

# Stop mordet på Afghanistan Schiller Institutts online- seminar

**Mandag den 17. januar 2022  
(Martin Luther King-Dag i  
USA)**

**kl. 17 dansk tid**

*“Uretfærdighed hvor som helst er en trussel mod retfærdighed  
når som helst.”*

*– Martin Luther King*

Tilmeld dig her for at få et direkte link: [Konference, 17. januar 2022](#)

Eller se programmet på denne side på vores danske hjemmeside.

Når året 2022 begynder, lad os så i hele verden vende vores tanker, ikke kun mod Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., men mod hans mission: Etableringen af et “elsket fællesskab” af hele menneskeheden. Vi må indse, at den største sygdom, der truer menneskeheden, er “fordærvet ligegyldighed”, hvilket viser sig mest spektakulært i den bevidste udsultning lige nu af millioner af mennesker i Afghanistan “i menneskerettighedernes navn”. Hvis man lader en sådan uretfærdighed ske for andre, vil den samme uretfærdighed før eller senere ske for en selv.

19 mennesker er netop omkommet i en forfærdelig brand i Bronx i New York. Der var over to dusin tidligere rapporterede overtrædelser i denne bygning. Blandt de døde var ni børn. Men hundredtusindvis af børn er ved at sulte ihjel i Afghanistan.

Årsagen til uskyldige børns død i Afghanistan og i Bronx er den samme: Årsagen er en fordærvet ligegyldighed med hensyn til, om de ville eller burde overleve eller ej.

Engang stræbte nationerne efter velstand for alle borgere; det blev kaldt "den generelle velfærd for os selv og vores efterkommere". Nu, fordi vi nægter at stoppe Wall Street og City of Londons forgæves forsøg på at videreføre deres bankerotte system, "vinker" massedøden dagligt til os i hele den transatlantiske verden. Vi får at vide, at massedød desværre vil være "normalt"; den vil være "endemisk" i form af pandemier, krig eller "ekstreme begivenheder". Hvis det er tilfældet, må det være et direkte resultat af vores fordærvede ligegyldighed, for vi kunne have behandlet de sygeste i verden først, men valgte i stedet at lade være, og vi vælger stadig at lade være.

Vi siger "NEJ" til denne pagt med fortvivlelsen og døden.

Der findes en plan, kaldet "Operation Ibn Sina", som er udarbejdet af Schiller Instituttet, for at løse den uretfærdighed, der er i gang i Afghanistan, og derved skabe en fælles verdensomspændende indsats, for at rulle de grove uretfærdigheder inden for sundhedspleje og andre områder tilbage. Frigivelsen af Afghanistans 9 milliarder dollars i pengemidler er kun begyndelsen.

Du har magten til at gennemføre Operation Ibn Sina ved at stå sammen med os og afvise den fordærvede ligegyldighed. Vejen til at bekæmpe uretfærdighed er at skabe retfærdighed i verden nu. På den måde kan den uretfærdige død for dem, der er døde ved branden i Bronx, af hungersnød i Afghanistan og pga. de tåbelige, dødsdømte imperialistiske ambitioner over hele verden, måske være inspirationen til at skabe det "elskede fællesskab", som menneskeheden virkelig har brug for og fortjener.

---

# **Pressemeddelelse den 6. januar 2021: Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive traktaterne foreslåede af Putin. Interview med rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen til Schiller Instituttet i Danmark**

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

KØBENHAVN – I lyset af den eskalerende spænding mellem USA/NATO og Rusland, som kan føre til en varm krig, ja endog atomkrig, foretog Schiller Instituttet i Danmark et timelangt engelsksproget video/lydinterview med Rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen den 30. december 2021.

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

arrangeret rejser til Rusland.

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

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

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

---

Nogle højdepunkter:

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

"Faktisk havde jeg en lang snak med Mikhail Gorbatsjov, den tidligere leder af Sovjetunionen, i 1989, lige da NATO begyndte at bombe Serbien, og da de indlemmede Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn i NATO. Man bør huske på at Gorbatsjov er en meget rar person. Han er en meget livlig person, med godt humør og en erfaren person. Men da vi begyndte at snakke, spurgte jeg

ham om NATO-udvidelsen, som foregik præcis den dag, hvor vi snakkede. Han blev meget dystert, meget trist, fordi han sagde: Altså, jeg talte med James Baker, Helmut Kohl fra Tyskland og flere andre personer, og de lovede mig alle ikke at flytte en tomme mod øst, hvis Sovjetunionen ville lade Tyskland forene DDR (Østtyskland) og Vesttyskland, for at blive ét land, og komme til at blive medlem af NATO, men ikke bevæge sig en tomme mod øst.'... Det stod ikke skrevet, for, som han sagde, "Jeg troede på dem. Jeg kan se, at jeg var naiv."

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

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

"[Man] kan forestille sig, hvad der vil ske, hvis Kina, Iran

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

---

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Hvem kan hævde at “forsvare Ukraine”, mens der begås masse mord i Afghanistan?**

Den 10. januar (EIRNS) – Så mange institutioner i det amerikanske intellektuelle etablissement er nu på linje med Schiller Instituttet og kræver frigivelse af Afghanistans bistands- og reservemidler – 15 tænketanke og organisationer i et fælles brev til præsident Biden den 8. januar og andre på deres egne hjemmesider – at der helt klart er en forfærdelig erkendelse: USA's finansielle og økonomiske sanktioner er ved at myrde et uskyldigt folk, grundet utilstrækkelig loyalitet over for NATO's besættelsesstyrker. Enhver borger der tror, at denne forbrydelse ikke har noget at gøre med truslen om en overhængende, meget større konflikt om Ukraine, forveksler moralsk poseren med moral.

På de møder mellem USA og Rusland, der nu finder sted i Genève om NATO i Østeuropa og Ukraine, har amerikanske diplomater hurtigt og fuldstændigt erstattet det personlige diplomati mellem præsident Biden og præsident Putin, som synes at give håb om en løsning, med moralsk komediespil. Efter den bilaterale fase af møderne mellem USA og Rusland den 10. januar sagde talsmand for Udenrigsministeriet, Ned Price, at USA aldrig ville overveje at holde Ukraine ude af NATO, {"ikke havde til hensigt at indgå nogen aftale"} med Rusland og ikke engang "betragtede samtalerne som en forhandling". Han afsluttede sin briefing med en liste over diskussionsemner om russiske "ondsindede aktiviteter" for at hævde, at Rusland, og kun Rusland, måtte nedtrappe og gøre indrømmelser, så NATO's styrker og missiler kunne fuldføre deres lange fremrykning helt til Ruslands grænser – mens russiske tropper måtte forlade deres egne vestlige grænseregioner og "vende tilbage til deres permanente baser". Udenrigsminister Tony Blinken tilføjede samtidig et umotiveret forsøg på at hovere over Ruslands bistand til Kasakhstans regering for at kontrollere optøjer og forsøg på oprør.

Medmindre præsident Joe Biden igen griber personligt ind, er Ruslands foreslåede aftaler blevet blankt og permanent afvist. Det svarer til, at Nikita Khrusjtjov nægtede at overveje at trække sovjetiske missiler tilbage fra USA's sydlige grænse under den frygtindgydende Cuba-krise i oktober 1962. På det tidspunkt havde millioner af skræmte mennesker verden over allerede forestillet sig, hvad denne afvisning ville betyde.

Selv om konsekvensen nu "blot" er en konventionel konflikt i Ukraine, giver USA's tidligere chefvåbeninspektør og militære ekspert Scott Ritter en idé om, hvorfor det ikke ville gå godt for NATO-styrkerne.

(<https://consortiumnews.com/2022/01/10/what-war-with-russia-would-look-like/> )

Hvad nu hvis konsekvensen kun er det "fuldstændige brud på



forbindelserne”, som Putin truer med, og en dyb og umiddelbar kold krig. Nationen med verdens hurtigst ekspanderende og teknologisk mest avancerede økonomi og med den største indflydelse på bekæmpelse af fattigdom og udvikling i Afrika, Syd- og Østasien [Kina] er fast partner med Rusland. Dette fremgår endnu en gang tydeligt af undertrykkelsen af det tilsyneladende mislykkede forsøg på en “farverevolution” i Kasakhstan.

Hvis Biden-regeringen har besluttet, at USA vil angribe og konfrontere Rusland og Kina sammen i en ny kold krig – modarbejde dem i rummet, bekæmpe deres politik med at eksportere atomkraft til tredjelande, kræve at de holder op med at bruge kul til energiproduktion, angribe Kinas politik for Bælte & Vej og udryddelse af fattigdom osv. – hvem vil de så have i sit hjørne? Det britiske imperium, naturligvis – de grønne kongelige og klovnen Bojo og Hendes Majestæts styrker, der er ivrige efter at blive indsat i Ukraine. Hvad vil Amerika have i reserve? Ingen udviklingskreditinstitution; et svagt økonomisk opsving efter en dyb recession; en arbejdsstyrke på 3 millioner arbejdere og 3,5 millioner arbejdspladser mindre end for to år siden; faldende realindkomster; en centralbank, der skaber økonomiske katastrofer verden over, som IMF advarede den 9. januar, og som forsøger at stoppe inflationen, den har forårsaget.

Men langt værre end alt dette er den fortsatte kvælning af Afghanistans befolkning på grund af de amerikanske sanktioner. Det forårsager en voksende kaskade af dødsfald som følge af sult og forfrysninger i hjem uden vinterbrændstof, i en nation som USA helt klart bærer ansvaret for efter 20 års krig og besættelse. Myrdet for den synd, at man ikke opretholdt en marionetregering, da NATO forlod det. {Disse} sanktioner er en forbrydelse mod menneskeheden.

Med dette Afghanistan som “banner” vil nationer instinktivt undgå et angloamerikansk forsøg på at fastsætte reglerne for verden. Der vil være en pervers ny betydning, som Schiller

Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, sagde i dag, for udtrykket "Afghanistan, imperiernes kirkegård".

Det skal forhindres, det må vendes. Politikken må ændres til en udviklingspolitik, ved hjælp af Helga LaRouches Operation Ibn Sina. Schiller Instituttets presserende organisering for dette mål vil tage sit næste skridt fremad med et webinar på Martin Luther King-dagen, mandag den 17. januar.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 7  
januar 2022**

**Den gamle verden kommer ikke  
tilbage.**

**Gør 2022 til Lyndon LaRouches  
år!**

---

**Briten forsøger at skubbe  
Rusland ind i en  
"bjørnefælde" i Kasakhstan.**

Med kun et par dage tilbage før de planlagte forhandlinger 10. januar mellem russiske og amerikanske diplomater på højt

niveau, om Ruslands krav om "øjeblikkelige" skriftlige sikkerhedsgarantier fra USA og NATO, har magtfulde kredse i London og Washington, som ikke vil bevæge sig bort fra at være på randen af atomkrig, lanceret endnu en provokation mod Rusland: den voldelige destabilisering af Kasakhstan. Tony Blair, George Soros og utallige internationale ngo'er medvirker i hele operationen.

En "farverevolution" i Kasakhstan har klare sikkerhedsmæssige konsekvenser for Rusland. Kasakhstan har den længste grænse til Rusland. Det er placeringen af □□Ruslands vigtigste rumopsendelses anlæg, Baikonur Cosmodrome, en by, som Rusland i dag lejer af Kasakhstan.

Det ser ud til, at magtfulde kredse i London og Washington er opsat på at provokere den russiske bjørn til at reagere med undertrykkende vold i Kasakhstan, eller til at gøre det samme i det østlige Ukraine, for derefter at vende om og bruge dette som en færdigpakket undskyldning for at starte destruktiv økonomisk krigsførelse imod Rusland. Kort sagt, hvis de kan få Rusland til at gå i "bjørnefælden", så vil de give Rusland "Afghanistan-behandlingen" – økonomiske sanktioner og krigsførsel så alvorlig, at de sulter landet til underkastelse ... eller forsøger at gøre det. I den forstand er det forestående afghanske folkedrab på mere end 20 millioner mennesker også en forløber for 3. Verdenskrig.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremhævede den strategiske betydning af denne udvikling i sin ugentlige webcast: "Hvis du ville have spurgt mig for en uge siden, hvis jeg forventer en indsats for at forstyrre den diplomatiske offensiv, der hovedsageligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina, for at uskadeliggøre det, der tydeligvis byggede op som en dobbelt "cubamissilkrise" med udviklingen omkring Ukraine og Taiwan, så ville jeg have sagt, at man så absolut bør forvente en provokation til at forstyrre disse møder, og her er vi så ...

"Lad mig nu først nævne det positive aspekt:□□Der var et vist

gennembrud for blot et par dage siden, i mandags, da P5 FN-nationerne, det vil sige de permanente fem atomvåbenstater, for første gang blev enige om at bekræfte den meget vigtige erklæring, som blev forhandlet mellem Gorbatsjov og præsident Reagan i Reykjavik i oktober 1986, om at en atomkrig aldrig kan vindes og derfor aldrig må udkæmpes.”

Det er positivt, sagde Zepp-LaRouche, men nu “skal ordene følges op af gerninger. Og den udtalelse som sådan, selv om den er ekstremt vigtig, dæmper endnu ikke krisen omkring Ukraine og heller ikke krisen omkring Taiwan, men, som jeg sagde, så er det et meget vigtigt første skridt... ”

“Men vi har brug for en vending på hundrede procent, fordi denne konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina er selvmorderisk ... Jeg tror, vi har brug for en fuldstændig ændring af prioriteringer, og befolkningen er nødt til at vågne op. Deres ligegyldighed, ligegyldigheden – hos nogle af jer – over for Afghanistan er det der åbner for, at disse rådne politikker fortsætter i vores egne lande. Og vi skal have en mobilisering for et nyt paradigme, både i vores egne lande og også i relationer mellem nationer, fordi det er udtryk for samme problem i systemet.”

Udvalgt billede: Esetok, CC BY-SA 4.0 via Wikimedia Commons

---

# **Opdateret version: Er vi søvngængeragtigt på vej til atomar 3. verdenskrig?**

Memorandum fra Schiller Instituttet

Læs den opdaterede version på engelsk nedenunder.

Den 24. december. Man lyver overfor dig. Rusland planlægger ikke at indtage Ukraine. Putin er ikke en »ondsindet aktør«, der er ude på at genskabe det sovjetiske imperium. Ukraine er ikke et fremspirende demokrati, som blot fokuserer på sig selv. Som en sammenfatning af de dokumenterede gerninger viser, bliver Ukraine brugt af geopolitiske magter i Vesten, der står til regnskab for det bankerotte, spekulative finanssystem, som er gnisten, der kan udløse et strategisk opgør med Rusland, et opgør som allerede er farligere end Cuba-krisen, og som nemt kunne ende med en atomkrig, som ingen ville hverken vinde eller overleve.

Overvej kendsgerningerne, som vi præsenterer dem her i den forkortede tidslinje nedenfor. Rusland, ligesom Kina, er i stigende grad blevet udsat for truslen om at blive tilintetgjort gennem to særskilte former for "atomkrig" af det krigeriske og bankerotte angloamerikanske finansetablisement: 1) »Et atomart førsteslag«, som udtalt mest direkte af den vanvittige senator Roger Wicker (republikaner fra Mississippi), og 2) den "atomare valgmulighed" i finansiel krigsførelse, tiltag så ekstreme, at de ville svare til en finansiel belejring af Rusland for at prøve at udsulte nationen til at underkaste sig, som dette gøres mod Afghanistan.

Rusland har nu bekendtgjort, så hele verden kunne høre det, at dets røde streg er ved at blive overskredet, hvorefter Rusland vil blive tvunget til at svare tilbage med »militær-tekniske gengældelsestiltag«. Denne røde streg, gøres det klart, er den yderligere fremfærd af USA's og NATO's militærstyrker helt op til selve Ruslands grænse, herunder opstillingen af defensive og offensive missilsystemer i stand til at bære atomspræghoveder med blot 5 minutters flyvetid fra Moskva. Rusland har fremlagt to forslag til internationale

traktater – én med USA, den anden med NATO – som ville give lovbundne garantier om, at NATO's østlige udvidelse ville ophøre, at især Ukraine og Georgien ikke ville blive inviteret til at blive en del af NATO og at avancerede våbensystemer ikke vil blive opstillet på Ruslands dødkam. Disse forslag er hverken mere eller mindre end de verbale garantier, som blev givet til Sovjetunionen i 1990 af de løgnagtige Bush- og Thatcher-regeringer, garantier som er blevet brudt systematisk lige siden. De er hverken mere eller mindre end det, som præsident John F. Kennedy krævede af Khrusjtjov i løbet af Cuba-krisen i 1962, der blev afmonteret med succes af de behændige forhandlinger bag scenen af Kennedy's personlige udsending, hans bror Bobby Kennedy, skjult fra det krigsvillige, militær-industrielle kompleks.

Det er højst nødvendigt, at USA og NATO omgående underskriver de forslåede traktater med Rusland – og tager et skridt tilbage fra den atomare udryddelses afgrund.

Hvad vi skildrer nedenfor har fundet sted, skridt for skridt, imens de fleste mennesker rundt om i verden sov på vagten. Det er på tide at vågne op før vi, søvngængeragtigt, påbegynder en tredje, atomar verdenskrig.

## **Den militære side**

De sidste tredive års strategiske relationer mellem USA og NATO, på den ene side, og Rusland, på den anden, er fulde af brudte løfter, begyndende umiddelbart efter Berlin-murens fald i november, 1989. Allerede i februar 1990 var den daværende udenrigsminister, James Baker, i Moskva, hvor han, i kølvandet på den påbegyndende tyske genforening, som ville finde sted senere det samme år, lovede den sovjetiske leder, Mikhail Gorbatsjov, og udenrigsminister Eduard Sjevardnadze, at hvis amerikanske tropper blev i Tyskland, ville NATO ikke udvide sig »én tomme mod øst«. Men det tog ikke lang tid før USA's forsvarsministerium planlagde præcist dette, og processen fik

fuld fart i løbet af præsident Bill Clintons administration.

Den første runde af NATO-udvidelse, efter Tysklands genforening, fandt sted i 1999 med indslutningen af Polen, Ungarn og Den tjekkiske Republik, efterfulgt i 2004 af alle tre baltiske lande, Bulgarien, Rumænien, Slovakiet og Slovenien. Endnu fire lande blev medlemmer i de efterfølgende år, hvilket bragte antallet af NATO-medlemmer op på tredive lande. I midten af denne proces, i løbet af George W. Bushs administration, begyndte USA også at afmontere det system af strategisk våbenkontrol, der var blevet opbygget gennem Den kolde Krig, begyndende med USA's tilbagetrækning fra ABM-traktaten fra 1972. Trump-administrationen fremskyndte processen ved at trække USA tilbage fra INF-traktaten og Åben Himmel-traktaten, hvilket betød at kun den Nye START-traktat var tilbage, der blev forlænget af præsident Joe Biden kort efter han påbegyndte sit embede, som værende den eneste traktat om atomvåbenkontrol, der er i kraft mellem USA og Rusland.

Vendepunktet, hvad den nuværende krigsfare angår, kom i 2014. De fortsatte anstrengelser for at indlemme Ukraine i EU's fælles marked, gennem den Ukrainsk-Europæiske Associeringsaftale, blev afvist som værende umulig at acceptere af Ukraines regering under Viktor Janukovitj sent i 2013, da det blev klart, at Ukraine *de facto* ville blive associeret med NATO og give europæiske varer ubegrænset adgang til det russiske marked. Janukovitjs drejning væk fra EU førte til »Euromaidan«-protesterne af dem, som støttede et tættere fællesskab mellem Ukraine og EU, hvilket i januar eskalerede til dødelige sammenstød, eftersom disse demonstrationer blevet taget over af pro-nazistiske grupperinger, herunder dem associeret med personen Stepan Bandera, den berygtede ukrainske nazist, som arbejdede tæt sammen med Hitler i løbet af 2. Verdenskrig. I februar måned eskalerede volden, og Janukovitj blev drevet ud af sit embede, og den nye regering begyndte at vedtage stærke tiltag mod det russisk-talende

mindretal i Ukraine, særligt på Krim og Donetsk- og Lugansk-regionerne i Østukraine. Alt dette blev gjort med den fulde støtte fra London og Washington, hvor USA's udenrigsministeriums embedskvinde, Victoria Nuland, spillede en vigtig rolle. *EIR* udgav et detaljeret »informationspapir« og flere dybdegående rapporter i sin udgave fra den 7. februar. Informationspapiret kan findes via [dette link](#).

Den 16. marts 2014 blev et referendum afholdt i Krims autonome Republik og Sevastopols lokale regering, som spurgte befolkningerne om de ønskede at blive en del af Den russiske Føderation eller bevare Krims status som en del af Ukraine. På Krim stemte 97% for at blive integreret med Den russiske Føderation, med en valgdeltagelse på 83%; i Sevastopol var der også 97%, som stemte for at blive integreret med Den russiske Føderation, med en valgdeltagelse på 89%.

Der var hverken en »russisk invasion af Ukraine« eller en tvungen forandring af nogle grænser.

I løbet af denne periode protesterede Rusland hele tiden mod NATO's østudvidelse, men til ingen nytte. »På trods af vores talrige protester og anmodninger, er den amerikanske maskine sat i bevægelse, og transportbåndet ruller fremad«, sagde den russiske præsident, Vladimir Putin, i sin dramatiske tale den 1. marts til Den føderale Forsamling, hvor han offentliggjorde en ny generation af strategiske våben, som Rusland havde haft under udvikling, hvoraf mindst to af disse, det hypersoniske Avangard-våben beregnet til brug i interkontinentale ballistiske missiler og Kinzhal-luftaffyrede ballistiske missiler, er siden blevet en del af det russiske militær.

---

Her er den opdaterede version på engelsk. Der er ændringer i versionen ovenfor, flere kapitler og tidslinjen.



# Schiller Institute Memorandum

## [Updated]

### December 31, 2021

You are being lied to. Russia is not planning to invade Ukraine. Putin is not a “bad actor” out to recreate the Soviet Empire. Ukraine is not a fledgling democracy just minding its own business.

As a summary review of the documented record shows, 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.

Consider the facts as we present them in the abbreviated timeline below. Russia, like China, has been increasingly subjected to the threat of being destroyed by two distinct kinds of “nuclear war” by the bellicose and bankrupt UK-U.S. financial Establishment: (1) “first-use nuclear action,” as stated most explicitly by the demented Sen. Roger Wicker (R-MS); and (2) the “nuclear option” in financial warfare—measures so extreme that they would be laying financial siege to Russia to try to starve it into submission, as is being done against Afghanistan.

Russia has now announced, for the whole world to hear, that its red line is about to be crossed, after which it will be forced to respond with “retaliatory military-technical measures.” That red line, it has made clear, is the further advance of U.S. and NATO military forces up to the very border with Russia, including the positioning of defensive and offensive nuclear-capable missile systems to within a scarce five minutes’ flight time to Moscow.

Russia has presented two draft documents—one, a treaty with the United States, the other, an agreement with NATO—which together would provide legally binding security guarantees that NATO's eastward march will stop, that Ukraine and Georgia in particular will not be invited to join NATO, and that advanced weapons systems will not be placed at Russia's doorstep.

These are neither more nor less than the verbal guarantees the Soviet Union was given in 1990 by the duplicitous Bush and Thatcher governments, guarantees that have been systematically violated ever since. They are neither more nor less than what President John F. Kennedy demanded of Chairman Nikita Khrushchev during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which was successfully defused by the deft back-channel negotiations of JFK's personal envoy, his brother and Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, out of sight of the pro-war military-industrial complex.

It is urgently necessary that the United States and NATO promptly sign those proposed documents with Russia—and step back from the edge of thermonuclear extinction.

What we chronicle below has been happening, step by step, while most Americans have been asleep at the switch. It is time to wake up, before we sleepwalk into thermonuclear World War III.

## **The Military Component**

The collapse of the socialist states of Eastern Europe and then the Soviet Union in 1989-91 was a moment of great hope, for an end of the Cold War and the potential for the parties of the Cold War to cooperate in building a new world order based on peace through development. That moment was lost when the Anglo-American elite chose instead to declare itself "the only superpower" in a unipolar world, looting Russia and the former Soviet states, while seeking to either take Russia

over, or to crush it.

Promises were made to the Soviet Union—and thus to Russia as its recognized legal successor as a nuclear-weapons power—at the outset of this period, all of which have been broken over the past thirty years. Already in February of 1990 in Moscow, then Secretary of State James Baker promised Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachov and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze that, in the wake of German reunification which came about later that year, if U.S. troops remained in Germany there would be no expansion of NATO “one inch to the East.” (This was confirmed in official U.S. files released in 2017.)

At that time, Soviet force structure in East Germany consisted of around 340,000 troops and extensive military infrastructure, weapons, and equipment. The terms of their withdrawal (eventually completed in 1994) and whether or not, under German reunification, NATO forces would replace them in that formerly Soviet-occupied section of Germany, were on the table. Other Eastern European countries, located to the east of East Germany, were still members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization (Warsaw Pact), whose dissolution was not then anticipated; that dissolution happened in July 1991, the month before the Soviet Union itself broke up.

But the U.S. Department of Defense was plotting the expansion of NATO eastwards already by October of 1990. Although there were different policies being debated within the U.S. political leadership, planning for expansion was proceeding behind the scenes.

On the surface, Russian relations with the trans-Atlantic powers remained non-adversarial for most of the 1990s. In the economic sphere, however, the “takeover” proceeded apace, with the adoption of London- and Wall Street-engineered economic reforms that resulted in the large-scale deindustrialization of Russia, and could have led to the annihilation of its military might. There was some planned dismantling of nuclear

weapons in both East and West, with U.S. specialists providing on-site assistance in the transfer of nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Belarus and other now independent ex-Soviet areas back to Russia, as well as in the disposal of some of Russia's own weapons.

On May 27, 1997, the NATO-Russia Founding Act<sup>1</sup> was signed, establishing the NATO-Russia Council and other consultation mechanisms. Among other things, the document declared that "NATO and Russia do not consider each other as adversaries." (Sec. 2, Para. 2) NATO described the document as "the expression of an enduring commitment, undertaken at the highest political level, to build, together, a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area." (Sec. 2, Para. 2)

Nonetheless, a shift began to occur in the late 1990s, driven by several events. One was that the imported economic reforms, promoting enormous financial speculation and the looting of Russian resources, led to a blow-out in August 1998 of the Russian government bond market (nearly triggering a meltdown of the global financial system because of bad bets placed on Russian securities by Wall Street and other hedge funds, as ex-Director of the International Monetary Fund Michel Camdessus later acknowledged).

In the wake of that collapse, Russia's London- and Chicago-trained liberal "young reformers" were replaced by a government under the leadership of former Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov and military-industrial planner Yuri Maslyukov, who acted swiftly to stem the collapse of the remainder of Russia's industry.

A second factor in Russia's troubles at that time was the escalation of terrorist separatist movements in Russia's North Caucasus region, which Russian intelligence services had solidly identified as being backed and egged on not only by Wahhabite Islamic fundamentalists from Saudi Arabia, but also by U.S. and UK intelligence agencies directly. In summer 1999,

these networks attempted to split the entire North Caucasus out of Russia.

Also in the late 1990s, NATO boosted its involvement in the Bosnian War and other Balkan Peninsula conflicts among the former components of Yugoslavia, which had broken up. This meddling peaked with NATO's bombing of Belgrade, the capital of Serbia, in March-June 1999 without authorization of the United Nations Security Council. This action shocked Moscow with the realization that NATO was prepared to act unilaterally, as it wished, without international consensus.

In July 1997, at a NATO Summit in Madrid, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic were invited to join NATO, which they formally did in 1999. This was the first of five rounds of NATO expansion. In 2004, all three Baltic countries (formerly republics within the Soviet Union proper), and Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia were admitted. Four more Balkan countries joined in the years following, bringing NATO's membership up to its current level of 30 countries.

Vladimir Putin, in his Dec. 21, 2021 address to an expanded meeting of the Defense Ministry Board, expressed Moscow's view of the importance of the NATO-Russia Founding Act and its subsequent betrayal by NATO:

*Take the recent past, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when we were told that our concerns about NATO's potential expansion eastwards were absolutely groundless. And then we saw five waves of the bloc's eastward expansion. Do you remember how it happened? All of you are adults. It happened at a time when Russia's relations with the United States and main member states of NATO were cloudless, if not completely allied.*

*I have already said this in public and will remind you of this again: American specialists were permanently present at the nuclear arms facilities of the Russian Federation. They*

*went to their office there every day, had desks and an American flag. Wasn't this enough? What else is required? U.S. advisors worked in the Russian government—career CIA officers, [who] gave their advice. What else did they want? What was the point of supporting separatism in the North Caucasus, with the help of even ISIS—well, if not ISIS, there were other terrorist groups. They obviously supported terrorists. What for? What was the point of expanding NATO and withdrawing from the ABM Treaty?*

As Putin noted, the United States, under the George W. Bush Administration, began to dismantle the system of strategic arms control assembled during the Cold War, beginning in 2002 with the U.S. withdrawal from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, just a few months after Putin had extended an offer of strategic cooperation with the United States following the 9/11 attacks.

The U.S. administration quickly began planning for a global ballistic missile defense system (BMDS) in Europe and Asia, which in Europe led to the first sailing of an American guided missile destroyer equipped with the Aegis anti-missile missiles (the USS *Arleigh Burke*) into the Black Sea in the spring of 2012. In 2016 would come the inauguration of an “Aegis Ashore” installation—the same system, but land-based—in Romania, and the start of construction of a similar site in Poland.

At a conference in Moscow in May of 2012, then Deputy Chief of the Russian General Staff Gen. Valery Gerasimov provided extensive documentation, with video animations, of the fact that the BMDS was not aimed primarily at Iran, but did, in its intended later phases, represent a threat to Russia's strategic deterrent. Putin and other Russian officials have also emphasized the possibility of the defensive (anti-missile) systems being quickly reconfigured as missile launchers for direct attack.

An increasingly sharper Russian response to the U.S./NATO pursuit of these programs and to the rejection of Russia's offers of cooperation was also evident in the contrast between two speeches President Putin gave in Germany: before the Bundestag (Parliament) on September 25, 2001, and at the Munich Security Conference in 2007.

Putin spoke to the Bundestag, in German, just two weeks after the 9/11 terrorist attack on the U.S. in 2001. He had called President Bush within hours of that attack—he was the first foreign leader to call—offering full Russian support for the U.S. in the moment of crisis. He told the Germans: “The Cold War is over,” and posed a vision of global collaboration in building a new paradigm based on collaboration of the nations of the world.

Then on February 10, 2007, Putin delivered a landmark speech at the annual Munich Security Conference. The Western media and some people who were present, including the war-monger U.S. Senator John McCain, denounced it as belligerent, and it became a point of departure for the subsequent demonization of Putin. But it was not an aggressive speech. Putin simply made clear that Russia was not going to be trampled underfoot, as a subjugated nation in a unipolar imperial world.

Almost all international media ignored how he opened the speech, with a carefully chosen quotation from Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Fireside Chat of September 3, 1939, two days after the Nazi invasion of Poland that had marked the outbreak of World War II. FDR said, and Putin quoted, “When peace has been broken anywhere, the peace of all countries everywhere is in danger.” This speech was the signal that, speaking in strategic terms, Russia was “back.”

In July 2007, Putin attempted to avert the crossing of a line that Moscow defined as a fundamental threat to Russian security, namely the installation of the American BMDS

directly at Russia's borders. Visiting President George W. Bush in Kennebunkport, Maine, he proposed joint Russian-American development and deployment of anti-missile systems, including an offer to the U.S. administration to use the Russian early-warning radar in Gabala, Azerbaijan as part of a mutual Russian-American missile defense system for Europe, instead of the American BMDS planned for installation in Poland and the Czech Republic (the latter was changed to Romania). Putin also offered to give the U.S. access to a radar facility in southern Russia, and to place coordination of the process with the NATO-Russia Council.

Sergei Ivanov, then a deputy prime minister, said that the Russian proposals signified a fundamental change in international relations, and could mean an end to talk about a new Cold War:

*If our proposals are accepted, Russia will no longer need to place new weapons, including missiles, in the European part of the country, including Kaliningrad.*

Negotiations between Russian and American officials over the Russian proposal were conducted throughout 2008, before petering out. Key to their failure was the vehemence of Washington's refusal to abandon construction of the BMDS. In the words of then Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Political Military Affairs Stephen Mull:

*What we do not accept is that Gabala is a substitute for the plans that we're already pursuing with our Czech and Polish allies. We believe that those installations are necessary for the security of our interests in Europe.*

Clearly, the target was not Iran, but Russia, and the opportunity for a new paradigm was lost.

At the April 2008 NATO summit in Bucharest, Georgia and



Ukraine were promised future NATO membership, although they were not offered formal Membership Action Plans (MAP). Their bids, nonetheless, were welcomed by many and they were left with hopes of MAPs in the future, maybe the near future—enough so that the Georgians declared:

*The decision to accept that we are going forward to an adherence to NATO was taken and we consider this is a historic success.*

In August 2008, while President Dmitri Medvedev was on vacation and then Prime Minister Putin was at the opening of the Olympic Games in Beijing, Mikheil Saakashvili's Georgia attacked Russian peacekeepers in the breakaway Georgian province of South Ossetia, leading to a short but ferocious war, which Georgia lost. The fact that Saakashvili acted on the assumption he would have full NATO backing, although it proved wrong in the event, was not lost on Moscow and has influenced subsequent Russian thinking about what would happen with Georgia or Ukraine becoming full NATO members.

## Ukraine

In December 2008, in the wake of Georgia's military showdown with Russia, Carl Bildt and Radek Sikorski, the foreign ministers of Sweden and Poland, respectively, initiated the European Union's "Eastern Partnership." It targeted six countries that were formerly republics within the Soviet Union: three in the Caucasus region (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) and three in East Central Europe (Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine). They were not to be invited to full EU membership, but were nevertheless drawn into a vise through so-called EU Association Agreements (EUAA), each one centered on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA).

The prime target of the effort was Ukraine. Under the EUAA negotiated with Ukraine, but not immediately signed, the

country's industrial economy would be dismantled, trade with Russia savaged (with Russia ending its free-trade regime with Ukraine to prevent its own markets from being flooded via Ukraine), and EU-based market players would grab Ukraine's agricultural and raw materials exports.

Furthermore, the EUAA mandated "convergence" on security issues, with integration into European defense systems. Under such an arrangement, the long-term treaty agreements on the Russian Navy's use of its crucial Black Sea ports on the Crimean Peninsula—a Russian area since the 18th Century, but administratively assigned to Ukraine within the USSR in the early 1950s—would be terminated, ultimately giving NATO forward-basing on Russia's immediate border.

Turning Ukraine against Russia had been a long-term goal of Cold War Anglo-American strategic planners, as it was earlier of Austro-Hungarian imperial intelligence agencies during World War I. After World War II, up until the mid-1950s, the U.S.A. and UK supported an insurgency against the Soviet Union, a civil war that continued on the ground long after peace had been signed in 1945.

The insurgents were from the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and remnants of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). The OUN had been founded in 1929 from a template similar to that which produced the Italian and other European fascist movements. Its leader, Stepan Bandera, was an on-again/off-again ally of the Nazis, and the OUN-UPA, under an ethnic-purist ideology, committed mass slaughter of ethnic Poles and Jews in western Ukraine towards the end of World War II. In Europe after the War, Bandera was sponsored by British MI6 (intelligence), while CIA founder Allen Dulles shepherded Gen. Mykola Lebed, another OUN leader, into the U.S.A., despite strong opposition from U.S. Army Intelligence, based on Lebed's record of collaboration with the Nazis and war crimes.

Next-generation followers of Lebed, whose base of operations—the Prolog Research Corporation in New York City—was funded by Dulles’s CIA for intelligence-gathering and the distribution of nationalist and other literature inside the U.S.S.R., staffed the U.S. Radio Liberty facility in Munich, Germany for broadcasting into Ukraine, up into the 1980s.<sup>2</sup>

When the U.S.S.R. broke up in August 1991, key Banderite leaders dashed into Lviv, far western Ukraine—a mere 1,240 km from Munich, 12 hours by car—and began to rebuild their movement. Lviv Region, which for many years had been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, not the Russian, was the stronghold of the OUN’s heirs.

The Banderites’ influence got a boost after the 2004 Orange Revolution in Kiev. Backed by the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy and the private foundations of financier George Soros, this was a so-called “color revolution,” which overturned the results of a Presidential election and, in a second vote, installed banker Victor Yushchenko as President. He was voted out in 2010 because of popular opposition to his brutal austerity policies (generated by IMF-dictated formulae for privatization and deregulation), but not before overseeing a revision of the official history of Ukraine’s relations with Russia in favor of a radical, anti-Russian nationalism (whereas, historically, there had been a strong tendency among Ukrainian patriots and advocates of independence to prefer a long-term alliance with Russia).

The Lviv-based Banderites, meanwhile, recruited and strengthened their movement, and held paramilitary summer camps for young people in the Ukrainian countryside and elsewhere in Eastern Europe. At times, the instructors included off-duty military officers from NATO countries. In 2008, Yushchenko first applied for NATO to grant Ukraine a Membership Action Plan.

The turning point for Ukraine's status as a potential trigger in the current war danger came in 2014. Ongoing efforts to get Ukraine to finalize its EUAA were rejected as untenable by the Viktor Yanukovich government in November 2013, when it became clear that free-trade provisions giving European goods unlimited access to the Russian market through Ukraine would bring retaliatory measures by Ukraine's biggest trade partner, Russia, to counter this assault on Russia's own producers, and thus would backfire against the Ukrainian economy. When Yanukovich on November 21 announced postponement of the EU deal, long-laid Banderite plans to turn Ukraine into a tool for isolating and demonizing Russia were activated.

Protesters against Yanukovich's EUAA postponement decision immediately began to assemble in Kiev's Maidan (central square). Large numbers of ordinary people turned out, waving EU flags, because of the destruction of the Ukrainian economy under "shock" deregulation in the 1990s and the IMF-dictated policies of privatization and austerity throughout the Orange Revolution years. Many had desperately believed, as Ukrainian economist Natalia Vitrenko once put it, that the EUAA would bring them "wages like in Germany and benefits packages like in France." A disproportionately high number of the demonstrators hailed from far western Ukraine, and pre-planned violence by the Banderite paramilitary group Right Sector was then used for systematic escalation of the Maidan.

Bloodshed and victims, all blamed on the regime, were then used to keep Maidan fervor and outrage going through to February 2014.<sup>3</sup> Neo-Nazi and other fascist symbols defaced building walls and placards in the Maidan, but they did not deter public U.S. support of this process. Sen. John McCain addressed the mob in December 2013, while Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland passed out cupcakes and negotiated with the U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Geoffrey Pyatt regarding whom to place in office once Yanukovich was ousted. A Nuland-Pyatt phone discussion of this was caught on tape and

circulated worldwide.

On February 18, 2014, Maidan leaders announced a “peaceful march” on the Supreme Rada (parliament), which turned into an attack and touched off three days of street fighting. Peaking on February 20—a day of sniper fire from high buildings that killed both demonstrators and police—these clashes killed more than 100. Scrupulous research by Ukraine-born Prof. Ivan Katchanovski at the University of Ottawa, using video recordings and other direct evidence of these events, has convincingly shown that the majority of the sniper fire came from the Maidan’s paramilitary positions, not the government’s Berkut special police forces.<sup>4</sup>

On February 21, 2014, a trio of Maidan leaders, including Arseniy Yatsenyuk, the man hand-picked by Nuland to be Ukraine’s next prime minister, signed an agreement with President Yanukovich, committing both sides to a peaceful transition of power: constitutional reform by September, presidential elections late in the year, and the turning in of weapons. The foreign ministers of France, Germany and Russia helped negotiate it, with a representative from Moscow as an observer. When this document was taken to the Maidan, a young Banderite militant seized the onstage microphone to lead its rejection by the mob, and threatened Yanukovich’s life if he didn’t step down by morning. Yanukovich left Kiev that night. The Rada unconstitutionally installed an acting president.

Among the new government’s first measures was for the Rada to strip Russian and other “minority” languages of their status as regional official languages. (As of the 2001 census, Russian was spoken throughout the country and considered “native” by one-third of the population.) This, with other measures announced from Kiev, fanned major opposition to the coup, centered in eastern Ukraine—the Donetsk and Luhansk regions (the Donbas) and Crimea. Civil conflict erupted in both areas, with local groups seizing government buildings.

In Crimea, the insurgency against the coup-installed Kiev regime prevailed. A referendum held March 16, 2014 in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (a separate jurisdiction on the peninsula), asked voters whether they wanted to join the Russian Federation or retain Crimea's status as a part of Ukraine. In Crimea, 97% of the 83% of eligible voters who turned out, voted for integration into the Russian Federation; in Sevastopol, the result was likewise 97% for integration, while the turnout was even higher, at 89%.

There was no "Russian military invasion of Ukraine." On March 1 President Putin sought and received authorization from the Federal Assembly (the legislature) to deploy Russian forces on Ukrainian territory, citing threats to the lives of Russian citizens and Russian-ethnic residents of Crimea; these were troops from the Russian Black Sea Fleet facilities in and around Sevastopol, already stationed in Crimea.

The fate of two Donbas self-declared republics in Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts (Regions), was not settled so quickly. Support from within Russia for these insurgents was unofficial, including the involvement of Russian military veterans on a volunteer basis. The Donbas conflict turned into heavy fighting in 2014-15, continuing at a lower level until now; more than 13,000 people have been killed in the past seven years. Defeats of Kiev's forces by the Donbas militia, including their gaining full control of the Donetsk International Airport in January 2015, set the stage for Kiev's agreement to a ceasefire.

After one false start—the so-called Minsk Protocol in September 2014—an interim state of affairs in the Donbas was agreed to in the February 2015 "Minsk II" accord between the regime in Kiev, then under President Peter Poroshenko, and representatives of the self-declared Donbas republics, which was negotiated by Kiev, France, Germany and Russia with support from the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). It provided for a ceasefire, pullback of

weapons, prisoner exchanges, and humanitarian relief, as well as a political settlement within Ukraine. This envisaged a special status for the Donbas, with extensive regional autonomy including the “right of linguistic self-determination.” Re-establishment of Ukraine’s “full control” over its border with Russia in the Donbas was to occur following provisional granting of the special status and after local elections. The special status was to be enshrined in the Ukrainian Constitution by the end of 2015.

The UN Security Council endorsed Minsk II on February 17, 2015. It remains unimplemented, because Kiev almost immediately refused to conduct the elections or fully legalize the special status, until first being given control over the Donbas-Russia border. Today, President Volodymyr Zelensky’s government in Kiev refuses even to meet with Donbas leaders for negotiations, and continues to claim that the Donbas is under Russian “occupation,” and therefore Kiev should talk only with Russia, not the Donbas leaders. Sporadic fighting has continued, with a new escalation of shelling across the “line of contact” between the Donbas entities and the rest of Ukraine.

## **A New U.S. War Posture**

The Trump Administration accelerated the take-down of the entire architecture of international arms-control agreements by withdrawing the U.S. from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachov in 1987, and the Open Skies Treaty, negotiated by NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations in 1992. This left the New START Treaty (Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed by the U.S. and the Russian Federation in 2010) as the last of the existing arms control agreements—the one covering heavy intercontinental missiles. Upon taking office this year, President Joe Biden extended the New START Treaty for five

years, a decision welcomed by Moscow.

On January 19, 2018, the U.S. Department of Defense released its new *National Defense Strategy*. “Great power competition—not terrorism—is now the primary focus of U.S. national security,” said the then Secretary of Defense James Mattis in a speech describing the document:

*We face growing threats from revisionist powers as different as China and Russia, nations that seek to create a world consistent with their authoritarian models—pursuing veto authority over other nations’ economic, diplomatic, and security decisions.*

Hours later, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov said, in response to the release of the new Pentagon strategy:

*We regret that, instead of conducting a normal dialogue, instead of relying on international law, the United States seeks to prove its leadership through confrontational concepts and strategies.*

All throughout this time period, Moscow has protested these confrontational actions, but to no avail. “Despite our numerous protests and pleas, the American machine has been set into motion, the conveyer belt is moving forward,” Russian President Vladimir Putin said in his dramatic March 1, 2018 address to the Federal Assembly, in which he publicly announced the new generation of strategic weapons that Russia had under development, at least two of which, the Avangard hypersonic glide vehicle for ICBMs and the Kinzhal aeroballistic missile, have since been introduced into service.



# The Economic Component

Beginning in March 2014, right after the February 2014 coup in Kiev, the United States imposed financial and economic sanctions on Russia, purportedly over Crimea and the Donbas republics. These sanctions have included five Acts of Congress, six Presidential Executive Orders, ten “Directives pursuant to Executive Orders” and two additional Presidential “Determinations.” This, according to the Treasury Department’s sanctions list. There have of course been other sanctions, property seizures, diplomatic expulsions for other alleged reasons, as well as other forms of economic warfare. All of the Ukraine/Crimea-related sanctions remain in effect; none have been lifted. The last major new round of sanctions was imposed in 2018 (the CAATSA Act), coinciding with new sanctions over the Sergei Skripal poisoning case.

According to various estimates, the resultant cost to Russia’s economy of all of these sanctions (in GDP accounting) has been in the range of \$250-400 billion, with comparable losses imposed on European economies.

In addition, in 2016 and 2017, President Putin accused the Barack Obama Administration of having conspired with Saudi Arabia to lower the price of oil and thereby damage the Russian economy. During the Trump Administration, that appeared not to continue, as Russia and Saudi Arabia made two significant production-pricing agreements on oil, the second in 2019 with Trump Administration participation of some kind.

In 2021, the crisis came to a head.

## 2021 Timeline

**February 2:** The U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings* published an article by Adm. Charles A. Richard, Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, in which he claimed that the risk of

nuclear war with Russia or China was increasing and called for action.

*There is a real possibility that a regional crisis with Russia or China could escalate quickly to a conflict involving nuclear weapons, if they perceived a conventional loss would threaten the regime or state. Consequently, the U.S. military must shift its principal assumption from “nuclear employment is not possible” to “nuclear employment is a very real possibility,” and act to meet and deter that reality.*

**March 15:** The U.S. Army-led DEFENDER-Europe 21 exercise began and ran through the month of June, involving 28,000 troops from 27 different countries. The exercise included “nearly simultaneous operations across more than 30 training areas” in a dozen countries, reported *Army Times*.

**March 16:** The UK Government of Prime Minister Boris Johnson released its Integrated Review of security, defense, development, and foreign policy. The report, among other things, announced that the UK nuclear warhead stockpile would be increased from 180 to 260 warheads. This was decided “in recognition of the evolving security environment, including the developing range of technological and doctrinal threats...”

**April 1:** U.S. Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin called Ukrainian Defense Minister Andriy Taran “to discuss the regional security situation,” the Pentagon reported, condemning the supposed “escalations of Russian aggressive and provocative actions in eastern Ukraine.” Austin assured Taran:

*Washington will not give up on Ukraine in case Russia escalates aggression. [And] in the event of an escalation of Russian aggression, the United States will not leave Ukraine to its own devices, and neither will it allow Russia’s aggressive aspirations toward Ukraine to be realized.*

**April 13:** Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu visited Northern Fleet headquarters in Severomorsk, where he said that the United States and its NATO allies were building up naval and land forces in the Arctic, increasing the intensity of combat training, and expanding and modernizing military infrastructure.

*This activity is typical not only for the Arctic region. Over the past three years, the North Atlantic bloc has increased its military activity near the Russian borders.*

Shoigu then commented on the DEFENDER-Europe 21 exercise:

*Now American troops are being transferred from the continental part of North America across the Atlantic to Europe. There is a movement of troops in Europe to the Russian borders. The main forces are concentrated in the Black Sea region and the Baltic region... In total, 40,000 military personnel and 15,000 units of weapons and military equipment, including strategic aviation, will be concentrated near our territory... In response to the Alliance's military activities threatening Russia, we have taken appropriate measures.*

*Within three weeks, two Russian armies and three formations of the airborne troops were successfully transferred to the western borders of the Russian Federation performing combat training tasks.*

*The troops have shown full readiness and ability to perform tasks to ensure the military security of the country.*

**April 15:** The Biden White House issued an Executive Order (EO 14024) proclaiming that Russia's various so-called malign actions "constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United

States.”

That E0 contained a series of new sanctions against Russia, including expelling ten diplomats, blacklisting six Russian technology companies, sanctioning 32 entities and individuals, and—most importantly—prohibiting U.S. financial institutions from participating in the primary market for ruble or non-ruble denominated bonds issued after June 14, 2021, by the Russian government and its financial institutions.

The explicitly stated purpose of the measures was to trigger voluminous capital flight and a “negative feedback loop” that would wreak havoc on the Russian economy. A background briefing by an unnamed senior administration official elaborated:

*There are elements of this new E0 that give us additional authorities that we are not exercising today ... We are prepared, going forward, to impose substantial and lasting costs if this [Russian] behavior continues or escalates ... We're also delivering a clear signal that the President has maximum flexibility to expand the sovereign debt prohibitions if Russia's maligned [sic] activities continue or escalate.*

The latter was widely understood as a threat that further sanctions could follow barring participation in the far more important secondary bond market, and even escalate to the so-called “nuclear option” of expelling Russia from SWIFT.<sup>5</sup>

**June 14:** The E0 announced on April 15, 2021 officially went into effect—two days before the June 16, 2021 summit between presidents Biden and Putin.

**June 23:** The Russian Defense Ministry announced that a Russian warship fired warning shots at the Royal Navy destroyer *HMS Defender*, which it said had violated Russia's maritime border around Crimea in the Black Sea. *HMS Defender* had entered waters in the vicinity of Crimea's Cape Fiolent that are

within Russian sovereign territory, and it had ignored warnings to depart the area. Not mentioned in the press coverage but visible on flight tracking websites was an U.S. Air Force RC-135V electronic intelligence aircraft, which was rounding the west coast of Crimea at the time of the Russian naval encounter with the *Defender*.

The BBC, which had one of its own reporters on board the British warship, confirmed that the *HMS Defender* deliberately entered waters claimed by Russia in order to provoke a response from Russian forces:

*This would be a deliberate move to make a point to Russia. HMS Defender was going to sail within the 19 km (12 mile) limit of Crimea's territorial waters.*

**June 23:** Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu again warned of the strategic danger facing Europe in an address to the Moscow Conference on International Security:

*As a whole, the situation in Europe is explosive and requires specific steps to de-escalate it. The Russian side has proposed a number of measures. For example, it put forward a proposal to move the areas of drills away from the contact line.*

Shoigu also pointed to Russia's proposal for a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in Europe, calling them "a special danger" for Europe because their deployment in Europe "will return to the situation, when the Europeans were hostage to the confrontation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A."

Speaking at the same conference, Gen. Valeriy Gerasimov, the chief of the Russian General Staff, pointed to NATO as a destabilizing factor:

*NATO's naval activity near our borders has grown*

*considerably. Warships outfitted with long-range precision weapons are operating in the Black and Baltic Seas constantly, while reconnaissance, patrol and attack aircraft and also unmanned aerial vehicles are performing their flights. The operations by the warships of the United States and its allies are clearly of a provocative nature... Preconditions are being created for the emergence of incidents, which does not contribute to reducing military tensions.*

**September 20:** NATO kicked off Exercise Rapid Trident 21 at the Yavoriv training range in western Ukraine, with 6,000 troops from 15 countries, including 300 from the U.S. The drills are “an important step towards Ukraine’s European integration,” said Brigadier General Vladyslav Klochkov, co-director of the exercises.

**October 6:** NATO ordered the expulsion of eight diplomats from the Russian mission at NATO headquarters in Brussels, alleging that they were “undeclared Russian intelligence officers.” Moscow retaliated Oct 18 by announcing that Russia’s mission to NATO would shut down and the NATO information office in Moscow would be closed and its staff stripped of their accreditation.

“If anyone ever believed in the sincerity of those statements [from NATO], there are none left today. Their true price is clear for everyone,” said Russian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexander Grushko, in response to the NATO action.

**October 19:** U.S. Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin landed in Kiev and, speaking at a press conference at the Defense Ministry, promised the regime’s leaders that the U.S. will back it in its conflict with Russia:

*Let me underscore what President Biden said during President Zelensky’s recent visit to Washington. U.S. support for Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity is*

*unwavering. So, we again call on Russia to end its occupation of Crimea ... to stop perpetuating the war in eastern Ukraine ... to end its destabilizing activities in the Black Sea and along Ukraine's borders ... and to halt its persistent cyber-attacks and other malign activities against the United States, and our Allies and partners.*

He noted that the U.S. has spent \$2.5 billion in support of Ukraine's military forces "so that they can preserve their country's territorial integrity and secure its borders and territorial waters."

"I think our posture in the region continues to present a credible threat against Russia and it enables NATO forces to operate more effectively should deterrence fail," Austin said the following day in Romania. "And I think this is borne out of our commitment to sustaining a rotational U.S. force presence."

**October 21:** The NATO defense ministers, on the first day of their meeting in Brussels, endorsed "a new overarching plan to defend our Alliance...." The new plan includes: "significant improvements to our air and missile defenses, strengthening our conventional capabilities with fifth generation jets, adapting our exercises and intelligence, and improving the readiness and effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent." NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg said that the alliance has been increasing its presence on the Black Sea, "because the Black Sea is of strategic importance for NATO."

**October 21:** Putin warned in a speech to the Valdai Discussion Club in Sochi that Ukraine doesn't even have to be formally brought into the NATO alliance to pose a strategic threat to Russia:

*Formal membership in NATO ultimately may not happen, but the military development of the territory is already underway. And this really poses a threat to the Russian Federation ...*

*Tomorrow, rockets could appear near Kharkov, what are we going to do about it? It's not us placing our missiles there, it's them shoving theirs under our nose.*

Putin cited NATO's promise not to move its infrastructure eastwards after the reunification of Germany, a promise which it did not keep:

*Everyone from all sides said that after the unification, in no circumstances would NATO infrastructure move toward the East. Russia should have been able to at least rely on that. That's what they said, there were public statements. But in practice? They lied ... and then they expanded it once, and then they expanded it again.*

**October 30:** *The Washington Post*, citing unnamed officials, reported that the Russians were engaged in another buildup of troops along the border with Ukraine. The article's authors said the troop movements have reignited concerns that arose in April.

*"The point is: It is not a drill. It doesn't appear to be a training exercise. Something is happening. What is it?" said Michael Kofman, Program Director of the Russia Studies Program at the Virginia-based nonprofit analysis group CNA.*

**November 1:** *Politico* published satellite imagery purporting to show a Russian troop buildup near the Ukrainian border, including armored units, tanks, and self-propelled artillery, along with ground troops massing near the Russian town of Yelnya close to the border with Belarus. Elements of the 1st Guards Tank Army were spotted in the area. The army "has been designed to conduct operations at every level of combat from counterinsurgency to mechanized warfare," *Jane's* analysis reported.

Even the Ukrainian Defense Ministry denied the reported



Russian military buildup, stating officially: “As of November 1, 2021, an additional transfer of Russian units, weapons and military equipment to the state border of Ukraine was not recorded.”

**November 2:** The Russian Security Council announced that CIA Director William Burns was in Moscow for two days of talks with Nikolai Patrushev, Secretary of the Security Council. According to leaks reported by CNN on November Nov. 5, Biden sent Burns to Moscow to tell the Russians to stop their troop buildup near Ukraine’s border, which the U.S. was monitoring closely.

**November 8:** For the first time, a Resolution passed by both Houses of Congress voiced the demand for “crushing sanctions” on Russia’s economy, purportedly to stop the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, because, in the words of Sen. James Risch, “Russia is creating and weaponizing this energy crisis.” Sen. Ron Johnson said the U.S should “use crushing sanctions to stop the pipeline.” Sen. Tom Cotton added: “The Nord Stream 2 pipeline will expand Russian influence and threaten energy security throughout Europe. Since the Biden administration won’t hold Putin accountable, Congress must take action to ensure our NATO allies aren’t hostage to Russian energy.”

**November 11:** Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov warned that Russia is prepared to act against any NATO provocations:

*If necessary, we will take measures to ensure our security if there are provocative actions by our opponents near our borders. I’m referring to NATO and NATO forces that are taking rather active and assertive actions in close proximity to our borders, be it in the air, on water, or on land.*

**November 16:** British Defense Secretary Ben Wallace met in Kiev with Ukrainian President Zelensky, and signed a joint statement with Ukraine Defense Minister Oleksii Reznikov. Zelensky “thanked Ben Wallace for the unwavering support of

the UK for the independence and territorial integrity of our country within its internationally recognized borders,” according to a statement issued by his office. Zelensky “also praised the signing of the Ukrainian-British Bilateral Framework Agreement on official credit support for the development of the Ukrainian fleet’s capabilities:

*The United Kingdom has become our key partner in building the Ukrainian fleet. I expect that future security projects planned under this agreement will be effectively implemented.*

**November 18:** During an address to a meeting of the Russian Foreign Policy Board, President Putin protested the repeated flights of U.S. bombers close to Russia’s borders:

*Indeed, we constantly express our concerns about these matters and talk about red lines, but of course, we understand that our partners are peculiar in the sense that they have a very—how to put it mildly—superficial approach to our warnings about red lines.*

Putin repeated that Russian concerns about NATO’s eastward expansion “have been totally ignored.”

**November 19:** U.S. Director of National Intelligence Avril Haines landed in Brussels to brief NATO ambassadors on U.S. intelligence on the situation and the possibility of a Russian military intervention in Ukraine.

NATO’s Stoltenberg suggested that if the new German government (which was still the subject of coalition negotiations) were to pull out of the NATO nuclear sharing arrangement, the B61 nuclear bombs currently stored in Germany could be moved eastwards:

*Of course, it’s up to Germany to decide whether the nuclear arms will be deployed in this country, but there’s an alternative to this; the nuclear arms may easily end up in*

*other European countries, including these to the east of Germany.*

That is, even closer to Russia's border.

**November 20:** Ukrainian military intelligence chief Brig. Gen. Kyrylo Budanov told *Military Times*, on the sidelines of the Halifax International Security Conference, that Russia has more than 92,000 troops massed near Russia's border with Ukraine and is preparing for an attack by the end of January or beginning of February 2022.

**November 21:** Bloomberg published a report citing unnamed sources saying that the U.S. had shared intelligence including maps with European allies that shows a buildup of 100,000 Russian troops and artillery to prepare for a rapid, large-scale push into Ukraine from multiple locations, should Putin decide to invade.

**November 30:** Radio Free Europe reported that U.S. Republicans had blocked voting on the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) until Nord Stream 2 sanctions were added to it, objecting that the Russia-to-Germany Baltic Sea pipeline will deny billions in annual revenue to "ally" Ukraine. (The overland pipeline from Yamal in Siberia to Europe traverses Ukraine, which collects transit fees.)

**December 5:** Neo-con Democrat Michèle Flournoy, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy under President Barack Obama, appeared on "Fox News Sunday" and declared that President Biden, in his upcoming December 7 video-conference summit with Putin, was going to threaten "much more severe" financial/economic sanctions on Russia than anything previously done:

*[What] the administration is actively considering with our allies, is an escalating set of sanctions that go beyond what's been done before. I'm sure they are looking at*

*sanctioning the banking system, sanctioning the energy sector, possibly cutting off Russia from the SWIFT system, which enables all of their international financial transactions. So, they're looking at much more serious means ... much greater level of pain than anything [that Russia has faced to date].*

**December 6:** The day before the Biden-Putin video conference, an anonymous senior White House official briefed the press that all NATO allies had agreed on a package of “financial sanctions that would impose significant and severe economic harm on the Russian economy” should Russia invade Ukraine:

*We believe that there is a way forward here that will allow us to send a clear message to Russia there will be genuine and meaningful and enduring costs to choosing to go forward—should they choose to go forward—with a military escalation... We have had intensive discussions with our European partners about what we would do collectively in the event of a major Russian military escalation in Ukraine, and we believe that we have a path forward that would involve substantial economic countermeasures by both the Europeans and the United States, We have put together a pretty damn aggressive package.*

In its coverage, CNN raised the “nuclear option” directly:

*Officials have also been weighing disconnecting Russia from the SWIFT international payment system, upon which Russia remains heavily reliant, according to two sources familiar with the discussions. This is being considered a “nuclear” option. The European Parliament passed a nonbinding resolution in the spring calling for such a move should Russia invade Ukraine, and the U.S. has been discussing it with EU counterparts.*

Later the same day, after Biden had personally spoken with European leaders, the White House issued a statement which did not mention financial sanctions or significant economic damage to Russia. It said, “diplomacy is the only way forward to resolve the conflict in Donbas through the implementation of the Minsk Agreements.”

**December 7:** Presidents Biden and Putin held a video conference summit, after which National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan assured the media that Biden—

*told President Putin directly that if Russia further invades Ukraine, the United States and our European allies would respond with strong economic measures, and would provide additional defensive material to the Ukrainians, above and beyond that which we are already providing, [and that the United States] would fortify our NATO allies on the eastern flank, with additional capabilities in response to such an escalation.*

Biden himself emphasized later that he was considering Putin’s demand for security guarantees, which later resulted in Russia’s proposals (see below).

**December 12:** The new German Foreign Minister, Annalena Baerbock, declared on a national television interview that the Nord Stream 2 pipeline could not become operational because, according to the German government coalition agreements, the pipeline was not consistent with European energy law.

The previous government of Chancellor Angela Merkel had found the opposite. Baerbock, a war-hawk Green Party leader, did not explain the reversal. *The Hill* pointed out that the Greens want Ukraine in NATO.

**December 17:** The Russian Foreign Ministry released two draft treaties specifying guarantees for Russia’s security, one, an agreement between Russia and NATO, and the other,

a treaty between Russia and the United States.

Both documents call for recognizing a principle of “non-interference in the internal affairs” of each other, acknowledge that a “direct military clash between them could result in the use of nuclear weapons that would have far-reaching consequences,” reaffirm “that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought,” and recognize “the need to make every effort to prevent the risk of outbreak of such war among States that possess nuclear weapons.”

The operative part of the U.S.-Russia treaty calls for refraining from taking actions “that could undermine core security interests of the other Party.” Cognizant of the drive for NATO-ization of Ukraine, Article 4 states:

*The United States of America shall undertake to prevent further eastward expansion of NATO and deny accession to the Alliance to the States of the former U.S.S.R.*

And,

*The United States of America shall not establish military bases in the territory of the States of the former U.S.S.R. that are not members of NATO, use their infrastructure for any military activities or develop bilateral military cooperation with them.*

It goes on to state that the Parties (the U.S. and Russia) will not take military actions outside their own borders that threaten each other’s national security, or fly bombers or sail warships outside of their territorial waters in ways that would threaten each other. On the U.S.’ expansion of its nuclear weapons to include those stored in such locations of Germany, the treaty states,

*The Parties shall refrain from deploying nuclear weapons outside their national territories and return such weapons*

*already deployed ... to their national territories.*

**December 19:** An anonymous senior White House official told CNN and other media that there was “only about a four-week window” to compel Russia to de-escalate and that U.S.-planned sanctions “would be overwhelming, immediate, and inflict significant costs on the Russian economy and their financial system.”

**December 21:** In an extensive report delivered to an expanded meeting of the Defense Ministry Board, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu stated:

*Tensions are growing on the western and eastern borders of Russia. The United States is intensifying its military presence at Russian borders.*

*The United States and NATO are purposefully increasing the scale and intensity of military training activities near Russia. Increasingly, they involve strategic aviation, carrying out simulated launches of nuclear missiles at our facilities. The number of their flights near the Russian borders has more than doubled.*

*NATO pays special attention to the issues of the transfer of troops to the eastern flank of the alliance, including from the continental part of the United States. The exercises are practicing various options for using coalition groups against Russia with the use of non-aligned states—Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine.*

*The presence of more than 120 employees of American PMCs [private military companies] in Avdeevka and Priazovskoe settlements in Donetsk region has been reliably established. They equip firing positions in residential buildings and at socially significant facilities, prepare Ukrainian special*

*operations forces and radical armed groups for active hostilities. To commit provocations, tanks with unidentified chemical components were delivered to Avdeevka and Krasny Liman cities.*

Speaking at that same meeting of the Defense Ministry Board, Russian President Putin himself sounded the alarm:

*What they [the United States] are doing on the territory of Ukraine now—or trying to do and going to do—this is not thousands of kilometers away from our national border. This is at the doorstep of our home. They must understand that we simply have nowhere to retreat further... Do they think we don't see these threats? Or do they think that we are so weak-willed to simply look blankly at the threats posed to Russia?*

*As I have already noted, in the event of the continuation of the obviously aggressive line of our Western colleagues, we will take adequate retaliatory military-technical measures, and react toughly to unfriendly steps. And, I want to emphasize, we have every right to do so, we have every right to take actions designed to ensure the security and sovereignty of Russia... We are extremely concerned about the deployment of elements of the U.S. global missile defense system near Russia.*

---

**Historisk begivenhed i**



# København – En albansk musikskat genoplivet, af Feride Istogu Gillesberg

Indledningen og interviews er på albansk, men nød musikken.  
Read the English version below the Danish.

3. januar 2021 – En delegation af fantastiske albanske kunstnere fra Tirana, Albanien, gik sammen med en schweizisk-albansk pianist og to danske sangere om at indspille 50 albanske traditionelle sange, der var arrangeret af Lola Gjoka (Aleksi), den første albanske pianist. Lola Gjokas sange er en sammensmeltning af autentiske albanske folkesange og klassisk musik – en kulturskat, som nu efter syv årtier vil gense dagens lys.

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) 1910-1985, var den første albanske pianist, og spillede en afgørende rolle for at bringe klassisk musik til Albanien. Lola arrangerede 50 albanske sange, baseret på autentiske albanske folkesange, der stadig var levende, som de blev sunget af lokalbefolkningen rundt om i landet. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) skrev melodierne ned og komponerede derefter klaverakkompagnement til sangene, så det var så tro mod sangenes autenticitet som muligt. Disse sange blev en del af de klassiske koncerter, som hun gav sammen med de første bel canto-operasangere i Albanien.

I 1912 fik Albanien endelig sin uafhængighed efter 500 års brutal besættelse af Det Osmanniske Rige – en uafhængighed, der blev opnået mod alle odds. Da tyrkerne endelig var ude, forsøgte nabolandene alt, hvad de kunne, for at dele Albanien mellem sig, hvilket til dels lykkedes. Da vi endelig fik en nation, var ønsket om at komme ud af den ekstreme politiske, økonomiske og kulturelle tilbagestående levende i Albaniens sjæl og ånd.

## **Hvordan den klassiske musik fandt vej til Albanien**

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) blev født i Sevastopol på Krim. Hendes forældre var albanske indvandrere. Hendes far elskede at synge albanske folkesange, og han var en passioneret mandolinspiller. Han elskede musik og ønskede, at hans datter skulle have mulighed for at spille klaver, så han købte et klaver til Lola. Da hun var 9 år gammel, begyndte Lola at få klaverundervisning i skolen, og hendes klaverlærer var meget begejstret for Lolas musikalske talent. Lola Gjoka studerede på musikkonservatoriet i Sevastopol og havde et år tilbage, da hendes studier blev afbrudt. I 1932 blev der udstedt et ultimatum i form af en lov til indvandrerne: enten skulle de blive statsborgere i Sovjetunionen eller forlade landet. Familien var for patriotisk til at opgive deres albanske identitet, da de vidste, hvor hårdt det havde været for deres folk at opnå uafhængighed.

Derfor besluttede familien at vende tilbage til Albanien. Lola var 21 år gammel da hun ankom til Albanien som den første albanske pianist. Senere afsluttede hun sin uddannelse i Athen efter at have vundet en klaverkonkurrence i Wien.

Da Lolas familie forlod Krim, tog de klaveret med, da de vidste, at der ikke fandtes klaverer i Albanien. Turen endte tragisk, da Lolas lillebror døde på rejsen. Da de ankom til Korca i Albanien, hjalp gamle venner familien med at slå sig ned, og Lola begyndte at give undervisning til piger og drenge fra mere velhavende familier for at tjene til livets ophold for familien, som havde mistet hele deres opsparing på grund af hyperinflation.

Da Lola kom til Korca, var kimen til en kulturel renæssance allerede blevet lagt af den første albanske lyriske operasanger, Mihal Ciko, som var kommet tilbage fra udlandet i 1920'erne. Han var den første albaner, der studerede i Milano på Giuseppe Verdi-konservatoriet. Mihal skabte stor begejstring, og ikke kun i Albanien. Han deltog i den internationale folkesangskonkurrence på Fiera di Milano i

1924, hvor han fremførte albanske folkesange. Sange som aldrig var blevet sunget uden for Albanien før. Mihal Cikos fortolkning var så bevægende, at han vandt konkurrencen.

Lola Gjoka og Mihal slog sig sammen og flere operasangere kom tilbage til Albanien – soprannerne Jorgjia Felice Truja, Tefta Tashko, Maria Kraja, tenoren Kristaq Antoniu og barytonen Kristaq Koco. Kimen til en kulturel renæssance blev dannet, med Lola Gjoka i epicentret.

Den store pianist akkompagnerede alle sangerne i Verdi- og Puccini-arianer, tyske sange og meget mere og albanske folkesange var ligeledes en vigtig del af koncerterne. Tefta Tashko og de andre sangere kom til Lola med sange fra forskellige dele af Albanien, så Lola kunne skrive dem ned og arrangere klaverakkompagnement til dem, med respekt for folkesangenes autenticitet. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) og Tefta Tashko blev beskrevet som bier, der samlede honning fra alle de forskellige blomster i den albanske have.

Disse sange blev en kulturel skat, der fyldte folkets hjerter med skønhed, kærlighed, optimisme og håb om en bedre fremtid. Dette var starten på en kulturel renæssance i 30'erne og 40'erne, som varede i flere årtier.

I 1970'erne omarbejdede Lola sine sange endnu en gang, og hendes sidste ønske, inden hun døde i 1985, var, at disse sange skulle være tilgængelige for den nye generation. På grund af helbredsproblemer udgav Juki, Lolas eneste barn, først en bog med sin mors 52 sange i 2007, men de blev aldrig indspillet.

Jeg blev først introduceret til nogle af Lola Gjokas (Aleksi) sange af den schweizisk-albanske pianist Ermira Lefort, som kom til Danmark i 2019 for, sammen med mig, at opføre to af Lola Gjokas sange ved koncerten »A Musical Dialogue of Cultures«, arrangeret af Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog og Det Kinesiske Kulturinstitut. Ermira og jeg blev

derefter af det danske konsulat i Tirana inviteret til at give en koncert med et dansk-albansk program. På grund af Corona blev koncerten udsat til den 5. juni 2021. Skæbnen ville, at Ermira ikke var i stand til at komme til Tirana, og jeg derfor havde brug for en erstatning. Det blev pianisten Rudina Ciko, og det var virkelig held i uheld.

Da jeg i maj havde mødt Rudina i Tirana, havde hun givet mig bogen med de samlede sange af Lola Gjoka (Aleksi). Det var nogle uger før vores koncert og indimellem havde jeg tid til at kigge på sangene og opdagede, at hver enkelt af dem var både speciel og meget smuk. Efter koncerten i Tirana, på vej tilbage til Danmark, fik jeg den idé, at disse sange burde indspilles. Hver sang var som en perle i en række af perler, der tilsammen udgjorde en smuk halskæde, Folk burde have tilgang til denne skat.

### **Gnisten, der ventede på at blive til rigtig ild**

Jeg besluttede mig for at gøre mit for at få disse sange indspillet. Gennem Rudina Ciko mødte jeg hendes mand, dirigenten Zhani Ciko, søn af den berømte bel canto-sanger Mihal Ciko, Lola Gjokas (Aleksi) veninde. Zhani Ciko var et barn af den kulturelle renæssance og bar den levende arv fra den albanske kulturelle renæssance i sit hjerte og sind. Zhani Ciko organiserede også den første opførelse af Beethovens 9. symfoni i Albaniens historie i 1970'erne.

Da jeg fortalte Zhani idéen om at indspille alle Lola Gjoka (Aleksis) sange, blev han meget begejstret og begyndte straks at arbejde på at realisere den. Zhani organiserede en gruppe af talentfulde sangere, herunder den meget kendte sopran Mariana Leka, sopranen Erlinda Agolli, tenoren Gerald Murraj, barytonen Antonio Zefi og Rudina Ciko, der akkompagnerede på klaver. Sammen med den store pianist Ermira Lefort, den kendte danske tenor Stig Fogh Andersen og mig selv, en dansk-albansk sopran, blev der dannet en gruppe, som kunne realisere ideen. Vi mødtes alle i Danmark for at gennemføre projektet. Takket være Knud Rasmussen, organist i Virum Kirke, så åbnede Virum

Kirke sine døre for os, så vi kunne lave optagelserne der. Og takket være Stig Fogh Andersen, hans søn Ask og Stigs gode veninde Heidrun Beer, så fik vi gennemført optagelserne. Det lykkedes at indspille de 50 sange på mindre end fire dage den 27.-30. december 2021. Vi afsluttede optagelserne med at filme en lille koncert i kirken, da Corona gjorde publikum umuligt.

Indspilningen af disse 50 sange er en historisk begivenhed, da det aldrig er sket før. Udgivelsen af de samlede sange på en dobbelt-cd vil finde sted i slutningen af februar i år og vil ikke kun være en skat, der atter vil blive en del af den albanske kulturarv, men også en perle, der vil blive indføjet i den europæiske kulturskat.

Må cd'erne så være en inspiration til at holde mange koncerter og kulturelle udvekslinger mellem Albanien og mange andre nationer.

For at bestille kopier af cd'erne kan man kontakte Feride Gillesberg på: [feridegillesberg@gmail.com](mailto:feridegillesberg@gmail.com).

---

Udgivet i Executive Intelligence Review Volume 49, Number 6, February 11, 2022.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Earlier article:

Historic Event in Copenhagen – An Albanian Musical Treasure Revived

By Feride Istogu Gillesberg

January 3, 2021 – A delegation of fantastic Albanian artists from Tirana, Albania, joined forces with a Swiss-Albanian pianist, and Danish musicians, to record 50 Albanian traditional songs, arranged by the first Albanian pianist, Lola Gjoka (Aleksi). Lola Gjoka's songs are a fusion of authentic Albanian folk songs and classical music – a cultural

treasure that will now see daylight, after seven decades.

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) 1910-1985, was the first Albanian pianist, who played a crucial role in bringing classical music to Albania. Lola arranged 50 Albanian songs, based on authentic Albanian folk songs that were still alive, as sung by local people around the nation. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) wrote down the notes, and composed the piano accompaniment to the songs, as truthful to the authenticity of the songs as possible. These songs became a part of the classical concerts she gave, together with the first bel canto opera singers in Albania.

In 1912, Albania finally got its independence, after 500 years of a brutal occupation by the Ottoman Empire – an independence achieved against all odds. When, finally, the Turks were out, the neighboring countries tried everything they could to divide Albania among them, which partly succeeded. When we finally had a nation, the desire for rising out of extreme backwardness, politically, economically, and culturally, was vividly in the soul and spirit of the people of Albania.

How classical music made its way to Albania

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) was born in Sevastopol, Crimea. Her parents were Albanian immigrants. Her father loved singing Albanian folk songs, and he was a passionate mandolin player. Lola Gjoka's father loved music and wanted his daughter to have the possibility of playing the piano, so he bought a piano for Lola. When she was 9-years-old, Lola started getting piano lessons at school, and her piano teacher was very excited about Lola's musical talent. Lola Gjoka studied at the music conservatory in Sevastopol. She had one year left, when her studies were disrupted. In 1932, an ultimatum, in the form of a law, was issued to the immigrants: either become Soviet Union nationals, or leave the country. The family was too patriotic to give up their Albanian identity, knowing how hard the achievement of independence had been for their people. So, the family left to go back to Albania. Lola was 21 years old.

She arrived in Albania as the first Albanian pianist. Later, she finished her diploma in Athens, after winning a piano competition in Vienna.

When Lola's family left the Crimea, they took the piano along, since they knew that there were no pianos in Albania. The tour ended tragically, when Lola's little brother died on their journey. Arriving in Korca, Albania, old friends helped the family settle down, and Lola began giving lessons to girls and boys of wealthier families, to make a living for their family, which had lost all their savings due to hyperinflation.

When Lola came to Korca, a seed for a cultural renaissance had already been planted by the first Albanian lyric opera singer, Mihal Ciko, who had come back from abroad in 1920s. He was the first Albanian who studied in Milan at the Giuseppe Verdi Conservatory. Mihal created a lot of excitement, not only in Albania. He took part in the international folk song competition in "Fiera di Milano" in 1924, where he performed Albanian folk songs, songs that had never been sung outside Albania before. Mihal Ciko's interpretation was so moving, that he won the competition.

Lola Gjoka and Mihal joined forces. More opera singers came back to Albania – the sopranos Jorgjia Felice Truja, Tefta Tashko, Maria Kraja, tenor Kristaq Antoniu, and baritone Kristaq Koco. The seed of a cultural renaissance was formed, with Lola Gjoka in the epicenter.

The great pianist accompanied all the singers in Verdi and Puccini arias, German Lieder, and much more. Albanian folk songs were an important part of the concerts. Many traditional Albanian folk songs were written down by Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) who arranged piano accompaniments, carefully keeping the authenticity of the old folk songs. Tefta Tashko and the other singers would come to her with songs from different parts of Albania, so Lola could write them down and arrange piano accompaniments. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) and Tefta Tashko were

described as bees that collected the honey from all the different flowers in the Albanian garden.

These songs became a cultural treasure that filled the hearts of the people with beauty, love, optimism and hope for a better future. This was the start of a cultural renaissance in the 30s and 40s, that lasted for several decades.

In the 1970s, Lola reworked her songs once again. Her last wish before she died in 1985, was to have these songs available for the new generation. Due to health problems, Lola's only child, Juki, first published a book of her mother's 52 songs in 2007, but they were never recorded.

I was first introduced to some songs by Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) by the Swiss-Albanian pianist Ermira Lefort, who came to Denmark in 2019 to perform two of Lola Gjoka's songs with me at the concert, "A Musical Dialogue of Cultures," organized by the Schiller Institute, Russian-Danish Dialogue, and the Chinese Cultural Center. Ermira and I were invited by the Danish consul in Tirana to give a concert with a Danish-Albanian program. Due to corona, the concert was postponed to June 5, 2021. As destiny played out, Ermira was not able to come to Tirana, and I needed a replacement. The pianist Rudina Ciko was her replacement, a blessing in disguise.

When I met Rudina in May in Tirana, she had given me the book with the collected songs of Lola Gjoka (Aleksi), some weeks before our concert. In between, I had the time to look through the collected songs, and discovered that each of them was very special and beautiful. After the concert in Tirana, on my way back to Denmark, I was thinking that these songs ought to be recorded. Each song is like a pearl in the row of a treasure necklace, and people should have access to this treasure.

The spark that waited to be transformed into fire

I decided to do my part to get these songs recorded. Through Rudina Ciko, I met her husband, the conductor Zhani Ciko, the



son of the famous bel canto singer Mihal Ciko, Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) friend. Zhani Ciko was a child of the cultural renaissance, and carries the living heritage of the Albanian cultural renaissance in his heart and mind. Zhani Ciko also organized the first performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony in the history of Albania, in 1970s.

When I spoke to Zhani about the idea of recording all of Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) songs, he became very excited. He immediately began working on realizing this idea. Zhani organized a group of great singers, including the very well-known soprano Mariana Leka, soprano Erlinda Agolli, tenor Gerald Murraj, baritone Antonio Zefi and Rudina Ciko playing the piano. Together with the great pianist Ermira Lefort, Stig Fogh Andersen, a very well-known Danish tenor, and myself, a Danish-Albanian soprano, a group was formed that could realize the idea. We all met in Denmark to carry out the project.

Thanks to Knud Rasmussen, the organist at Virum Church, the church opened their doors for us to make the recordings there. And thanks to Stig Fogh Andersen, his son Ask, and his good friend Heidrun Beer, we were able to make the recordings. Thanks to all the musicians, we succeeded in recording the fifty songs in less than four days (December 27- 30, 2021).

We concluded by holding a little concert.

This recording is an historical event, as it has never been done before. Publishing Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) collected songs on a double CD in the spring of this year will not only be a treasure that will be given back to the Albanian cultural heritage, but, also, be a pearl to be added to the European cultural treasure.

May the CDs be an inspiration for many concerts and cultural exchanges between Albania and many nations.

To order the CDs, contact Feride Gillesberg at: [feridegillesberg@gmail.com](mailto:feridegillesberg@gmail.com)

---

# NATO's udvidelse mod øst i billeder



---

## »Aldrig atomkrig«-erklæringen af fem stormagter begynder 2022, LaRouches år

Den 3. januar (EIRNS) – Imens året 2022 åbnede, der markerer økonomien og statsmanden Lyndon LaRouches 100-års fødselsdag, rådførte stats- og regeringscheferne for de fem atomvåbenstater, som også er de permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd (P5), sig med hinanden, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har insisteret på, at de må gøre, og udstedte for første gang en erklæring om, at »atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes« (se hele erklæringen nedenunder). Ordene blev brugt af præsidenterne Biden og Putin efter deres videokonference den 7. december 2021; og denne erklæring vil nu være in mente,

når USA-Rusland-NATO-forhandlingerne om Ukraine-krisen finder sted den 10.-13. januar.

Men den grundlæggende årsag til optimisme her er ikke så meget ordene i denne erklæring, men at lederne af de fem magter handlede sammen mod global krig. Helga Zepp-LaRouche havde offentligt opfordret dem til at gøre dette for præcis to år siden – den 3. jan. 2020, i den farlige periode efter USA's mord på den iranske general Qassem Soleimani – og har opfordret dem til det mange gange siden. Den 15. januar 2020, to uger efter Helga LaRouches første appel, opfordrede Ruslands præsident Putin til et P5-statsoverhoved-topmøde for at behandle problemerne med fred, sikkerhed og terrorisme – og han har også gentaget det forslag adskillige gange siden; og hans talsmand understregede i dag, at det stadig er nødvendigt efter denne »aldrig atomkrig«-erklæring.

Allerede i begyndelsen af marts 2020 havde Helga LaRouche identificeret COVID-pandemien – med krav om et moderne sundhedssystem opbygget i alle lande – som den nye betingelse for et sådant stormagtstopmøde. Dette må ske som en nødforanstaltning i Afghanistan sammen med fødevarehjælp og strømforsyningsgarantier for at redde millioner af liv. Det er starten på, gennem fysisk-økonomisk udvikling, det rigtige navn for fred; og det peger på et nyt internationalt kreditsystem, som Franklin Roosevelts Bretton Woods, i stedet for det krakkende kasino, vi har nu. Det er disse missioner, der er unikt tilgængelige gennem det Lyndon LaRouche kaldte »fire-magtsaftalen« mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien. Det gør dagens »P5«-erklæring væsentlig ud over dets ordlyd.

Erklæringen blev offentliggjort samtidigt omkring kl. 11:00 amerikansk østlig tid på alle fem præsidenters/premierministres hjemmesider. »Vi bekræfter, at en atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes,« siger erklæringen. »Da brug af atomvåben ville have vidtrækkende konsekvenser, bekræfter vi også, at atomvåben – så længe de fortsætter med at eksistere – bør tjene defensive formål,

afskrække aggression og forhindre krig. Vi er overbevist om, at yderligere spredning af sådanne våben må forhindres«. Dette irettesætter de gale krigshøge som USA's senator Roger Wicker, der har rejst »muligheden« for et første atomangreb på Rusland i forbindelse med Ukraine.

De fem underskrivere bekræfter også vigtigheden af at imødegå atomare trusler, såvel som deres forpligtelser i forhold til traktaten om ikke-spredning af atomvåben (NPT) og dens forpligtelse til »at føre forhandlinger i god tro om effektive foranstaltninger vedrørende standsning af atomvåbenkapløbet snarligt«. De »bekræfter, at ingen af vores atomvåben er rettet mod hinanden eller mod nogen anden stat«.

De erklærede også: »Vi har til hensigt at fortsætte med at søge bilaterale og multilaterale diplomatiske tilgange for at undgå militære konfrontationer, styrke stabilitet og forudsigelighed, øge den gensidige forståelse og tillid og forhindre et våbenkapløb, der ikke ville gavne nogen og bringe alle i fare. Vi er fast besluttet på at føre en konstruktiv dialog med gensidig respekt og anerkendelse af hinandens sikkerhedsinteresser og bekymringer«.

Det russiske udenrigsministeriums talskvinde, Maria Zakharova, sagde: »Vi håber, at godkendelsen af en sådan politisk erklæring under de nuværende vanskelige forhold for international sikkerhed vil hjælpe med at reducere niveauet af internationale spændinger«. Kreml-talsmand Dmitry Peskov understregede, at Moskva stadig betragtede et topmøde mellem verdens store atommagter som »nødvendigt«. Kinas viceudenrigsminister, Ma Zhaoxu, blev citeret af det officielle nyhedsagentur, Xinhua, at løftet »vil hjælpe med at øge den gensidige tillid og erstatte konkurrence mellem stormagter med koordinering og samarbejde«.

Men det er kun et skridt, som disse nationers ledere skal holdes til. Det transatlantiske bank- og finanssystem er på vej mod hyperinflation og krak. Det, verden absolut har brug

for, er en stormagtsforhandlingsproces, som i det mindste også involverer Indien, for at iværksætte et nyt internationalt kreditsystem, der er i stand til at finansiere reel økonomisk udvikling, »TVA-lignende«, gennemgribende udvikling af fattigere regioner (TVA var et statsligt udviklingsagentur i USA til udvikling af Tennessee-dalen under depressionen i 1930'erne –red.), avanceret udvikling af atomkraft, teknologiske fremskridt drevet frem af lynprogrammer inden for rumvidenskab og fusionskraft. Vejlederen og planlæggeren af denne proces, og verdens førende i kampen for den, var Lyndon LaRouche. Dette begynder LaRouches år.