

# Hvorfor Danmark bør afstå fra et intensiveret geopolitisk militært engagement, af næstformand Michelle Rasmussen:

Fra videokonferencen den 25. maj 2022.

Jeg vil lige bruge et par minutter på at tale om den danske situation, idet jeg afløser Tom Gillesberg, der er formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark.

Schiller Institutet i Danmark siger helt klart, at folk skal stemme NEJ ved folkeafstemningen, som skal afholdes den 1. juni. Folkeafstemningen drejer sig om en situation, hvor fem partier i den danske regering i forbindelse med Ukraine-krigen stemte for at få en folkeafstemning, som en del af et nationalt forsvarskompromis, herunder Socialistisk Folkeparti, som i første omgang havde sørget for fravalgene. Det var tilbage i 1992, hvor den danske befolkning først havde stemt NEJ til Maastricht-traktaten. Derefter kom forhandlingerne, der førte til Edinburgh-aftalen, frem til fire undtagelsesbestemmelser. Derefter stemte befolkningen JA til at acceptere Maastricht-traktaten.

En af undtagelserne var, at Danmark ikke ville deltage i de fælles europæiske EU-militære aktiviteter. Vi mener, at befolkningen skal stemme NEJ. Det ville være en måde, ikke blot at forhindre Danmark i at øge sine militære aktiviteter med EU, men også at sætte en stopper for en militariseringsproces, der især siden 2001 har været i gang. Personligt er jeg amerikansk statsborger, og for nylig er jeg også blevet dansk statsborger. Og jeg vil sige, at Danmark,

mit nye hjemland, i stedet for bare at følge med i USA's politik, mit oprindelsesland, at Danmark i stedet burde arbejde for at ændre USA's politik.

Lyndon LaRouche opfordrede for mange år siden til en fire-magts-aftale. Hvis USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og Rusland samarbejder om at etablere et nyt retfærdigt økonomisk verdenssystem, et nyt kreditsystem, kunne dette har været grundlaget for konfliktløsning gennem økonomisk udviklingssamarbejde. Som Li Xing sagde, er det bedste alternativ til krig at få iværksat et økonomisk samarbejde. [Dermed kunne den nuværende konflikt have været undgået.]

Siden 2001 har Danmark deltaget i alle de krige, som USA, tilskyndet af briterne, har indledt, fra Afghanistan under statsminister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, og det var især under statsminister Anders Fogh Rasmussen, som senere blev NATO's generalsekretær, at militariseringen blev optrappet. Danmark deltog i krigene i Irak, og så havde vi Libyen. Vi var med i de andre krige, der kom bagefter.

Nu er Danmark i forhandlinger med USA om etablering af en bilateral forsvarsaftale, som formentlig vil omfatte permanent udstationering af amerikanske tropper på dansk jord, hvilket vil sige, at udenlandske tropper for første gang i fredstid vil blive permanent udstationeret her.

Der var et spørgsmål til de fem partier, der kom med dette nationale forsvarskompromis, fra en journalist til de to højrepartier, Det Konservative Folkeparti og Venstre, om, hvad de ville sige, hvis USA ville bede om at forhandle om opstilling af atomvåben i Danmark. Og deres svar var: "Jamen, det må vi da tale om." Det er også en total kursændring i forhold til den tidligere danske politik.

Den anden ting er, at det ikke er nok at stemme NEJ ved folkeafstemningen. Det vil ikke løse problemerne. Men det vil være en måde at dæmme op for denne trinvis militarisering.

For det, Schiller Instituttet siger, er, at nøglen til en mere fredelig verden ikke er at øge militariseringen, men at etablere en ny arkitektur for sikkerhed og økonomisk udvikling, hvor man kan undgå krigsudbrud. Som Jan Øberg påpegede, kan man have konflikter, men hvordan sikrer vi, at de ikke fører til krig? Hvordan kan vi løse disse konflikter på en fredelig måde?

Det er her, at idéen om fremgangsmåden med den Westfalske Fred dukker op. Jeg vil snarest stille et spørgsmål til Helga for at få mere at vide om det.

Danmark har også haft en anden tradition. Et af vores slogans her har været, at i stedet for krigsførelse skal vi bygge broer. Der er en dansk tradition for økonomisk udvikling, partnerskab med lande om vandudvikling, om brobygning og om energiudvikling. Det er det, vi skal fremhæve.

In English:

I will just take a few minutes to speak about the Danish situation, standing in for Tom Gillesburg, the chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark.

The Schiller Institute in Denmark is definitely saying that people should vote NO in the referendum, which is to be held on June 1st. The referendum concerns a situation where after the Ukraine war, five parties in the Danish government voted to have a referendum as part of a National Defense Compromise, including the Socialist People's Party, which had organized the opt-outs in the beginning. Back in 1992, where the Danish population had first voted NO to the Maastricht Treaty. Then, the negotiations that led to the Edinburgh agreement came up with four opt-outs. Then, the population voted YES to accept the Maastricht Treaty.

One of the opt-outs was that Denmark would not participate in the joint European EU military activities. We think that people should vote NO. This would be a way, not only to prevent Denmark from increasing its military activity with the

EU, but would also put a stop to a process of militarization that has been going on, especially since 2001. Personally, I'm an American citizen, and recently, I also became a Danish citizen. And I would say that Denmark, my adopted country, ought to, instead of just following along with the policies of the United States, my native country, that Denmark should, instead, work to change the policies of the United States.

Lyndon LaRouch, many years ago, called for a four power agreement. If the United States, Russia, China and India would cooperate to establish a new just world economic system, a new credit system, this could be the basis of conflict resolution through economic development cooperation. As the Li Xing was saying, the best alternative to war is to get economic cooperation going.

Since 2001, Denmark has participated in every war that the United States, goaded on by the British, have launched, from Afghanistan under Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, and it the militarization was especially escalated under Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen, who later became the NATO's general secretary. Denmark participated in the the wars in Iraq, and then we had Libya. We had the other wars that came after that.

And now Denmark is in negotiations with the United States for setting up a bilateral defense treaty, which will probably include permanent stationing of United States troops on Danish soil, which would be that foreign troops would be permanently stationed here for the first time in peacetime.

There was a question to the five parties that came up with this National Defense Compromise from a reporter to the two right parties, the the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party (Venstre), about what they would they say if the United States would ask for negotiating about stationing of nuclear weapons in Denmark. And their answer was, "Well, we'll have to talk about it." This is also a total reversal of the previous Danish policy.

The other thing is that it's not enough to vote NO in the referendum. That will not solve the problems. But it will be a way of of stemming the tide of this step by step by step militarization.

Because, what the Schiller Institute is saying, is that the key to a more peaceful world is not increasing the militarization, but it is establishing a new security and economic development architecture, where you can avoid the outbreak of war. As Jan was saying, you can have conflicts, but how do we make sure that it doesn't lead to war? How can we solve these conflicts in a peaceful way?

And that is where the idea of the Peace of Westphalia approach comes in. I will soon ask a question to Helga to explain more about that.

And Denmark has also had a different tradition. One of our slogans here has been, instead of war fighting, bridge building. There is aa Danish tradition for economic development, partnership with countries about water development, about building bridges, about energy development. And this is what we need to be emphasizing.

So, I would like to introduce, then, the question period, by asking the question to Helga. This is from Sarah on YouTube, who would like to ask Helga "What is a foreseeable path to reaching a position to propose the peace of Westphalia? Is war the only way? How much can transparency work towards reaching this goal?" To sum it up. What is the idea of the Peace of Westphalia? How can these principles of peace building be used today? And how can we actually implement this?

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:**

The answer will come soon.