvert fald en tidsbombe for alle, fordi hvis vi ikke forsyner hvert land med et moderne sundhedsvæsen – ikke blot en vaccine – så vil der være områder, hvor der bliver meget lidt vaccineret, hvor virusser muterer i nogle længere tidsperioder. I sidste ende kunne det nå et punkt, hvor det gjorde de vacciner, som allerede er blevet anvendt, ubrugelige. I sådanne tilfælde har forskellige farmaceutiske firmaer sagt, at de kunne udvikle en ny vaccine på tre uger. Men derefter ville der være tre måneders testning og tre måneders produktion, så det ville være et halvt år inden den nye vaccine kunne anvendes. I mellemtiden kunne en enorm katastrofe bryde ud.

Hvorfor er det, at USA har mere end 750.000 dødsfald med en befolkning på en smule mere end 300 millioner? Tyskland, med en befolkning på omkring 80 millioner, har haft mere end 100.000 dødsfald? Men Kina, med en befolkning på 1,3

milliarder mennesker har indtil nu ikke engang haft 5.000 dødsfald? Der er en tydelig lærestreg. I en vis forstand, hvis ikke Vesten er villig til at overveje hvad Kina gjorde godt og reflektere over årsagerne til, at fejltagelserne blev begået i Europa og USA, tror jeg ikke, at der kan rettes op på dette. Hvad de gjorde i Kina var, at de øjeblikkeligt anvendte alle de kendte standardtiltag i tilfælde af pandemi: isolation, karantæne, og de lukkede ned for en hel provins – Hubei – og byen Wuhan med 11 millioner mennesker; lukkede det ned i to måneder, anvendte alle tiltag disciplineret og havde derefter et system med en absolut nøje, digital kontaktsporing og omgående isolation, når et nyt tilfælde blev fundet. Argumentet var altid, at Kina er et meget styret land, og at man ikke kan gøre dette i såkaldte liberale samfund. Men i Tyskland blev der begået en masse fejl. Allererst sagde sundhedsministeriet i begyndelsen, at virusset aldrig ville komme til Tyskland, hvilket var en så meningsløs udtalelse, at det er svært at tro. Derefter var der ingen masker, og vacciner blev bestilt for sent. Dernæst, frem og tilbage, ingen koordinering, selv indenfor ét land. Så, meget af befolkningens tillid gik tabt, og en masse mennesker døde af grunde, som kunne have været forhindret. Jeg mener, at vi nu bliver nødt til at genoverveje situationen og indse, at denne sygdom kunne blive hos os, og nye sygdomme kunne opstå hvert eneste øjeblik. Der er nogle virologer, der allerede studerer muligheden af, at andre virusser udbredes og bliver til pandemier. Så, det er på høje tid, at vi virkelig påbegynder den slags tiltag, som burde være taget fra begyndelsen. Jeg tror, at det nu dæmrer, at medmindre vi fjerner hele kontinentets modtagelighed – at være en slags petriskål for udbredelsen af virusvarianter og -mutationer – så vil dette ikke blive bragt under kontrol.

Hvad det betyder er, at vi bliver nødt til at drage konklusionen af det faktum, først og fremmest, tror jeg, i

Europa og USA, at privatiseringen af sundhedsvæsenet var en stor fejltagelse; fordi sundhedspleje er et af de områder, hvor det almene vel må komme først, og ikke profitmaksimering. Det er simpelthen ligesom uddannelse, ligesom grundlæggende infrastruktur, disse er områder, som tilhører statens domæne. Det kan diskuteres, men jeg tror, at hvis vi ønsker at blive mere effektive i at sørge for folkets almene vel, så er dette hvad der må gøres.

Hvis man betragter udviklingslandene, så er de værste tilfælde lige nu åbenlyst Haiti og Afghanistan. Jeg kunne nævne Syrien og Yemen og andre lande, men lad os blive ved Afghanistan et øjeblik. Dette er et land, som, efter 20 år med krig under NATO-regi, var et land i ruiner, en uge, to uger efter at NATO havde trukket sig ud. Mere end 90% af befolkningen har ingen fødevarer sikkerhed, hvilket betyder, at mange millioner kunne dø denne kommende vinter. Mere end 90% af befolkningen har overhovedet ingen medicinske forsyninger. Dette er, midt under en pandemi, åbenlyst en uholdbar situation.

Så, derfor har vi foreslået at begynde dér med et moderne sundhedssystem; det betyder, at man må bygge moderne sygehuse. Kina har bevist i Wuhan, at man kan bygge et moderne sygehus med 1.000 senge på to uger. Vi kunne fremstille sådanne hospitaler i de industrialiserede lande og fragte dem til udviklingslande, som Afghanistan, og bygge dem hurtigt. Men dernæst er der brug for grundlæggende infrastruktur. Det kræver elektricitet; det kræver rent drikkevand. Der er to milliarder mennesker i verden, som ikke har adgang til rent vand. Det må der hurtigt gøres noget ved. Dernæst, for alt dette er der brug for omkring 200 gigawatt fra en stabil og sikker strømforsyning. Og naturligvis kræver alt dette, at der bygges grundlæggende infrastruktur. Så, i en vis forstand, hvis vi forstår, at denne pandemi har lært os, at vi er ét verdenssamfund, en menneskehed, så burde vi begynde med at bygge disse moderne sygehuse i hver nation og betragte det som

begyndelsen på overvindelsen af underudvikling, hvilket er grunden til, at denne pandemi kunne hærgne på den måde, som den gjorde.

Det betyder, at vi har brug for omkring 30.000 nye sygehuse i hele verden. Vi har brug for omkring 10 millioner nye hospitalssenge i disse sygehuse. Vi har brug for millioner af nye læger og sygeplejersker og sundhedsarbejdere. Dette burde omgående begynde med et træningsprogram, særligt for de unge mennesker, som burde få missionen at hjælpe med at uddanne befolkningen i hvad en pandemi er, hvorfor grundlæggende hygiejnetiltag er nødvendige. Op træningen af disse unge kunne blive begyndelsen på at integrere dem i et uddannelsesprogram for dette moderne sundhedssystem verden over.

Jeg tror, at hvis vi gjorde dette og begyndte i et par lande – vi burde gøre det i alle lande – hvis alle internationale kræfter ville arbejde sammen, herunder alle de største nationer, hvis de ville arbejde sammen om dette spørgsmål om et globalt sundhedsvæsen, så kunne vi øjeblikkeligt begynde at forandre retningen. Vi kunne få pandemien langt bedre under kontrol. Selvfølgelig er der mange tiltag, som også burde tages, såsom at ophæve (vaccine-)patenterne indtil videre, indtil vaccineproduktionen er tilstrækkelig i hele verden. Men jeg tror, at det centrale spørgsmål er at indse, at underudviklingen af hele kontinenter med milliarder af mennesker, at dette ikke er en naturlig tilstand for menneskeheden. Hvis vi ønsker at gøre noget for menneskeheden som helhed, så burde vi begynde med at overvinde denne underudvikling. Den bedste måde at gøre dette på er ved at bygge moderne sygehuse i hvert land og gennemføre de programmer, som hører med til det, hvilket alt i alt ville kræve omkring 1,5 mia. ny arbejdspladser. Hvis du tror, at det er for meget, så har ILO [Den internationale Arbejdsorganisation] udgivet tal, [som viser] at under pandemien, alene i 2020, gik en halv milliard arbejdspladser

tabt. Og det tager ikke engang hensyn til undergrundsøkonomien, så 1,5 milliarder nye produktive arbejdspladser er ikke for lidt.

I tilfældet af Afghanistan – jeg tror, at Dennis allerede henviste til det – hvad er mere åbenlyst end at give dette navnet Operation Ibn Sina? Ibn Sina, som levede fra 980 til 1037, var et universalgeni af fortræffelig kvalitet. Han hører til i samme kategori som Platon, Konfucius og Leibniz. Han var ikke blot et universalgeni, der udviklede de dybeste filosofiske begreber, men han er mest kendt for sit enestående bidrag til lægevidenskaben. Den mest berømte af hans mange bøger er *Medicinens Kanon*, som er en samling af både kroppens anatomi og forbindelsen mellem musklernes og nervernes systemer. Han opdagede mange nye sygdomme, som var fuldstændig skelsættende på hans tid. Han udviklede et helt medicinsk katalog. Hans bøger var delvist standarden indtil det 19. århundrede i Europa. Han er tydeligvis en af de enestående tænkere, som hører til blandt den bedste tradition af folk, hvor han kommer fra. I dette tilfælde er der en vis debat, angående om han tilhører usbekerne, tilhører afghanerne eller tilhører iranerne. Det er ikke så vigtigt, fordi han var fra denne region. Måske var kun hans far født i Afghanistan og han selv i Usbekistan, men det er blot en detalje, der ikke er relevant i forhold til det argument, som jeg fremsætter. Det jeg siger er, at en nation som Afghanistan, der nu er fuldstændig ødelagt efter 40 år med krig, hvor der er en overhængende fare for at miste millioner af mennesker, må have et synonym for den mest stolte og smukkeste tradition, hvor en søn af dette folk bidrog til universal viden. Fra den tilbagemelding, som vi har fået indtil videre fra mange mennesker i regionen, fra Yemen, fra Syrien, fra Pakistan, fra Iran, Afghanistan selv, er det en idé, som kan give denne bestræbelse et navn der inspirerer, og som giver et løfte om en bedre fremtid for hele det afghanske folk.

Så, vores forslag er, at vi mobiliserer vores kræfter omkring Operation Ibn Sina for at sige, at vi omgående har brug for at tage hånd om denne situation, ved at opbygge et moderne sundhedssystem, og at gøre dét til modellen for hvert eneste udviklingsland i verden. På den måde kan vi også begynde at give lande i den såkaldte udviklingssektor, der for det meste ikke ser særligt udviklede ud, at give dem en mission. Fordi en stor del af problemerne, som har ramt vores samfund, ligesom dette enorme tillidstab mellem folket og regeringerne, hvilket er et fremtrædende problem i USA og mange europæiske lande, som regeringernes opførsel i forbindelse med pandemien har bidraget til; det skal der hurtigt rettes op på. Og der er ingen bedre måde at rette op på det, end at give dem en fælles mission.

Dr. Elders, som I vil høre fra om et øjeblik, har skrevet dette brev for at tage hånd om dette spørgsmål, fordi på trods af videnskaben om virusset, så er der stadig et stort antal mennesker, der nægter at blive vaccineret. De har alle mulige forklaringer om, hvad vaccinationens formål er, hvilket er fuldstændig i modsætning til videnskaben om den. I Tyskland ser vi nu, at med de nye regler – den såkaldte G2-regel og andre sådanne regler – er der nu mange folk, som, måske også på grund af omikron-varianten, bliver vaccineret for første gang. Men der er stadig en del af befolkningen, som helt og holdent tror på, at dette er en sammensværgelse for at dræbe dem, og jeg vil ikke engang gå igennem de forskellige argumenter. Dette blander en masse virkelighed og fortolkning sammen, som gør det helt forkert. Så derfor opfordrede Dr. Elders virologer rundt om i verden til at samarbejde for at påbegynde en uddannelseskampagne for at forklare nogle meget grundlæggende fakta til befolkningen, hvilket tydeligvis ikke blev gjort af regeringerne i tide. For eksempel, hvad er forskellen mellem en pandemi og en epidemi? Hvad er standardprocedurerne i tilfældet af en pandemi? Hvordan fungerer et virus? Alle disse spørgsmål, som de fleste mennesker ikke har en klar forståelse

af. Bør vi have en obligatorisk vaccination eller ej? Dette er en stor debat i Tyskland lige nu, hvor tendensen fører i retningen af en obligatorisk vaccination. Er det den rigtige idé? Hvad er de etiske spørgsmål, der er involveret? Jeg tror, at det er meget vigtigt at inddrage befolkningen i en dialog, hvor idéen må være at genopbygge tilliden i befolkningen.

Så, jeg tror, at dette er en presserende nødvendighed. Jeg mener, at princippet som igen må stå i forreste række, hvilket jeg synes har meget at gøre med den hippokratiske ed, med lægelig ære, er, at menneskelivet må behandles som værende absolut enestående. Hvis man gerne vil diskutere det fra standpunktet af den religiøse tro, kan man sige at hvert menneskeliv bør betragtes som helligt. Det er helligt og unikt, fordi den menneskelige art er den eneste art i universet, der er blevet begavet med kreativ fornuft. Vi er den eneste art, der igen og igen kan opdage universets fundamentale love, hvilke, når de anvendes i videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt i produktionsprocessen, fører til en forøgelse i levestandarden, levetiden og en forbedring af livsbetingelserne. Det er det, som vi burde gøre for hele den menneskelige art. Så, jeg tror at dette menneskesyn bør være i denne diskussions centrum og ikke andre overvejelser – som profit eller andre idéer – som folk kunne have. Jeg ønsker at lade det være ved dette, med denne appel, at vi efter to år bliver nødt til at lære fra det der er sket, og virkelig bliver seriøse med at opbygge et moderne sundhedssystem i hvert eneste land på denne planet.

Efter Biden - Putin - topmødet

sidder vi stadig på en krudttønde Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 8. december 2021

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede en nøgtern vurdering af den globale strategiske situation efter det virtuelle topmøde den 7. december mellem præsidenterne Biden og Putin. Hun advarede om, at det der gik forud for topmødet – en krigstidslignende propagandakampagne, der beskylder Rusland for at forberede sig på at invadere Ukraine – fortsætter med potentielt katastrofale konsekvenser. Fremstødet for yderligere udvidelse af NATO mod øst, med et medlemskab for Ukraine, blev identificeret af Putin som at krydse en »rød streg«. Dette blev afvist af Biden, på trods af løfter givet af USA i 1990 om, at der ikke ville forekomme udvidelse mod øst. Truslen om atomkrig bliver rejst af andre end Schiller Instituttet, herunder Tucker Carlson, mens krigshøge som har mistet forstanden, såsom Senator Wicker fra Mississippi, opfordrer til, at USA overvejer muligheden for et første-atomvåbenangreb.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentog, hvordan hendes initiativ for at håndtere den forfærdelige krise i Afghanistan, Operation Ibn Sina, er en vej til samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina. Det andet valg, at øge geopolitisk konfrontation, gennem den falske opdeling af verden i "demokratier mod autokrater" – som er idéen bag Bidens kommende demokrati-topmøde – efterlader menneskeheden "siddende på en krudttønde".

At skabe en mulighed ud af katastrofen: Tilblivelsen af en katalysator for et nyt paradigme

(2. december (EIRNS) – Rusland og Kina er flankeret mod vest og øst af truslen for militærkonflikt gennem brændpunkterne, Ukraine og Taiwan. Varslingerne om et angiveligt forestående angreb på Ukraine fra Rusland, bruges af NATO's ledere som undskyldning til at presse på for at tropper og våben bliver stationeret i Ukraine. Præsident Putin har gjort det klart, at dette fuldstændigt ville overskride en rød linje for Rusland. Og udtalelsen tidligere i denne uge fra den forhenværende japanske premierminister, Shinze Abe, at Japan og USA ville forsvare Taiwan militært i tilfælde af en invasion fra det kinesiske fastland, blev mødt med yderst stærke fordømmelser fra Folkerepublikken Kina.

I tirsdags forklarede Putin truslen, som hans land står over for: »Den russiske Føderation har også visse bange anelser, hvad angår de storstilede militærøvelser, afholdt nær dets grænser, , herunder dem som ikke var planlagte, såsom de nylige øvelser i Sortehavet, hvor strategiske bombefly, der er kendt for at bære præcisions- og sågar atomvåben, fløj indenfor 20 km fra vores grænse.« Med NATO's udvidelse mod Rusland i løbet af de sidste 20 år, inklusive placeringen af angivelige missilforsvarssystemer i Polen og Rumænien – udstyr som også er i stand til at affyre Tomahawk- og andre missiler – advarede Putin, at der er en absolut rød linje fra truslen af missiler fra Ukraine. »Jeg vil gentage det endnu engang, at spørgsmålet omhandler den mulige opstilling på

Ukraines territorium af missilsystemer med en flyvetid på 7-10 minutter til Moskva, eller 5 minutter i tilfældet af hypersoniske systemer...«

»Så, hvad skal vi gøre? Vi ville blive nødt til at skabe lignende systemer, som kan bruges mod dem, der truer os... [V]i har afholdt succesfulde testninger, og tidligt næste år vil vi gøre et nyt sø-affyret, hypersonisk missil med en tophastighed på 9 mach klar til brug. Flyvetiden for dem, der udsteder ordrer, vil også være 5 minutter.«

»Hvorfor gør vi dette?« spurgte Putin. »Skabelsen af sådanne trusler er en rød linje for os.«

Udenrigsminister Sergej
Lavrov fortalte udenrigsministrenes OSCE-møde i Stockholm, at NATO's involvering i Ruslands umiddelbare nærområde (vigtigst af alt Ukraine) ville »have de mest alvorlige konsekvenser og vil tvinge [Moskva] til at svare igen«. Det væbnede konflikts monster er vendt tilbage indenfor Europas grænser.

Kinas viceudenrigsminister, Hua Chunying, påmindede Japan: »Gennem dets koloniale herredømme over Taiwan for et halvt århundrede siden, begik Japan talrige forbrydelser, for hvilket det bærer et alvorligt, historisk ansvar overfor det kinesiske folk. Ingen bør undervurdere det kinesiske folks stærke viljestyrke, beslutsomhed og de evner de har for at garantere nationens suverænitet og territoriale integritet. Dem, som vover at forfølge en gammel vej med militarisme og udfordre vores grundlag, vil være på kollisionskurs med det kinesiske folk!«

Og det er ikke blot krig! Det ideologiske foretagende, som søger at bruge truslen om en militær konfrontation for at destabilisere udvikling, og kontrollere væksten og suveræniteten af nationer, der er uafhængige af den angloamerikanske slimede skimmelsvamp, er den samme

magt, der fremmer den åbenlyse malthusianske dagsorden bag Den store Nulstilling. En pandemi løber amok i det meste af verden uden vacciner til rådighed i tilstrækkelige mængder til at dække behovet og efterspørgslen i de mindre udviklede lande. Men i stedet for at løse dette problem, og udvikle en dybdegående sundhedsinfrastruktur, fortælles verden at den må mobilisere ti eller endog hundreder af billioner af dollars i investeringer for at forhindre relativt små forandringer i klimaet. Dette umenneskelige paradigme må erstattes omgående med et nyt paradigme for vækst og udvikling.

Selve den dødelige corona-pandemi skaber en mulighed. Ved at kaste lys over vores ekstreme mangel på beredskab, både imod nyfremkommende virusser og i form af sundhedsinfrastruktur samlet set, viser det behovet for et moderne, avanceret sundhedsvæsen for alle mennesker, som en motor for at skabe infrastrukturel, industriel og kulturel udvikling, samt uddannelse, i sin helhed.

Deltag med Schiller Institutet denne lørdag i en diskussion om, hvordan den fulde udvikling af sundhedsinfrastruktur kan tjene som en motor for at feje den umenneskelige malthusianisme og geopolitik til side, og erstatte dem med en tilgang, der er i overensstemmelse med hvert individs værdighed.

Billede: chess-Pixabay, FelixMittermeier

NYHEDSORIENTERING NOVEMBER 2021:

Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference:

**Alle menneskehedens moralske
ressourcer skal samles:**

**Menneskeheden må være den
udødelige art!**

Indhold:

Resumé af Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference
den 13.-14. november 2021

Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale: En frygtelig afslutning eller
et nyt paradigme?

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

Åbent brev til virologer og eksperter indenfor lægevidenskaben
rundt om i verden for at tage hånd om COVID-19 pandemien, af
Dr. Joycelyn Elders, tidligere chef for USA's militærs
sundhedskorps

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Omicron krisen viser, hvorfor vi har brug for et verdenssundhedssystem, som opfordret af Schiller Instituttets stifter og international formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Nov. 28 (EIRNS)—None of the political leaders of the so-called “advanced” economies, has yet found the honesty to acknowledge the truth that the emergence of dramatically altered variants, like Omicron, confirms. The failure of these “economically advanced” nations to spread vaccines, modern health facilities and public health capacities as rapidly as possible throughout the underdeveloped countries, was humanly negligent, morally indifferent and deadly foolish. It invites the virus, circulating freely among the billions of unvaccinated, to create new forms and again threaten the entire world with death and economic destruction.

A few, like former British Prime, and currently WHO Ambassador for Global Health Financing Minister Gordon Brown, have stated this truth in clear terms since Nov. 26 when the “Omicron” variant of COVID was identified...

The sane worldwide collaboration of virologists to provide accurate and responsible public health advice to populations about the COVID pandemic, called for by former U.S. Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders for the Committee for the Coincidence

of Opposites, is really urgently needed now. (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/11/23/open-letter-to-virologists-and-medical-experts-around-the-world-to-address-the-covid-19-pandemic/>) Being circulated by the Schiller Institute, Dr. Elders' statement says, "I am calling upon virologists and medical experts throughout the globe to undertake an international, coordinated and integrated educational campaign to establish a sane approach to deal with this and potentially future pandemics...."

Nov. 29 (EIRNS) – The World Health Organization met urgently today to issue a new technical brief for its 194 member states on the Omicron variant of the coronavirus, as the number of countries around the world with reported cases continued to grow. The WHO stated that it will still be two weeks or so until sufficient evidence is gathered to reach solid conclusions about Omicron, but as of now what can be said is that "there could be future surges of COVID-19, which could have severe consequences, depending on a number of factors including where surges may take place. The overall global risk related to the new VOC [variant of concern] Omicron is assessed as very high," the UN health agency said.

More bluntly, WHO Director General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus told the meeting of members: "Omicron demonstrates just why the world needs a new accord on pandemics." Also addressing the meeting, Richard Hatchett, a scientist and CEO of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), a foundation that funds vaccine development, said that Omicron's emergence had fulfilled predictions that transmission of the virus in areas with low vaccination rates would speed its evolution. "The inequity that has characterized the global response has now come home to roost," he told the talks, noting that Botswana and South Africa had fully vaccinated less than a quarter of their populations.

Full vaccination of every nation's population is urgently necessary, but it is only one component of a planetary defense

against the current pandemic, and possible future ones, that must now be put in place in short order. That requires an international crash program to build modern health systems in every country, along with the full-set human and physical infrastructure needed to make that possible – from energy, to water, to food, to modern transport, to the education and training of skilled professionals. This is the core of the proposal first issued by Helga Zepp-LaRouche when the pandemic first emerged, and has since been taken up by the Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites and its co-founder, former U.S. Surgeon General Dr. Joycelyn Elders.

Over a dozen countries are now reporting Omicron cases, and three countries – Japan, Israel and Morocco – have shut down all international travel into their countries. The U.S. today joined most European nations in putting in place controversial prohibitions of air travel from Southern African nations. Omicron's existence was first reported less than a week ago, on Wednesday, Nov. 24.

Billede: Licens: CC0 1.0 Universal (CC0 1.0) Public Domain Dedication

**Videokonference: Omicron:
Presserende behov for et
verdenssundhedssystem,
Lørdag den 4. december kl. 19**

dansk tid

Tilmeld dig her for at modtage et link til din e-mail, talerlisten og opdateringer,

eller se den på denne side.

På engelsk:

Will the Omicron COVID variant be the warning bell we heed?

Eight months ago, in March 2021, epidemiologists, virologists and infectious disease specialists from twenty-eight nations warned of the dangers to come without a full international vaccination roll-out. Most believed that we had a year or less before truly dangerous mutations proliferated widely. Gregg Gonsalves, Associate Professor of Epidemiology at Yale University eight months ago put it this way: "With millions of people around the world infected with this virus, new mutations arise every day. Sometimes they find a niche that makes them more fit than their predecessors. These lucky variants could transmit more efficiently and potentially evade immune responses to previous strains. Unless we vaccinate the world, we leave the playing field open to more and more mutations, which could churn out variants that could evade our current vaccines ...The virus doesn't respect borders and new variants somewhere on the planet mean none of us are safe."

But vaccinations alone will not stop COVID. Only full modern health systems everywhere, which require the simultaneous rapid build-out of electricity production and delivery, the provision of clean water—new water systems, and all other required infrastructure, to support the hospitals, the clinics and the ongoing health concerns of people can do the job.

Only if we develop a full international, in-depth response to the escalation warnings from epidemiologists, virologists and infection disease specialists as advocated by the Schiller

Institute beginning in March 2020, and repeated by former U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. Joycelyn Elders just a few days ago, can we stop the growing death, economic despair and that has wrecked so many human lives.

Join us in this conference, and recruit others to join the mission.

Baggrund:

Omicron: Urgent Need for a Modern Health System in Every Nation

Nov. 30: Helga Zepp-LaRouche has now urged the movement associated with her, in every nation where it is active and has outreach, to focus on the necessity to catalyze the construction of a modern system of hospital, healthcare, and research facilities *in every nation*, as a defense of the human race and the planet against pandemics. Taking the worldwide spread and capabilities of pandemic viruses seriously, has been postponed and played with for long enough in the COVID case—possibly too long.

Truly worldwide vaccination, which is urgent, is only one step back from the brink.

Already 21 months ago, on March 13, 2020, Helga LaRouche wrote an editorial statement for the Schiller Institute in *EIR*, “COVID-19 Pandemic Forces Re-Thinking: International Cooperation Indispensable!,” with an accompanying fact sheet “Urgent Physical-Economic Requirements To Fight the Pandemic.” She wrote then: “If we want to prevent the coronavirus pandemic from spreading in waves and migrating from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere and back— thus potentially creating the breeding grounds for additional similar and worse

viruses—we must initiate radical changes.

“Hospitals with isolation wards must be built throughout the world, following the example of the city of Wuhan and Hubei Province, which built a total of 14 temporary hospitals, including the necessary intensive care beds. World Health Organization standards must be observed in doing so. China, for example, built facilities with 16,000 new hospital beds in just one month.

“International scientific research centers must be established for research on the COVID-19 virus and other viral and bacterial pathogens. Vaccines must be developed and tested. The results of research in biophysics, nuclear biology and space medicine must be made available immediately to all nations. The point of reference for this is the conception of a Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE) developed by Lyndon LaRouche, in which the protection of human life from pandemics is one focal point.”

A great mobilization was needed then, and now: 10 million new hospital beds worldwide in 30,000 new hospitals and clinical centers; new laboratory facilities; 200 new gigawatts of reliable baseload electric power which is essential to such capacities; a tremendous years-long recruitment, including among youth, of 9-10 million physicians and assistants, nurses, engineers, laboratory technicians.

“These worldwide measures,” Zepp-LaRouche wrote, “require investments that cannot be made under the conditions of the present, collapsing financial system. The current actions of the central banks in injecting liquidity into this financial system by the trillions of dollars, and even the allocation of budget funds by governments, is due to a hyperinflationary monetary explosion, and is unsustainable.”

Therefore, she concluded, the “four economic laws” proposed by her husband Lyndon LaRouche were needed for this international

construction, beginning with Glass-Steagall bank reorganization and introduction of Hamiltonian national banking.

Read Helga's statement [here](#).

Now former U.S. Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, in an open letter Nov. 23, days before the Omicron variant of the COVID virus was identified, "called upon virologists and medical experts throughout the globe to undertake an international, coordinated and integrated educational campaign to establish a sane approach to deal with this and potentially future pandemics." Dr. Elders was in 2020 the co-founder with Helga LaRouche of the Committee on the Coincidence of Opposites, which has cooperative contacts with physicians and nurses organizations and with medical educators. She asks for a mobilization of ideas, as Helga LaRouche did in March 2020, on these questions (på dansk):

- Hvad er en pandemi?
- Hvordan bekæmpes en pandemi?
- Hvad er offentlig sundhed og hvordan bør vi arbejde sammen for at gennemføre anvendte og allerede testede, fundamentale sundhedstiltag, herunder hygiejne, rent drikkevand og næringsrig mad, og en forsyning af forebyggende og lindrende medicin, inklusive vacciner, som er afgørende for at overvinde pandemien?
- Hvad er den sammenlignede virkningsgrad af de forskellige vacciner og andre tiltag, som nu bruges i forskellige nationer og regioner, for at forhindre alvorlig sygdom og død?
- Hvordan sikrer vi tilstrækkelige antal af sygehuse, sundhedsklinikker og sundhedspersonale i hver nation, herunder den systematiske rekruttering af unge, lokale sundhedsmedarbejdere for at hjælpe nu, med at bringe pandemien under kontrol?

Læs hele Dr. Elders' brev [her](#).

An emergency meeting is called for broadcast on the Internet this Saturday, Dec. 4 at 19:00 Danish time. Join in helping to organize it.