

Poul Villaume den 14. januar 2022:

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

Skal vi ikke bygge den nu – sammen med Rusland?

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

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

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

»Det er i denne forbindelse også værd at minde om, at både NATO selv (London-erklæringen, juli 1990) og alle CSCE-lande (Paris-charteret, november 1990) ved Den Kolde Krigs afslutning lovede sig selv og hinanden, at der nu skulle opbygges nye sikkerhedspolitiske mekanismer og institutioner og en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur i et helet og helt Europa, som naturligt også skulle omfatte både Nordamerika og Rusland. Man talte også om et sikkerhedsfælleskab, som skulle strække sig "fra Vancouver til Vladivostok". Men efter at Sovjetunionen brød sammen under sin egen (død)vægt i 1991, blev NATO kastet ud i en stille, eksistentiel krise, som man først gradvist overvandt med vedtagelsen af NATOs udvidelsesprogram mod øst i 1993-94 ("expand or die", lød parolen internt). Der blev dermed, som Vestens yndlings-russer i 1990erne, Boris Jeltsin,

fortroligt advarede Bill Clinton om i 1994 og 1995, i praksis tale om, at den tilbageblevne koldkrigsalliance blev dominerende i Europa på bekostning af et sikkerhedspolitisk marginaliseret, isoleret og ydmyget Rusland...«

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

Læs hele artiklen i Ræson her.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fra Schiller Instituttet interviewet af CGTN om truslen om en atomkrig og nødvendigheden af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur

Den 26. februar (EIRNS)–Helga Zepp LaRouche blev interviewet i kinesiske CGTN's udsendelse The Hub i morges af vært Wang Guan.

WANG GUAN: Og nu er vi også sammen med Helga Zepp-LaRouche fra Wiesbaden, Tyskland, grundlægger og formand for Schiller Instituttet. Fru LaRouche, velkommen tilbage til CGTN. Jeg er glad for at have dig hos os igen. Først og fremmest vil jeg gerne høre din vurdering af den igangværende Rusland-Ukraine-konflikt: Tror du, at den kunne have været undgået?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Præsident Putin havde gjort det meget klart, at røde linjer var blevet overskredet. Han sagde på et tidspunkt, at der ikke er noget sted, jeg kan trække tilbage til, og Vesten lyttede ikke til det. Den 17. december bad han så NATO og USA om juridisk bindende sikkerhedsgarantier, om at NATO ikke ville udvide sig yderligere mod øst, at der ikke ville blive placeret offensive våben ved den russiske grænse, og at Ukraine aldrig ville blive medlem af NATO. Og han modtog ikke noget svar. Han fik ikke svar på det centrale spørgsmål, kun på underordnede forhold.

Så jeg mener, at Vesten begik en stor fejl ved ikke at lytte til Ruslands legitime, udtrykte sikkerhedsbekymringer, og nu er vi på randen af noget, som kan komme helt ud af kontrol.

WANG: Fru LaRouche, USA og NATO har annonceret de aktuelle

sanktionsrunder mod Rusland, som er rettet mod præsident Putin og udenrigsminister Lavrov og andre. Tror du, at det vil afskrække Rusland fra sine nuværende planer, deres operationer i Ukraine?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Det mener jeg ikke, for jeg tror, at præsident Putin har afvist dette. Han har allerede for nogle år siden sagt, at hvis Vesten ikke havde fundet Ukraine til at inddæmme og bruge til at nedbryde Rusland, ville de have fundet et andet problem. For nylig sagde han, at det virkelige formål med alt dette er at forhindre Ruslands økonomiske udvikling. Den 25. januar var der to unavngivne embedsmænd fra Det Hvide Hus, som sagde, at sanktionerne har til formål at forhindre Rusland i at diversificere fra olie og gas, hvilket betyder, at de nægter Rusland retten til udvikling!

[<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/01/25/background-press-call-by-senior-administration-officials-on-russia-ukraine-economic-deterrence-measures/>]

Dette er en krigshandling. Sanktioner er en krigshandling, og jeg tror, at Putin har afvist det. Det vil være smertefuldt for Rusland, men jeg tror, at Vesten påfører sig selv langt større skade. Og det skal fordømmes fuldstændigt.

WANG: Og lad os også tale om FN, den rolle FN's resolutioner spiller, som ikke blev vedtaget tidligere. Overrasker det dig overhovedet? At vi endnu en gang så et splittet Sikkerhedsråd i FN, når der står alt for meget på spil?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: FN's Sikkerhedsråd er praktisk taget blevet gjort overflødig af NATO allerede i 2011, da de løj i forbindelse med Libyen. De fik Ruslands og Kinas godkendelse til en begrænset aktion i Libyen, som så viste sig at være et omfattende militært angreb. Fra dengang har løgnet spillet en stor rolle, og det overrasker mig slet ikke, at målet med alt dette nu er at bevare den unipolære verden. Og det kan Rusland og Kina naturligvis ikke gå med til, så det er slet ikke

overraskende.

WANG: Madame LaRouche, i årevis og årtier har du opfordret til en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, og nu opfordrer du til en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur i Europa. Hvad indebærer denne nye sikkerhedsarkitektur?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Nej, jeg opfordrer til en {international} sikkerhedsarkitektur, som involverer sikkerhedsinteresser for alle nationer på denne planet, inklusive Rusland og Kina. Jeg mener, at det historiske forbillede er den Vestfalske Fred, fordi alle de deltagende magter efter 150 års religionskrig i Europa og de enorme ødelæggelser kom til den konklusion, , at en fortsættelse af krigen ikke ville være til gavn for nogen, fordi ingen ville leve for at nyde den. Og vi befinder os i en lignende situation: Hvis man virkelig ser nøje på situationen, er faren en atomar udslettelse af hele den menneskelige art. Og jeg tror, at det er det, der skal trænge ind i alles bevidsthed, og så skal der indledes en proces som Westfalens fred, hvor princippet er, at en løsning skal tage hensyn til den andens interesser, til {alle} andres interesser.

Og det indebærer Ruslands sikkerhedsinteresser, Kinas sikkerhedsinteresser, USA's, europæernes og alle andre nationers sikkerhedsinteresser. Det andet princip i Westfalske Fred var, at alle forbrydelser, som blev begået af den ene eller den anden part, skal glemmes af hensyn til freden, og for det tredje, at statens rolle er vigtig i den økonomiske genopbygning efter krigen.

Nu betyder det tilsvarende i dag, at alle magter skal tage fat på det virkelige, afgørende spørgsmål, nemlig at grunden til, at vi overhovedet har konflikten, er, at Vestens neoliberale system er ved at bryde sammen, og derfor skal den første handling i en sådan ny arkitektur være en global Glass-Steagall-bankopdeling, hvor der skal sættes en stopper for kasinoøkonomien, som har været årsagen til, at Vesten er blevet så desperat, og hvor der skal gøres en ende på den.

Derefter skal vi have et nationalt banksystem for hvert enkelt land og et nyt kreditsystem i traditionen fra Bretton Woods-systemet, som giver billig kredit til udvikling af udviklingslandene. Hvis man bliver enige om disse foranstaltninger, vil en varig fred være mulig.

WANG: Madame LaRouche, [navn 6:23] en anerkendt politolog i Asien sagde tidligere i dag, at Ruslands slutspil kunne være at skabe en slags "mini-Sovjetunion". Ser du også på det på den måde?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Nej, det tror jeg ikke. Jeg tror, at de eneste mennesker, der presser på for geopolitiske blokke lige nu, er dem, der står bag præsident Biden, som forsøgte at skabe denne "alliance af demokratier" mod de såkaldte autokratiske regeringer. Jeg mener, at aftalen mellem præsident Xi Jinping og Putin den 4. februar, hvor de indgik en strategisk alliance mellem Rusland og Kina baseret på de fem principper for fredelig sameksistens, er åben for alle. Og jeg mener, at enhver ny orden, der skal føre til fred, skal være inkluderende, skal overvinde geopolitikken og grundlæggende gå ud fra et princip om, at fred kun er mulig gennem udvikling, som skal være tilgængelig for alle.

WANG: Endelig, fru LaRouche, mener De, at USA og Vesten på en eller anden måde er på vej nedad, hvis man sammenligner deres holdning, f.eks. i Jugoslavien for 20 år siden, hvor de resolut greb ind militært, og nu, med Ukraine, med deres lige så resolute "ingen støvler på jorden"-princip og holdning?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Ja, vi har set i Afghanistan, at NATO og USA, som er den angiveligt mest magtfulde militærmaskine på jorden, ikke var i stand til at besejre det, der i sidste ende viste sig at være 65.000 talibankrigere. Der er altså tvivl om Vestens militære magt.

Problemet er, at der dermed kun er atomvåben tilbage, og hvis man ser på atomdoktrinerne – Prompt Global Strike-doktrinen

eller den nylige manøvre Global Lightning, som havde denne idé om en langvarig atomkrig – så tror jeg, at det udgør den virkelige fare. Og derfor er spørgsmålet om det nukleare magtspil, som vi ser lige nu, det, der skal undgås, og som skal udskiftes hurtigst muligt. Folk skal være klar over, at hvis det kommer til brug af et enkelt atomvåben, er det logikken i atomkrig, sammenlignet med konventionel krigsførelse, at alle atomvåben vil blive anvendt, og det vil betyde civilisationens fuldstændige udslettelse. Og det er det, der er spillet her.

Jeg tror, at flere mennesker, forstår det og kræver en anden verdensorden, en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, som f.eks. kunne være baseret på samarbejdet om et verdenssundhedssystem. Vi har stadig en pandemi. Vi har en hungersnød, som David Beasley kalder en hungersnød af “bibelske dimensioner”, som truer 300 millioner mennesker, der risikerer at dø. Og disse ting må vi tage fat på. Og det er den eneste chance for menneskeheden – kan vi forene alle disse... [crosstalk]

WANG: Ja, der er virkelig mange udfordringer derovre. Det er al den tid, vi har, er jeg bange for – undskyld, jeg afbryder. Kom tilbage til vores udsendelse næste gang, tak. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og formand for Schiller Institutet, mange tak, fordi du kom til os i denne stund.

Den militære operation i Ukraine er en åbenlys påmindelse om behovet for at

skabe en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur

Den 24. februar (EIRNS) –“Før vi endelig og uigenkaldeligt når det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen vej tilbage i menneskehedens historie – det punkt, hvor en global, atomkrig udsletter den menneskelige art – må vi handle prompte for at rette op på den absolutte katastrofe, som EU’s og USA’s imperialistiske politik har skabt i Ukraine og i relationen til Rusland og Kina. Og vi må især fjerne årsagerne til denne civilisationskrise, før vi når et punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen vej tilbage.” Sådan skrev Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en artikel den 8. marts 2014. Otte år senere er hendes analyse absolut helt rigtig.

NATO’s og USA’s manglende evne til at reagere seriøst på Ruslands sikkerhedskrav fra december 2021, har ført til en situation, hvor præsident Putin vurderede, at han ikke havde andet valg end at iværksætte en “speciel militæroperation” i Ukraine for at opnå en demilitarisering og afnazificering af landet, før situationen i Ukraine, herunder stigende mængder materiel og udenlandske militærpersoner, skabte en aldeles uudholdelig sikkerhedstrussel.

Den bogstaveligt talt nazistiske trussel i Ukraine, der blev installeret ved dette kup, blev beskrevet i en omfattende redegørelse, der blev offentliggjort af {Executive Intelligence Review} i februar 2014: “Western Powers Back Neo-Nazi Coup in Ukraine”. (Kilde)

Rødderne til den civilisatoriske krise, der driver det vanvittige stormløb mod en konflikt med Rusland og Kina, er det transatlantiske finanssystems disintegration, og den kuldsejlede plan om at bruge militære trusler og “grøn”

afpresning for at opretholde den transatlantiske elites unipolære overherredømme.

Som det fremgår af Schiller Instituttets underskriftsindsamling af 23. februar – som får et stigende antal underskrifter – “bag denne meget reelle krigsfare og årsagen til denne fare, ligger sammenbruddet af hele det transatlantiske finanssystem – City of London og Wall Street, ejerne af dette bankerotte system, er desperate efter at ødelægge ethvert fungerende alternativ til deres system – såsom Ruslands og Kinas alliance – og det finansielle etablissement har åbent tilkendegivet, at det er det, der er på spil.”

Vil dette etablissementets vanvittige krav om underkastelse blive overvundet og erstattet af et nyt paradigme, en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle nationer? Svaret ligger i vores hænder. Slut dig til LaRouche-bevægelsens bestræbelser for at kræve en omgående sammenkaldelse af en international konference, i lighed med den der udformede den Westfalske Fred.

Underskriftsindsamlingen er tilgængelig på dansk her:

https://www.skrivunder.net/krig_eller_fred

Udvalgt billede: Shane Aldendorff, Pexels

Nu med de første prominente

underskrivere: Underskriftindsamling: Indkaldelse til en international konference for at etablere en ny arkitektur for sikkerhed og udvikling for alle nationer

Se de første prominente underskrivere nedenunder.

23. februar 2022 – I lyset af den eskalerende Ukraine-krise spørger folk rundt om i verden indtrængende sig selv og deres politiske ledere, hvor det hele skal ende. Er dette på vej mod en meget stor, måske endda termonuklear, global konfrontation? Står vi over for en omvendt, farligere Cuba-krise? Vil menneskeheden overhovedet overleve?

Bag denne meget reelle krigsfare og årsagen til denne, ligger sammenbruddet af hele det transatlantiske finanssystem. En spekulationsboble af derivater og gæld på næsten 2 billiarder dollars er allerede ved at gå op i røg. En proces med hyperinflation er blevet udløst globalt, med et ledsagende sammenbrud af de vestlige nationers fysiske økonomier. City of London og Wall Street, ejerne af dette bankerotte system, er desperate efter at ødelægge ethvert fungerende alternativ til deres system – såsom Ruslands og Kinas alliance omkring Bælte- og Vej-initiativet, som nu omfatter næsten 150 nationer – og det finansielle etablissement har åbent erkendt, at det er det, der er på spil.

Det samme har Vladimir Putin, som med rette har erklæret, at USA's/Storbritanniens/NATO's ubarmhjertige ekspansion mod øst, op til Ruslands grænser, er drevet af denne økonomiske politik, og at den truer Ruslands nationale sikkerhed på en måde, som Rusland ikke kan acceptere.

For at standse fremdriften mod krig, er det derfor nødvendigt at anvende en mere gennemgribende tilgang, nemlig at etablere et helt nyt paradigme, som vil sikre sikkerheden og den økonomiske udvikling for alle nationer på jorden. Den eneste nyere præcedens for dette i Vesten, er den Westfalske Fred fra 1648, som satte en stopper for 150 års religionskrige i Europa. Den blev først udformet på det tidspunkt, hvor alle parter indså, at hvis de fortsatte ad deres nuværende vej, ville der ikke være nogen vindere og meget få overlevende. De valgte at skabe et nyt paradigme, baseret på forsvaret af den andens interesser, og på den forudsætning at alles sikkerhed var den grundlæggende forudsætning for hver parts sikkerhed.

Det er den vigtigste læresætning af den Westfalske Fred for i dag. Verden står i dag ved en lignende skillevej. Hvis den nuværende geopolitiske politik fortsætter, udgør en atomkrig en meget reel mulighed – hvorefter der ikke vil være nogen vindere, og sandsynligvis heller ingen overlevende.

I stedet må der straks indkaldes til en international konference, i stil med det Westfalske Fredsinitiativ. Den grundlæggende opgave for alle parter er at sikre, at der tages hensyn til de centrale økonomiske og sikkerhedsmæssige interesser for hver enkelt part – med andre ord en orden baseret på den andens fordel, på det fælles bedste, eller den almene velfærd, og på en grundlæggende kærlighed til hele menneskeheden.

Det økonomiske system må også omformes drastisk for at give udtryk for dette livssyn. Den berømte amerikanske økonom Lyndon LaRouche specificerede meget detaljeret, hvordan et sådant system ville fungere, baseret på det han kaldte sine

Fire Love:

Den øjeblikkelige genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven, som blev iværksat af den amerikanske præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt, uden ændringer, hvad angår handlingsprincippet. Det betyder, at hele den spekulative finansboble skal underkastes en konkursbehandling.

En tilbagevenden til et system med topstyret og nøje defineret nationalt banksystem, som angivet af USA's første finansminister, Alexander Hamilton.

Formålet med brugen af et sådant føderalt kreditsystem er at skabe højproduktive udviklingsforløb med henblik på at forbedre beskæftigelsen, med den ledsagende hensigt at øge den fysisk-økonomiske produktivitet og levestandarden for personer og husholdninger.

Vedtag et "lynprogram" med fusionsdrevet teknologi for at fremme de grundlæggende videnskabelige gennembrud, som ubegrænset økonomisk vækst og udvikling kræver.

Schiller Instituttet og dets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, udsender denne opfordring for at igangsætte den presserende internationale diskussion, der er nødvendig for at indkalde til en sådan konference og stoppe det såkaldte "Dommedagsur", før det slår midnat. Det er på høje tid, at institutioner og enkeltpersoner fra alle nationer træder frem og slutter sig til mobiliseringen for en international konference med henblik på at etablere en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle nationer.

Skriv under på underskriftindsamlingen her på skrivunder.net:

Links til underskriftindsamlingen på andre sprog:

Spanish, Italian, French, Swedish, Arabic, Danish, Portugese, German, and Chinese.

North America (U.S. and Canada)		
Canada	Julian Fell	Biologist; Co-Director Area F, Regional Government of Nanaimo, British Columbia
Canada	Faisal Huda	CEO, BUNA Capital Inc.
Canada	Bill MacPherson	Past President, Applied Science Technologists and Technicians of British Columbia
Canada	John Stone	MChE, Member, Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta
United States	Dr. Athar Abbasi	Major, U.S. Army (Ret)
United States	Jon Baker	Agricultural Bank Loan Officer
United States	James Benham	State President, Indiana Farmers Union; Board Member, National Farmers Union
United States	Fr. Lawrence Bernard	Order of Friars Minor (OFM)
United States	Mike Callicrate	Farm leader, Kansas/Colorado
United States	Marshall Carter-Tripp	Foreign Service Officer (ret), former political science professor

United States	Victor Chang	US-China Forum, Inc.
United States	Alan Covey	Political activist
United States	Joel Dejean	LaRouche Independent Candidate for U.S. Congress – 38th District (Texas)
United States	Dr. Joycelyn Elders	Former U.S. Surgeon-General
United States	Frank Endres	Farm Leader, California
United States	Christopher Fogarty	Chair, Chicago Friends of Irish Freedom; author of "Ireland 1845-1850; the Perfect Holocaust, and Who Kept it 'Perfect'."
United States	Graham Fuller	Former CIA Officer and Vice Chair of the National Intelligence Council
United States	Matthew Griener	City Council, Keota, Iowa
United States	Dr. Bihong Guan	Chairman, World Association of Chinese Elites
United States	DeWayne Hopkins	Former two-term mayor; current at-large Councilman, Muscatine, Iowa
United States	James Jatras	Former U.S. Diplomat and Advisor to U.S. Senate Republican Leadership

United States	Dr. Ernest Johnson	President Emeritus, Louisiana NAACP; civil rights attorney
United States	Wilbur Kehrli	National Board of Directors, American Blue Cattle
United States	George Koo	Chairman, Burlingame Foundation; retired international business consultant
United States	Keaten Mansfield	Center for Political Innovation, Chief of U.S. Staff
United States	Caleb Maupin	Founder and Director, Center for Political Innovation
United States	David Meiswinkle	Attorney and former President of the Lawyers' Committee for 9/11 Inquiry
United States	John O'Loughlin	
United States	Jeff Philbin	Nuclear Engineer, Technical Consultant, Independent Contractor
United States	Sam Pitroda	Inventor and entrepreneur; Chairman, Indian Overseas Congress

United States	Earl Rasmussen	Executive Vice President, Eurasia Center
United States	Diane Sare	LaRouche Independent Candidate for U.S. Senate – New York
United States	Naser Shahalemi	Executive Director, End Afghan Starvation
United States	John Shanahan	Editor, website: allaboutenergy.net
United States	Barbara Suhrstedt	International concert pianist
United States	Everett Suttle	Opera singer
United States	Bruce Todd	Former Independent candidate for NJ Lt. Governor; Retired Millwright, Local 715
United States	Mohammad Ashraf Toor, MD	Chairman, Pakistani American Congress
United States	Bob Van Hee	Redwood County Commissioner, Minnesota
United States	Zaher Wahab	Professor Emeritus of Education, former Advisor to the Afghanistan Ministry of Higher Education

United States	Alan Waltar	Retired Professor and Head, Dept. of Nuclear Engineering, Texas A&M University; Past President , American Nuclear Society
Europe		
Belgium	Frans Vandenbosch	Author of "Statecraft and Society in China"
Denmark	Tom Gillesberg	Director, Schiller Institute, Denmark; former parliamentary candidate
Denmark	Jelena Nielsen	Director, Russian-Danish Dialogue
Denmark	Jens Jørgen Nielsen	Former Moscow correspondent, Danish daily Politiken; author of books about Russia and Ukraine; a leader of Russian-Danish Dialogue
Denmark	Thomas Vissing	Director of a China-Nordic trading company
Denmark	Dr. Li Xing	Professor of Development and International Relations, Department of Politics and Society, Aalborg University

Donetsk People's Republic	Russell "Texas" Bentley	Journalist, Former Vice President of Donbass Humanitarian Aid
France	Jacques Cheminade	President, Solidarité et Progrès, former presidential candidate
France	Alain Corvez	Col. (Ret.), International strategy advisor; former advisor to the Commanding General of the United Nations Force in South Lebanon (UNIFIL)
France	Ali Ratsbeen	President, Academie Géopolitique de Paris
Germany	Dr. jur. Wolfgang Bittner	Author
Germany	Ole Doering	Professor, Hunan Normal University; Associate Professor, Dep't. for Global Health, Peking University; Privatdozent, KIT
Germany	Rainer Sandau	Technical Director, Satellites and Space Applications, International Academy of Astronautics (IAA)

Germany	Helga Zepp-LaRouche	Founder and Chairwoman, Schiller Institute
Greece	Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos	Ambassador ad Honorem; Secretary General, Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSEC), 2006-2012
Greece	George Tsobanoglou	Professor of Sociology, University of the Aegean
Italy	Mario Agostinelli	Chairman, Fondazione Energia Felice
Italy	Pino Arlacchi	Former Director, United Nations Drug Control Programme; Professor of Sociology, University of Sassari
Italy	Prof. Bruno Brandimarte	Professor of Electronic Measurement, Rome
Italy	Nino Galloni	Economist
Italy	Liliana Gorini	Chairwoman of Movisol (Movimento Internazionale per i Diritti Civili Solidarietà)
Italy	Prof. Fabio Massimo Parenti	Associate Professor of International Studies, CFAU, Beijing

Italy	Vincenzo Romanello	Nuclear Engineer, Founder of Atomi per la Pace (Atoms for Peace), Lecce.Italy
Italy	Alessia Ruggeri	Spokeswoman of Comitato per la Repubblica, Rome, Italy
Monaco	Aleksandar Krainer	Author, "Grand Deception: The Truth about Bill Browder, the Magnitsky Act and Anti-Russian Sanctions"; financial consultant
Netherlands	Guus Berkhout	Professor-Emeritus Geophysics, President of CLINTEL
Norway	Thore Vestby	Former mayor and MP; Cofounder, ICHI Foundation
Spain	Juan José Torres Núñez	Free-lance journalist, poet
Sweden	Hussein Askary	Southwest Asia Coordinator, Schiller Institute
Sweden	Kjell Lundqvist	Chairman, European Labor Party
Sweden	Ulf Sandmark	Chairman, Schiller Institute, Sweden
United Kingdom	Mike Robinson	Editor, The UK Column
Ibero-America/Caribbean		
Argentina	Enrique Juan Box	Media personality

Argentina	Luis Bragagnolo	Peronist leader; Veterinarian
Argentina	Roberto Fritzsche	Professor, Department of Economic Science, University of Buenos Aires
Argentina	Ruben Darío Guzzetti	Professor, Argentine Institute of Geopolitical Studies
Argentina	Juan Francisco Numa Soto	Constitutional Attorney
Argentina	Carlos Perez Galindo	Attorney at Law
Argentina	Alejandro Yaya	Vice President, Civilian Institute of Space Technology
Bolivia	Edwin De la Fuente Jeria	Former Commander in Chief of the Bolivian Armed Forces
Bolivia	Max Ibañez	Former Secretary of Grievance Resolution, National Federation of Electrical, Telephone and Water Workers of Bolivia

Bolivia	Sandra Marca Uscamayta	Integration Coordinator for the Peasant, Indigenous and Native Economic Organizations of Bolivia
Brazil	Jairo Dias Carvalho	Professor, Philosophy of Technology, Federal University of Uberlândia
Brazil	Igor Maquieira	Biologist; member of CLINTEL
Colombia	Mario Guillermo Acosta Alarcon	Scientist and author; General Director of CIFRA (Space Lab City)
Colombia	Ross Carvajal	Journalist
Colombia	Everardo Hernandez Pardo	Trade union leader
Colombia	Alba Luz Pinilla	Vice-President of DIGNIDAD Political Movement
Colombia	Pedro Rubio	President, Association of Officials of the General Accounting Office of the Republic
Dominican Republic	Ramon Emilio Concepcion	Attorney at Law; Presidential Pre-candidate for the PRM party (2020)
Dominican Republic	Ramon Gross	Post-graduate Professor, Catholic University of Santo Domingo

Dominican Republic	Dante Ortiz Nunez	Historian; Professor of History, Autonomous University of Santo Domingo
Dominican Republic	Domingo Reyes	Former professor of economics, Ph.D. in Higher Education
Dominican Republic	Rafael Reyes Jerez	TV producer, "Face to Face" and "Economics and Politics" on Chanel 69 Teleradioamérica
Haiti	Jhonny Estor	Founder, Renaissance-Haiti
Haiti	Dr. Garnel Michel	Physician and author; his book 'Bak Lakay' calls the diaspora to return and help rebuild Haiti
Mexico	Edith Cabrera	Founder and Director of "Coalition #24F Life and Liberty for Julian Assange"
Mexico	Oscar Ramon Castro Valdez	General Director, "Dossier Político" internet publication
Mexico	Daniel Estulin	Publicist

Mexico	Simon Levy	Founder, Cátedra México-China, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)
Mexico	Enrique Lopez Ochoa	Surgeon, Professor of Angiology, UNISON School of Medicine
Mexico	Daniel Marmolejo	Investigative journalist, winner of the 2019 National Journalism Award
Mexico	Marino Montoya Contreras	Journalist for El Centinela and LGM News
Mexico	Francisco Quezada	Mathematician; Professor Department of Sciences and Humanities, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)
Mexico	Antonio Valdez	Journalist
Mexico	Jaime Varela Salazar	Chemical Engineer; Former Director of the Department of Chemical Sciences, University of Sonora (UNISON)
Peru	José Antonio Benllochpiquer Castro	Vice President, Christian Democratic Party

Peru	Fernando Fauche	National Secretary, Christian Democratic Party
Peru	Adrian Flores Konja	Former Dean of Accounting Sciences, National University of San Marcos
Peru	Carlos Francisco Gallardo Neyra	President, Christian Democratic Party
Peru	Ruben Rojas	Nuclear Physicist
Peru	Milton Vela-Gutierrez	Professor, University of Lima
Venezuela	Emil Guevara Muñoz	Member of Parliament, Latin American Parliament (2006-2011)
Venezuela	Edgar Rodriguez Martinez	Alberto Adriani Foundation
Africa/Asia/Australia		
Africa	Tse Anye Kevin	Deputy President, State55 Afrika
Australia	Trudy Campbell	Australian Citizens Party
Congo, Republic of	Diogène Senny	President of Ligue Panafricaine – UMOJA Congo; Coordination avec les Partis Panafricanistes
Guinea	Jacques Bacamurwanko	Former Ambassador of Burundi to the United States

Iraq	Mustafa Jabbar Sanad	Member, Council of Representatives (Parliament), Basrah
Lebanon	Basham El Hachem	Professor of Political Sociology, Doctoral School, l'Université du Liban
Malaysia	Dr. Isharaf Hossain	President & Principal Research Fellow, Muslim World Research Center (MWRC), Kuala Lumpur.
Mozambique	Samo Fernando Soares da Manhiça	Executive Director, International Alliance for Development – Mozambique
Pakistan	Shakeel Ahmad Ramay	Chief Executive Officer, Asian Institute of Eco-Civilization Research and Development (AIERD), Islamabad
Pakistan	Khalid Latif	Executive Director, Center of Pakistan and International Relations (COPAIR); Program Director (Middle East)
Yemen	Fouad Al-Ghaffari	President, ALBRICS Yemeni Youth Parliament

Panel 2:

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 23. februar 2022: Rusland gør oprør imod USA med støtte fra Kina. Vil Europa ødelægge sig selv for at skade Rusland?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/tg-23.2.22.mp3>

**POLITISK ORIENTERING i går den 23. februar 2022:
Rusland gør oprør imod USA med støtte fra Kina.
Vil Europa ødelægge sig selv for at skade Rusland?**

Der findes et alternativ til krig og kaos.

Læs, cirkulér og debatér Schiller Instituttets nye udtalelse.

Resumé:

Rusland bryder med det "moderne britiske imperium", den

internationale regelbaserede (USA dikterede) verdensorden i lighed med den amerikanske uafhængighedserklæring imod det britiske imperium. Det er ikke en beslutning, det er truffet letsindigt, men fordi man ikke føler, man har et valg, hvis Rusland skal have sin frihed i fremtiden og undgå at være en vasalstat, som landene i EU og Nato tydeligvis er.

Rusland har fuldstændig rygdækning fra Kina på det grundlag, som er fremlagt i Beijing-erklæringen fra Putin og Xi Jinping den 4. februar, hvor man gør op med den unipolære USA-kontrollerede verdensorden og erklærede starten på en ny multipolær verdensorden.

Anerkendelsen af Lugansk- og Donetsk-republikkerne er kun første skridt. Indtil Rusland får de sikkerhedspolitiske indrømmelser, som man har krævet – en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur der også imødekommer deres bekymringer – så vil man skridt for skridt eskalere konflikten. Begyndende med indtagelsen af det fulde territorium af republikkerne Donetsk og Lugansk.

Rusland er klar over, at USA vil iværksætte massive sanktioner, som frem for alt vil ramme ikke blot Rusland, men også Europa. Det har briterne og USA det fint med. De ødelægger gerne Tyskland og kontinentaleuropa og frygter mest af alt et samarbejde mellem EU (med Tyskland i centrum) og Rusland. Både første og anden verdenskrig blev støttet af Det britiske Imperium for at forhindre et sådant tysk-russisk samarbejde.

At eskaleringen kom nu var ikke Ruslands valg, men konsekvensen af den vestlige finansielle nedsmeltning der er i gang, som har sat ekstra tryk på den vestlige offensiv imod Rusland i blandt andet Ukraine. Rusland følte sig tvunget til at sige fra nu (så snart vinter-OL i Beijing var overstået).

Kina vil bakke Rusland fuldstændigt op, fordi det ved, at hvis man knækker Rusland, så vil man rette alle sine kræfter imod at knække Kina. Se videoen og erklæringen fra 4. februar om den nye russisk-kinesisk lancerede verdensorden på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside.

Der er en vej ud af den ellers langvarige spændte og konfliktfyldte situation vi er inde i, hvis Vesten (USA) er villige til at tænke om og acceptere en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, der også tager hensyn til Rusland og Kina. Ellers vil tingene blive ved med at eskalere og faren for en atomkrig, bevidst eller ved en fejl, vil vokse. Der er ikke noget kvik-fix inden for den gamle vestligt-fastlagte verdensorden. De gode gamle dage kommer ikke tilbage.

Forslaget om en ny militær-aftale mellem USA og Danmark, der giver amerikanske soldater og materiel fri adgang til Danmark uden dansk kontrol, vil bekræfte, at Danmark ikke er en suveræn nation men blot en amerikansk vasalstat, der vil blive brugt i det amerikanske militære spil i Europa – med ubehagelige og potentielt fatale konsekvenser for Danmark. Danmark må have en selvstændig dansk strategi, vi må kunne tænke selv.

Oven i Ukraine-krisen kommer den igangværende finansielle nedsmeltning, som kan kraftigt forværres af de planlagte sanktioner imod Rusland.

Forbered Danmark til at håndtere dette gennem iværksættelsen af LaRouches 4 økonomiske love. Studér LaRouches økonomiske arbejde.

**Tale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche,
Schiller Instituttets
konference,
"100 sekunder til midnat på**

dommedagsuret: Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur!”

Den 19. februar 2022

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: God eftermiddag, god aften, alt efter hvor på planeten du befinder dig.

Hvis man ser på den nuværende strategiske situation ovenfra, ud fra historiens lange historiske bue, hvordan skal menneskeheden så skænke sig selv institutioner, der sikrer dens overlevelse på lang sigt, samt ud fra den nuværende dynamik mellem et Kina i fremgang og Asien generelt og et svigtende vestligt liberalt system, synes det at være indlysende, at resultatet af denne historiske æra må være et nyt paradigme i de internationale relationer. Fortsættelsen af geopolitik, som i øjeblikket har bragt os på randen af atomkrig, og det vanvid som ingen steder kommer tydeligere til udtryk end i den militærdoktrin, der ligger bag manøvren “Global Lightning”, som forudsætter en langvarig atomkrig – denne geopolitik må erstattes af en international sikkerhedsarkitektur, der garanterer sikkerhedsinteresserne for alle nationer på jorden, herunder Rusland og Kina samt udviklingslandene.

Konfucius tilskrives den idé, at det første, der skal til for at løse et problem, er at bringe orden i begreberne, for hvis begreberne er i uorden, fører det til misforståelser, som fører til skænderier, som fører til rystelse af statens fundament, og der kan ikke være nogen harmoni i verden. Derfor er det en af de mest presserende opgaver at klarlægge forskellen mellem den historiske sandhed om, hvad der er sket i løbet af de sidste godt 30 år, siden Sovjetunionens opløsning, og den officielle “beretning”, der fortælles i de

vestlige mainstream-medier, og faktisk i disse dage nu på sikkerhedskonferencen i München, hvor en bred repræsentation af eliten i NATO-fraktionen er til stede. Og hvor det ser ud til, at udenrigsminister Tony Blinken og den tyske udenrigsminister Annalena Baerbock synes at være to alen ud af et stykke – hvilket er et forbløffende skuespil.

Disse kræfters officielle linje er, at Putin er aggressoren, at Rusland er det eneste land, der har ændret grænserne i Europa i efterkrigstiden med magt, nemlig på Krim, og at den eneste relevante kamp er mellem de liberale demokratier og de aggressive, autokratiske stater, at NATO aldrig har gjort noget forkert, og at Rusland nægter suveræne lande som Ukraine retten til at vælge den alliance, de ønsker at være en del af. Det sidste, disse medier og politikere ønsker, er en præcis undersøgelse af, hvordan denne nuværende situation er opstået.

Men at tingene sættes på plads, er en uomgængelig forudsætning for at nå frem til en positiv løsning på den nuværende situation. Sovjetunionens sammenbrud betød ikke den vestlige liberale models overlegenhed. Det kollapsede af præcis de årsager, som Lyndon LaRouche identificerede i 1984, nemlig dets tilslutning til Ogarkov-doktrinen, afvisningen af at acceptere præsident Reagans tilbud om at samarbejde om det, der senere blev kaldt det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI), som min afdøde mand Lyndon LaRouche var ophavsmand til, og fastholdelsen af principperne for det, som den sovjetiske økonom Preobrazhensky havde betegnet som "primitiv social akkumulation". Pave Johannes Paul II advarede dengang eftertrykkeligt om, at Vesten ikke skulle drage den konklusion, at de var moralsk overlegne, og som bevis herpå pegede han på udviklingssektorens tilstand, der var fattig og underudviklet, som et biprodukt af det vestlige liberale system.

I denne periode mellem Berlinmurens fald og Warszawa-pagtens opløsning, var der en reel chance for noget helt nyt: Kommunismen var forsvundet, Vesten havde ikke længere nogen

fjende, og Lyndon LaRouche og hans bevægelse havde først foreslået den produktive trekant, Paris-Berlin-Wien, og derefter, efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, Den eurasiske Landbro som grundlag for skabelsen af en fredsordning for det 21. århundrede.

Den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør i Moskva, Jack Matlock, har gentagne gange eftertrykkeligt hævdet, at Sovjetunionen ikke udgjorde nogen trussel i de sidste år af sin eksistens, og at Den kolde Krig ikke sluttede med Sovjetunionen, men at den faktisk var slut to år tidligere, fordi Gorbatsjov havde accepteret en demokratisering af Østeuropa og forskellige interne reformer, hvilket en stor del af den russiske befolkning hadede ham for, og betragtede ham som en forræder, i modsætning til folk i Vesten og især i Tyskland, som i store folkemængder råbte: "Gorby! Gorby! Gorby!"

Argumentet om at der aldrig blev givet noget løfte til Rusland om, at NATO ikke ville udvide sig mod øst er en åbenlys løgn, som er blevet afsløret af samtidige vidner såsom Matlock. Der foreligger en diskussion af den daværende amerikanske udenrigsminister, James Baker III, den 9. februar 1990, hvor han bekræftede over for Gorbatsjov, at NATO "ikke ville rykke en tomme mod øst". Og for ganske nylig, på spektakulær vis, af Roland Dumas, den daværende franske udenrigsminister. Tydeligvis, på grund af den akutte krigsfare, brød han for fem dage siden sin mangeårige tavshed og vidnede i et langt interview med den franske hjemmeside "Les Crises" om det, han havde fortalt vores franske repræsentant, Jacques Cheminade, privat, allerede tre år forinden: at der dengang var en meget vigtig forhandling om nedrustning og demilitarisering af Warszawa-pagten i gang.

Dumas sagde: "og diskussionen begyndte således. Det var den russiske diplomat som via Gorbatsjov, men også via den russiske udenrigsminister, Sjevardnadze, bad om ordet, og som sagde: "Vi, den russiske delegation, vil gerne vide, hvad der kommer til at ske med NATO's bevæbning i forbindelse med

nedrustningen? Og vi kræver,” jeg husker det tydeligt; han var formel, “at de allierede tropper overholder to forpligtelser”. Den første, hvor han var meget sentimental, er den der vedrører bevarelsen af monumenter i alle de sovjetiske lande, til minde om den sovjetiske hærs ære. Den anden er, at der skal være en forpligtelse for Warszawa-pagtens og NATO's tropper, og at der ikke må ske nogen forskydning af NATO-tropper i de områder af Sovjet-pagten, der skal afvæbnes.” Og på spørgsmålet om hvorfor det ikke blev nedfældet i de egentlige traktater, sagde han: “Det blev ikke nævnt. Det vil sige, at folk, så påpasselige som amerikanerne, folk i Atlantalliancen, vi anmodede ikke om, at det blev nedskrevet. Det er muligt, men i forhold til karakteren af den generelle diskussion, det vil sige et forsøg på at afvæbne for at gøre en ende på truslen om krig, for det var det der betød noget, og for at forberede en anden periode i forbindelse med en tid, som var nedrustning, var det logisk.

“Så denne diskussion fandt sted: Den fandt først og fremmest sted, fordi russerne bad om det, fordi vi støttede det – først mig selv, og ligeledes amerikanerne, og naturligvis tyskerne.”

Jack Matlock understreger, at løftet om at selv før Sovjetunionens afslutning, var det almindeligt accepteret, at sikkerhed måtte betyde sikkerhed for alle, og at der var et argument, hvor Gorbatsjov retfærdiggjorde en reduktion af oprustningen af det sovjetiske militær. Matlock fortæller også, at præsident Bush senior i en af sine sidste taler i Kiev, da der stadig var et Sovjetunionen, rådede ukrainerne til, at de burde tilslutte sig Gorbatsjovs frivillige føderation, som han foreslog, og han advarede ukrainerne mod “selvmorderisk nationalisme”.

Lad os se videoen fra den tyske udenrigsminister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, som bekræftede dette meget tydeligt.

FORTÆLLER: Til gengæld for tysk enhed lovede Vesten at undlade

at lade NATO rykke længere mod øst. I Washington afgiver den daværende udenrigsminister vidtrækkende løfter.

HANS DIETRICH GENSCHER: Vi blev enige om, at det ikke er hensigten at udvide NATO's forsvarsområde mod øst. Det gælder i øvrigt ikke kun med hensyn til D.D.R. [Østtyskland], som vi ikke ønsker at indlemme der, men det gælder helt generelt.

[skærmvisning – "1999": Videoen viser udenrigsminister Madeleine Albright og tre udenrigsministre på et podium. Bag dem ses USA's, NATO's og andre flag.]

FORTÆLLER: Et kortvarigt løfte. De første østeuropæiske lande bliver optaget i NATO. Udenrigsminister Madeleine Albright stråler, da hun omfavner sine kolleger fra Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn. Et truende greb set fra Moskvas synspunkt. Men de er for svage til at reagere. [slut video]

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Så, man har Dumas, Genscher, Matlock, som alle bekræfter, at disse løfter blev aftalt, og som klart modsiger den officielle erklæring om, at sådanne løfter aldrig blev afgivet, hvilket NATO's generalsekretær, Jens Stoltenberg, altid gentager.

Så sent som i dag rapporterer Spiegel Magazine i Tyskland om et nyligt fremkommet, tidligere hemmeligt, klassificeret dokument i det britiske nationalarkiv, som blev opdaget af den amerikanske politolog Joshua Shiffrin, om et møde mellem de politiske ansvarlige for udenrigsministerierne i USA, Storbritannien, Frankrig og Tyskland i Bonn den 6. marts 1991. I dokumentet står der, at alle var enige om, at et NATO-medlemskab for de østeuropæiske lande ville være uacceptabelt. Jürgen Chrobog, repræsentant fra Bonn, citeres: "At en udvidelse af NATO hinsides Elben ville være uacceptabel. Derfor bør Polen og de andre lande ikke tilbydes NATO-medlemskab."

USA's repræsentant på dette møde, Raymond Seitz, var enig i, at de under 2+4-samtalerne havde lovet Sovjetunionen, at NATO

ikke ville udvide formelt eller uformelt mod øst.

Spiegel påpeger, at russerne allerede i 1993, længe før Putin, klagede over, at en udvidelse af NATO mod øst ville krænke ånden i 2+4-samtalerne. Det blev ikke skrevet ned, men begge parter handlede i 1990 i god tro, noget, som tilsyneladende er [gået] helt tabt.

Allerede dengang blev den gode tro imidlertid ikke delt af alle. I stedet for et nyt system, der ville yde sikkerhed for alle, hvilket også kunne have omfattet Ruslands optagelse i NATO, startede de neokonservative i USA og deres britiske kolleger "Projektet for et Nyt amerikansk Århundrede", som var et initiativ til at opbygge en unipolær verden. Den irrationelle opstemthed overtog ikke kun markederne, som Alan Greenspan bemærkede på et tidspunkt i 90'erne, men det var euforien over, at det vestlige liberale system havde "vundet" Den kolde Krig, som blev den fortælling, der erstattede den historiske kendsgerning.

Francis Fukuyamas tåbelige og fuldstændig grundløse, forkerte argument om historiens afslutning, som betød, at det liberale demokrati ville brede sig til alle lande på verdensplan, begyndte at lægge et røgslør over de vestlige etablissemeters tankegang. Måden, hvorpå denne unipolære verden skulle oprettes, var imidlertid ikke så smuk. Farverevolutioner – orange, rosa, hvide, gule, arabiske – næsten hele regnbuens spektrum – blev støttet med milliarder af dollars: 5 milliarder dollars til Ukraine alene, til NGO'ere, før 2014, som Victoria Nuland åbenlyst pralede med. Det omfattede støtte til et kup i Kiev i 2014, som bragte offentligt bekendende nazistiske kræfter i Stepan Banderas tradition til magten; netværk, som var blevet opretholdt af NATO's efterretningstjenester i organisationer som den Anti-Bolsjevikiske Blok af Nationer i efterkrigstiden med henblik på en potentiel konfrontation med Sovjetunionen.

"Så disse efterretningstjenester vidste præcis, hvem der

udførte kuppet på Maidan. Det var som en reaktion på den brutale undertrykkelse af den russisktalende befolkning i Ukraine, at folk på Krim ved en folkeafstemning stemte for at de ønskede at tilslutte sig Rusland, så der var ingen tvungen ændring af Krims grænser.”

Naturligvis skulle FN-pagten og folkeretten i denne proces erstattes af en “regelbaseret orden”. Dette skete med omfattende støtte fra Tony Blair, som i 1999 i Chicago argumenterede for humanitære interventionistiske krige, “retten til at beskytte”: at man måtte erklære afslutningen på den Westfalske Fred.

Omstændighederne omkring den 11. september, som Lyndon LaRouche havde advaret om ni måneder før det skete, som en “Reichstagsbrand”, der var ved at ske, hvilket eliminerede en betydelig del af borgerrettighederne i USA og dannede grundlaget for de endeløse krige, begyndende med Afghanistan – den første krig baseret på løgne. Det der fulgte, var Colin Powells løgne over for FN i 2003 om masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak, efterfulgt af krigene i Libyen med mordet på Gaddafi, forsøget på at vælte Assad-regeringen i Syrien og direkte og indirekte talrige andre militære operationer: Resultatet var millioner af døde og sårede og millioner af flygtninge.

Var alt dette i USA’s eller Vestens interesse i almindelighed?

Resultatet var et gigantisk tilbageslag. Putin, som i de første år af sit præsidentembede havde mange beundrere i Vesten, blev i stigende grad upopulær hos arkitekterne af den unipolære verden, fordi han ikke underkastede sig den “regelbaserede orden”. Han begyndte at genrejse Ruslands rolle som en aktør i verden. I 2008 i Georgien og i 2015 i Syrien og nu for nylig ved at kræve, at NATO’s ekspansion mod øst ikke blot stoppes, men også tilbageføres til 1997-status, og ved at kræve skriftlige, juridisk bindende garantier fra USA og NATO om, at Ukraine aldrig bliver medlem, at der ikke må være offensive våbensystemer langs den russiske grænse, og at NATO

ikke rykker længere mod øst.

Hvis man ser på de sidste 30 års historie, er dette faktisk et ganske beskedent krav. Også i lyset af, at Ukraine ikke opfylder kravene i NATO-traktatens artikel 5 og 10, som general Kujat, den tidligere stabschef for Bundeswehr, korrekt hævder.

I mellemtiden har et andet udslag af modstand mod den "regelbaserede orden" fået en fremtrædende plads. Kina, som havde sin egen plan for en eurasisk landbro, reagerede meget positivt på de programmer, som Schiller Instituttet foreslog for en ny silkevej, men som i første omgang mislykkedes. Det var for økonomisk svagt til at gennemføre disse planer efter den såkaldte "Asien-krise" i 1997, hvor nogle asiatiske landes valutaer blev brutalt spekuleret i sänk af folk som Soros, der på en uge frarøvede landene det, som deres befolkninger havde oparbejdet i årtier.

Kinas reaktion på denne hændelse og de overordnede mål om fattigdomsbekæmpelse i hele verden var præsident Xi Jinpings bekendtgørelse af Den nye Silkevej i 2013 i Kasakhstan. Dette uden sammenligning største infrastrukturprojekt i historien er blevet en omfattende succeshistorie med næsten 150 involverede lande. Men især Kinas fortsatte økonomiske fremgang som lokomotivet i Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet fik fortalene for den unipolære verden og deres finansfolk i City of London, Wall Street og Silicon Valley til i stigende grad at karakterisere Rusland og Kina som "autokratiske", "autoritære" og værre ting.

Disse angreb havde som forventet den følgevirkning, der var et mareridt for folk som Zbigniew Brzezinski, Dick Cheney og beslægtede, nemlig at disse to lande – Rusland og Kina – har skabt et partnerskab uden fortilfælde. Den 4. februar, i begyndelsen af de Olympiske Vinterlege i Beijing, underskrev præsident Putin og præsident Xi Jinping et dokument om et omfattende strategisk partnerskab, som ifølge deres egne

beskrivelser udgør en model for de fremtidige internationale forbindelser mellem nationer, der vil være baseret på gensidig hensyntagen til den andens interesser inden for det fulde spektrum af økonomiske, politiske, kulturelle og militære områder. [<http://en.kremlin.ru/supplement/5770>]

Denne aftale har formelt sat en stopper for ideen om en unipolær verden. Det er en historisk kendsgerning, der er kommet for at blive, ikke mindst fordi den kombinerer Ruslands marginale militære overlegenhed med den kinesiske økonomiske styrke, og i praksis indebærer det, at den slags trusler, som blev fremsat af de to unavngivne embedsmænd fra Det Hvide Hus, om at USA i tilfælde af en invasion af Ukraine ville forhindre Rusland i at diversificere fra olie og gas og nægte det adgang til avancerede teknologier. Aftalen mellem Kina og Rusland har gjort denne trussel forældet.

Det er nu på tide, at alle klart tænkende og fredselskende mennesker i Vesten genovervejer den strategiske og historiske situation uden fordomme eller ideologiske tilbøjeligheder. Hvis menneskeheden skal have en sikker og lykkelig fremtid, må vi opgive den geopolitiske tankegang i form af konfrontation og erstatte den med en plan for samarbejde mellem alle nationer med henblik på en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden. For det er hvad vi har, på godt og ondt.

Det er på høje tid at erklære NATO for forældet og erstatte det med en international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som garanterer sikkerhedsinteresserne for alle nationer på planeten. I stedet for at behandle det nye omfattende partnerskab mellem Rusland og Kina som en fjendtlig sammenslutning, der skal bekæmpes med et nyt våbenkapløb, bør Europas, USA's og andre kontinenters nationer signalere, at de er villige til at indgå i en ny "westfalsk" fredsforhandling, som vil være baseret på den andens interesser og alles fælles bedste. Det stod klart for de kræfter, der forhandlede denne traktat fra 1644-1648, at der ikke kunne være nogen vinder i fortsættelsen af Trediveårskrigen, som i virkeligheden var kulminationen på 150

års religionskrig i Europa, hvor en tredjedel af befolkningen og værdierne var blevet ødelagt.

I dag ville det være så meget mere klart for alle parter, at en fortsættelse af konfrontationen, herunder truslen om atomar udryddelse af hele menneskeslægten, ikke vil efterlade nogen som vinder.

En sådan ny Westfalsk Traktat må være baseret på principper, som er i overensstemmelse med naturloven og lovmæssigheden i det fysiske univers. Den skal afspejle skønheden i den menneskelige art, som er den eneste hidtil kendte art, der er udstyret med kreativ fornuft, hvilket adskiller os fra alle dyr og andre former for liv. Naturligvis skal den nye Vestfalske Traktat ligesom den oprindelige Vestfalske Fred omhandle alle specifikke emner som Minsk II-aftalerne og andre territoriale knaster, men også vor tids store udfordringer som f.eks. et globalt sundhedssystem til bekæmpelse af pandemier, afhjælpning af den globale hungersnød af bibelske dimensioner, som [den administrerende direktør for FN's Verdensfødevareprogram] David Beasley taler om, afhjælpning af fattigdom i hele verden og andre anliggender, der vedrører hele menneskehedens fælles bedste.

Den umiddelbare opgave, der ligger foran os, er at organisere alle landes samarbejde med projekter i Bælte- og Vej-initiativet, som allerede er beskrevet meget mere detaljeret i den rapport, vi offentliggjorde i 2014: "Den nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen", en omfattende plan for udvikling og integration af alle klodens kontinenter. Den skal tage fat på den umiddelbare fare for et systemisk sammenbrud af det transatlantiske finanssystem, som de Fire Love, der blev udformet af Lyndon LaRouche for mange år siden, er den tilgængelige løsning på. (https://larouchepub.com/lar/2014/4124four_laws.html) Og den skal definere de områder, hvor der er brug for et nødvendigt internationalt samarbejde, såsom den hurtigst mulige realisering af en ny økonomisk platform baseret på

termonuklear fusionsenergi, for at opnå energi- og råvaresikkerhed for alle nationer. Den skal definere fredeligt samarbejde inden for rumforskning, rumfart og kolonisering af rummet.

Vi er den kreative art, og det er nu det rette tidspunkt i vores historie til at bevise det.

Et sidste punkt. Hvis man sammenligner den Westfalske Freds succes med Versailles-traktatens totale fiasko, som ikke tog hensyn til alle deltagende parters interesser, men blot udgjorde optakten til den næste verdenskrig, så burde det være indlysende, at princippet om alle nationers suverænitet, forenet af et højere mål om én menneskehed, skal opretholdes.

Vi bør derfor vende tilbage til ånden fra Berlinmurens fald, som kunne have været en "menneskehedens stjernestund" (på tysk eine Sternstunde der Menschheit), og potentialet i 2+4-aftalen, som ikke blot var en egentlig fredstraktat, der afsluttede efterkrigstiden og teoretisk set etablerede den tyske suverænitet, men som alle ved, er denne suverænitet som følge af den ovenfor beskrevne udvikling aldrig kommet til udtryk i tyskernes bevidsthed, hvor ordet "suverænitet", i modsætning til Frankrig, hvor suverænisterne er i flertal, ikke engang er kendt af den gennemsnitlige borger i Tyskland. Det skal der også rettes op på og gøres noget ved.

Så lad os vende dette yderst farlige øjeblik til en chance for at skabe en ny æra for menneskeheden. Lad os skabe en ægte "menneskehedens stjernestund", som er den udødelige art værdig, som vi er skabt til at være.

Mange tak.

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

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

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

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

Afskrift på engelsk:

Interview: Li Xing, PhD

The China-Russia Feb. 4 Joint Statement:

A Declaration of a New Era and New World Order

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

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

Li Xing: Thank you Michelle for your invitation. It's my pleasure to be invited again by the Schiller Institute.

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

Second, unlike the U.S./NATO alliance, the China-Russia relationship is described by the joint document as a "close comprehensive strategic partnership." In Putin's early words, he said, "The China-Russia relationship is a relationship that probably cannot be compared with anything in the world." The

relationship is not “aimed against any other countries.” It is “superior to the political and military alliances of the Cold War era,” referring to the U.S.-NATO alliance. It also echoes Xi Jinping’s recent statement, that “the relationship even exceeds an alliance in its closeness and effectiveness.” So the document tries to demonstrate that the China-Russia relationship is a good example of interstate relationships.

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

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

Second, this part also clearly sets up a series of analyses, arguments and discourses to demonstrate both countries’ understanding, and to emphasize the fact that the world order has entered a new era. Again, “new era” are the key words for this document.

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

Rasmussen: Part 1 is about the question of democracy, and it starts by saying: “The sides” –that is, China and Russia–“share the understanding that democracy is a universal

human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States, and that its promotion and protection is a common responsibility of the entire world community.”

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

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

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

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

rights to interfere into other countries' internal affairs, and China really suffers a lot from this point.

Rasmussen: How would you say democracy works in China?

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

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

Rasmussen: Let's move on to part 2, which is about coordinating economic development initiatives, including harmonizing the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, and also the Russian Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), even more, and taking initiatives to create economic development, where they emphasize the role of scientific research in generating economic growth, something that Lyndon LaRouche and our movement have had as a priority concept. And also increasing healthcare and pandemic response in poor countries. What do you see as the significance of this call for increasing economic development cooperation?

Li: Yes. I also read this part of the document very carefully. This part shows a clear difference in approach between the West and the U.S. on the one side, and China-Russia on the other side. While the West is emphasizing, or holding the flag

of democracy and human rights, China-Russia actually emphasize that peace, development and cooperation lies at the core of the modern international system. So, according to the understanding of Russia and China, development is the key driver in ensuring the prosperity of other nations, even though democracy and human rights are important, but development must be the core. So it implies that good development will lead the country in the direction of democracy, but not defined solely by the West, the concept of democracy.

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

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

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

important field for economic development, which means life and death at this moment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

to encircle Russia will mean security for the Western side, but it is a danger for Russia. It is a national security concern.

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

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

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

Rasmussen: Many political spokesmen in the West have criticized Russia and China for not adhering to the “rules-based order” and here, in part 4, China and Russia write that they “strongly advocate the international system with the central coordinating role of the United Nations in international affairs, defend the world order based on international law, including the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, advance multipolarity and promote the democratization of international relations, together create an even more prospering, stable, and just world, jointly build international relations of a new type.”

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

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

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

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

And also the joint statement mentions the China foreign

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

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

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

Rasmussen: Yes, this is also to underscore what you said before, about how important economic development is for the wellbeing of the countries. And here you have China, which was the first country to eliminate poverty in their country, over the last 40 years, and is offering this as a model for other countries to get economic development. The slogan of the Schiller Institute is “Peace through Economic Development,”—

Li: Exactly.

Rasmussen: The way that you can get countries that have perceived each other as enemies to rise to a new level, to seek common interest, is through arranging economic development programs, not only for a single country, but for a whole region, which encourages them to work together. You spoke before about the Chinese criticism of the Bretton Woods institutions. What the Schiller Institute and Lyndon LaRouche

have been saying, is that the initial idea of the Bretton Woods institutions as proposed by Franklin Roosevelt was to try to get the economic development of the poorer countries. But it degenerated into, for example, where you had the World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposing austerity conditions on countries as a precondition for loans, where nothing was done to actually increase the productivity of the countries, in the way that the Belt and Road is actually –with the infrastructure development, creating the basis for the countries to becoming prosperous. And what we're saying is that the total change in the international financial institutions is absolutely necessary now, at a point where financial speculation is blowing out, hyperinflation, and we need to have a new economic architecture, you could say, based on the physical development of the countries.

Li: I fully agree with your remarks and comments.

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

"The sides [China and Russia] call for the establishment of a new kind of relationship between world powers on the basis of mutual respect, peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation. They reaffirm that the new inter-State relations between Russia and China are superior to political and military alliances of the Cold War era. Friendship between the two States has no limits, there are no 'forbidden' areas of cooperation, strengthening of bilateral strategic cooperation is neither aimed against third countries nor affected by the changing international environment and circumstantial changes in third countries."

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

Li Xing, what will this much strengthened alliance mean for China and Russia, and also for the rest of the world? Should

the West be worried, or is this a plea for a new type of international relations? What are the implications for shaping the new world order? What is your conclusion from the joint statement?

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

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

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

So the joint statement shows a strong unity between Russia and China. So my question is where is the West's unity after the Cold War, and when the unipolar world order is over? How strong is the trans-Atlantic relationship today? I don't know: I'm asking the questions to the West, the U.S. The West must rethink its Cold War strategy of reviving unity through creating enemies, and I think this is a completely wrong strategy, in a multipolar world order, where countries are much more interdependent. So it is necessary for the U.S. to rethink its own version of the rules-based order, in which the U.S. is the rule-maker and others are rule-followers. And this does not work in a new era any more. That is my conclusion after reading the joint statement.

Rasmussen: Now, as to the current situation, today is Feb. 22, and yesterday, Russia recognized the two breakaway republics in Ukraine as independent republics, which is now going to lead to very heavy sanctions by the West. Putin's point was

that these sanctions would have come anyway, but in any case, without going into the details of the Ukraine-Russia-U.S./NATO crisis, the fact is that Russia will be most probably faced with enormously hard sanctions.

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

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

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

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

Russia's economic-financial status is relatively limited, compared with China. China is the second largest economy in the world.

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

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

Rasmussen: Our analysts were saying that it may be the case that China would buy more oil and gas and other products from Russia. Actually, one thing is that today, February 21, is the 50th anniversary of Nixon's trip to China, [February 21 to 28, 1972] and the opening up of relations, and the United States commitment to the One-China policy. And at that time, many people were saying that Kissinger's strategy was to open up the relations to China, as a way of isolating Russia, of putting Russia aside. But the fact is that these sanctions and this type of policy over the recent period, has done more to bring Russia and China together, as signified by this document. What is your reaction to that? But also the prospects of how we get out of this?

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

world is facing?

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

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

So, the only way we can come to the second part of your question, about how we can manage major power relations, is in line with the spirit of the Schiller Institute conference that took place last week and its call for establishing a new international security architecture. There is no other way. The Western dominance, the U.S. singlehanded dominance, the unipolar world is over. We need what Helga proposed, to establish a new international security architecture. We don't know exactly what the form of this architecture, but that needs discussion from both sides! Unless the international community forms a kind of great, new international security architecture, conflict will continue.

Rasmussen: And then, as we spoke, it goes hand in hand with the increasing economic cooperation and the determination of

the great powers to really do something for the economic development of the poor parts of the world.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Li: Thank you very much.

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

Jan Øberg, ph.d., er freds- og fremtidsforsker og kunstfotograf,
Direktør, The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future
Research, TFF, Sverige, <https://transnational.live>

Jan Øberg kan kontaktes her: oberg@transnational.org

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

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Jan-0berg-21.2.22.mp3>

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Hello. Today is February 21st, 2022. I am Michele Rasmussen, the vice president of the Schiller

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

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

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

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

A Russian invasion of Ukraine, which some in the West said would start last Wednesday has not occurred. But as we speak, tensions are still very high. You wrote an article, Jan Oberg, on January 19th, called Ukraine The West has paved the road to war with lies, specifying three lies concerning the Ukraine crisis. Let's take them one by one.

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

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

George Bush, Margaret Thatcher, Helmut Kohl, James Baker, you can almost mention any important Western leader were unanimous in saying to Gorbachev, we understand that the Warsaw Pact has gone, the Soviet Union has gone, and therefore, we are not going to take advantage of your weakness. James Baker's formulation, according to all these sources, is we're not going to expand nature one inch. And that was said in 89, 90. That is 30 years ago. And Gorbachev, because of those assurances also accepted, which he's been blamed very much for since then, the reunification of Germany. Some sources say that was a kind of deal made that if Germany should be united, which it was very quickly after, it should be a neutral country. But the interpretation in the West was it could remain a member of NATO, but would then include what was at that time the German Democratic Republic, GDR [East Germany]

into one Germany. You can go to Gorbachev's Foundation home page and you will find several interviews, videos, whatever, in which he says these things, and you can go to the Danish leading expert in this, Jens Jørgen Nielsen, who has also written that he personally interviewed Gorbachev, in which Gorbachev, with sadness in his eyes, said that he was cheated, or that these promises were broken, whatever the formulation is.

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

Now, this is so fundamental that, of course, it has to be denied by those who are hardliners, or hawks, or cannot live without enemies, or want a new Cold War, which we already have, in my view, and have had for some years. But that's a long story. The way the West, and the U.S. in particular – but NATO's secretary general's behavior is outrageous to me, because it's built on omission of one of the most important historical facts of modern Europe.

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. In your article, you actually quote from the head of NATO, the general secretary of NATO, back in 1990, one year before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Manfred Wörner, where you say that in these documents released by the U.S. National Security Archive, that you just referred to, "Manfred Wörner gave a well-regarded speech in Brussels in May 1990, in which he argued 'The principal task of the next decade will be to build a new European security structure to

include the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. The Soviet Union will have an important role to play in the construction of such a system.' And the next year, in the middle of 1991, according to a memorandum from the Russian delegation who met with Wörner. He responded to the Russians by saying that he personally and the NATO council, were both against expansion "13 out of 16 NATO members share this point of view," and "Wörner said that he would speak against Poland's and Romania's membership in NATO to those countries leaders, as he had already done with leaders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And he emphasized that we should not allow the isolation of USSR from the European community," and this was even while the U.S.S.R. was still alive. So it must have been even more the case after the U.S.S.R. collapsed, and Russia emerged.

Jan Oberg: Well, if I may put in a little point here, you see, with that quotation of a former NATO secretary general, compare that with the present secretary general of NATO. Wörner was a man of intellect. The leaders around him at the time in Europe were too. I mean, those were the days when you had people like Willy Brandt in Germany and östpolitik [East policy], and you had Olof Palme in Sweden with common security thinking. We cannot in the West be sure, feel safe and secure in the West, if it's against Russia. Which does not mean at all to give into everything Russia does, but just says we cannot be safe if the others don't feel safe from us. And that was an intellectualism. That was an empathy, not a necessarily a sympathy, but it was an empathy for those over there, that we have to take into account, when we act. Today that intellectualism is gone completely.

And it is very interesting, as you point out, that 13 out of 16 NATO countries, at that time, were at that level, but in came in 1990 Bill Clinton. And he basically said, well, he didn't state it. He acted as though he had stated it, I don't care about those promises, and then he started expanding NATO.

And the first office of NATO was set up in Kiev in 1994. That was the year when he did that. And that was a year when I sat in Tbilisi, Georgia, and interviewed the U.S. representative there, who, through a two-hour long conversation, basically talked about Georgia as “our country.”

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

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

Jan Oberg: Well, it’s not the rest, it’s the beginning of the story. You see, people who write about these things, and it’s particularly those who are Western media and Western politicians and foreign ministers, et cetera, they say that it all started with this out-of-the-blue invasion in the Donbass, and then the taking, annexing or aggression on, or whatever the word is, Crimea. Well, they all forget, very conveniently, and very deliberately – I mean, this is not a longer time ago than people who write about it today would know – that there was a clearly western assisted, if not orchestrated, coup d’état in Kiev in 2014. After, I won’t go into that long story, after some negotiations about an economic agreement between Ukraine and the EU, in which the president then jumped off, allegedly under pressure from Putin, or whatever, but there were a series of violent events in Kiev.

And it’s well known from one of those who were there, and participated, namely the assistant secretary of State for European Affairs, Mrs. Nuland, and she’s given a speech in the U.S. where, if I remember correctly, she says that the US has

pumped \$5 billion into Ukraine over the years, to support democracy and human rights, et cetera, and training courses for young NGOs, et cetera. And it's obvious that that operation, that ousting of the president, he had to flee to Russia, and the taking over, partly by neo-Nazis and fascists who were present and who probably did the beginning of the shooting and the killing of people, that all this had to do with the promise that was given to Ukraine years before that it would be integrated into the Euro-Atlantic framework. And then it was kind of stopping and saying, we don't want that anyhow. We will negotiate something else, and we will look into what Putin has to offer, etc.

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

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

But what I'm talking about was something that happened in 2014, and there's no excuse for not mentioning that there's a connection between that coup d'état, and the influence of the

West in Ukraine in a very substantial way, and what happened in Donbas and Crimea.

So I'm just saying, if I put it on a more general level, if we look at today's ability to understand, describe, analyze issues as conflicts, we are heading for zero understanding. There is nobody in the press, and nobody in politics who are able, intellectually, to see these things as conflicts, that is, as a problem standing between two or more parties that has to be analyzed. And conflict resolution is about finding solutions that the parties we have defined as parties, and there certainly are many more than two in this very complex conflict, can live with in the future. What we are down to in banalization is that there is no conflict. There's only one party, Russia, that does everything bad and evil and terrible, while we are sitting in the receiving end, being the good guys who've done nothing wrong in history. Who could never rethink what we did or say, we're sorry, or change our policies, because we are right. There's only one problem. That's them. We're down now to the level in which these things, also the last three months, the accusations about Russia invading Ukraine, has nothing to do with conflict analysis. It is purely focusing on one party, and one party, by definition, is not a conflict.

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

on board the Titanic.

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

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

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

podcast from a place I don't remember, which the Guardian quotes. He says that he was asked by Putin whether, or at what time, or whatever the formulation was, NATO would accept Russia as a member.

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

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

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

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

could not do anything about it. China could not do anything about it at the time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, one of the things you have to ask yourself about is there one rule and one set of interests for the Western world that does not apply to other actors? If you want to avoid Russia invading Ukraine, which all this nonsense is about repeatedly now for two or three months. Look into a new status where the East and the West and Ukraine, all of it, can sit down and discuss security guarantees for Ukraine.

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

any moment, leaves the country and goes to a conference to speak which he could have done on Zoom.

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

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

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

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

And that is to me, the the schwerpunkt [main emphasis], the absolutely essential, that is to give the Ukraine people a feeling of security and safety and stability and peace so that

they can develop. I find it very interesting that President Zelensky, in this very long interview to the international press a couple of weeks ago, say I'm paraphrasing it. But he says "I'm tired of all these people who say that we are going to be invaded because it destroys our economy. People are leaving. No business is coming in, right?"

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

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

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

Jan Oberg: Oh, I would build a kind of, I wouldn't say copy of, but I would I would build something inspired by the United Nations Security Council. All Europe, representatives for all countries, including NGOs, and not just government representatives. I would have an early warning mechanism where the moment there is something like a conflict coming up, we would have reporters and we would have investigations we would look into, not conflict prevention.

My goodness, people don't read books. There's nothing about conflict prevention. We should prevent violence. We should prevent violent conflict, but preventing conflicts is nonsense, life is getting richer. There's not a family, there's not a school, there's not a workplace, there's not a political party, there's not a parliament in which there are no conflicts. Conflict is what life is made of. Conflict is

terribly important because it makes us change and reflect. I'm all for conflicts, and I'm one hundred and ten percent against violence. But people will say "Conflict prevention is something we should work, on and educate people in." Nonsense from people who never read books, as I said.

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

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

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

And second, limited destructive capacity because they're going to be used on your own territory in case somebody encroaches or invades you. But nobody wants to have nuclear weapons or totally super destructive weapons on their own territory because they don't want them to be used to there. So just ask yourself, what would you like in Country X, Y and Z to be defended with? And that's a definition of a defensive weapons. If we all had only defensive military structures, there would be very few wars, but they would also not be a military-industrial-media-academic complex that earns the money on this.

The whole thing here that the big elephant in the room we are talking about is, well, there are two of them, is NATO

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

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

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

Jan Oberg: Yeah, and you might add, what the West gets out of this is that Russia and China will get closer and closer. You are already seeing the common declaration. We will have friendship eternally. And that's between two countries who up to the sixties at some point were very strong enemies. And the same will go with Iran, and there would be other countries like Serbia which are turning away from the West. We're going to sit and be isolating ourselves because, one, we cannot bully the world anymore, as we could before in the West. And secondly, nobody wants to be bullied anymore. We have to live in a world in which there are different systems. This Christian missionary idea that everybody must become like us. We opened up to China because then we hope they would become liberal democracies with many parties, and the parliament is awfully naïve. And time is over for that kind of thinking.

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

Jan Oberg: I'm against it because it's a break of 70 years of sensible policies. We do not accept foreign weapons and we do not accept foreign troops, and we do not accept nuclear weapons stationed on Danish soil. I sat, for ten years, all throughout the 1980s, in the Danish Governments Commission for Security and Disarmament as an expert. Nobody in the 80s would have mentioned anything like this. I guess the whole thing is something that had begun to go mad around 20 years ago, when Denmark engaged and became a bomber nation for the first time in Yugoslavia. And then Afghanistan and Iraq, and it means that you cannot say no. This is an offer you can't refuse. You can't refuse it, among other things, it's my interpretation, because you remember the story where President Trump suggested that he or the U.S. could buy Greenland, and the prime minister Mette Frederiksen said, 'Well, that is not something to be discussed. The question is absurd,' after which he got very angry. He got personally very angry, and he said, 'It's not a matter of speaking to me. You're speaking to the United States of America.' And I think this offer to begin negotiations must have come relatively shortly after that, as 'This offer is not something you should call absurd once

again.' I've no evidence for that. But if these negotiations started more than a year ago, we are back in the Trump administration.

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

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

Secondly, it is not true that there is a no to nuclear weapons in other senses than Denmark will keep up the principle that we will not have them stationed permanently. But with such an agreement where the Air Force, Navy and soldiers, military, shall more frequently work with, come in to visit, etc., there's no doubt that there will be more nuclear weapons coming into, for instance, on American vessels than before, because the cooperation would be closer and closer.

Jan Oberg: And there the only thing the Danish government will do is, since they know that the "neither confirm nor deny policy" of the U.S., they would not even ask the question. If they are asked by journalists, they would say, "Well, we take for granted that the Americans honor or understand and respect that we will not have nuclear weapons on Danish territory, sea territory, or whatever. Now the Americans are violating that

in Japan even. So, this is this is nonsense. There would be more nuclear weapons. I'm not saying they would go off or anything like that. I'm just saying there would be more undermining of Danish principles.

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

And secondly, in a world where you are going to want multipolarity, a stronger Asia, stronger Africa, another Russia from the one we have known the last 30 years, etc., and a United States that is, on all indicators except the military, declining and will fall as the world leader. This is, in my view, be careful with my words, the most foolish thing you can do at the moment, if you are a leader of Denmark, or if you leading the Danish security politics. You should be open – I wrote an article about that in a small Danish book some six or seven years ago, and said "Walk on two legs." Remain friendly with the United States and NATO, and all that, but develop your other leg, so you can walk on two legs in the next 20, 30, 40 years. But there's nobody that thinks so long term in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and there's nobody who thinks independently anymore in research institutes or ministries. It's basically adapting to everything we think, or are told by Washington we should do. And that's not foreign policy to me. There's nothing to do with it.

Jan Oberg: A good foreign policy is one where you have a good capacity to analyze the world, do scenarios, discuss which way

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

China and Xinjiang

Michelle Rasmussen: The last question is that, you just mentioned the lack of independence of analysis, and there's not only an enemy image being painted against Russia, but also against China, with allegations of central government genocide against the Muslim Uyghur minority in Xinjiang province as a major point of contention. And on March 8th, 2021, the Newlines Institute for Strategy and Policy in Washington published a report The Uyghur Genocide, an examination of China's breaches of the 1948 Genocide Convention in cooperation with the Raoul Wallenberg Center for Human Rights in Montreal, and the next month, April 27, last year, you and two others issued a report which criticized this report. What is the basis of your criticism and what do you think should be done to lessen tension with China?

And also as a wrap-up question in the end, if you wanted to say anything else about what has to be done to make a change

from looking at Russia and China as the autocratic enemies of the West, and to, instead, shift to a world in which there is cooperation between the major powers, which would give us the possibility of concentrating on such great task as economic development of the poorer parts of the world?

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

So when we began to look into this, we also began to see a trend. And that's why we published shortly after a 150 page report about the new Cold War on China, and Xinjiang is part of a much larger orchestrated – and I'm not a conspiracy theorist. It's all documented, in contrast to media and other research reports. It's documented. You can see where we get our knowledge from, and on which basis we draw conclusions.

Whereas now, significantly, for Western scholarship and media, they don't deal with, are not interested in sources. I'll come back to that. It's part of a much larger, only tell negative stories about China. Don't be interested in China's new social model. Don't be interested in how they, in 30 to 40 years did what nobody else in humankind has ever done. Uplifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and creating a

society that I can see the difference from, because I visited China in 1983, and I know what it looked like back then when they had just opened up, so to speak.

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

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

So, I feel sad on a completely different level, and that is, Western scholarship is disappearing in this field. And those who may really have different views, analyses and question what we hear or uphold a plurality of viewpoints and interpretations of the world, we're not listened to. I mean, I'm listening to elsewhere, but I'm not listened to in Western media, although I have forty five years of experience in these things and I've traveled quite a lot and worked in quite a lot of conflict and war zones. I can live with that, but I think it's a pity for the Western world that we are now so far down the drain, that good scholarship is not what politics built on anymore. If it, I think it was at a point in time.

So what is also striking to me is, very quickly, the uniformity of the press. They have all written the day that the Newsline report that you referred to, was published, it was all over the place, including front pages of the leading

Western newspapers, including the Danish Broadcasting's website, etc., all saying the same thing, quoting the same bits of parts from it.

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

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

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

These are the kinds of things that make me scared as an intellectual. One thing is what happens out in the world. That's bad enough. But when I begin to find out how this is going on, how it is manipulated internally in editorial offices, close to foreign ministries, etc. or defense ministries is then I say, we are approaching the Pravda

moment. The Pravda moment is not the present Pravda [newspaper], but the Pravda that went down with the Soviet Union. When I visited Russia, the Soviet Union at a time for conferences, et cetera, and I found out that very few people believed anything they saw in the media. Now, to me, it's a question of whether the Western media, so-called free media want to save themselves or they want to become totally irrelevant, because at some point, as someone once said, you cannot lie all the time to all of the people, you may get away with lying to some, to some people, for some of the time.

Michelle Rasmussen: President Lincoln

Jan Oberg: Yeah. So the long story short is this is not good. This deceives people. And of course, some people, at some point, people will be very upset about that. They have been lied to. And also don't make this reference anymore to free and state media. Viewers may like to hear that may not like it, but should know it, the US has just passed a law – They have three laws against China – How to intervene in all kinds of Chinese things, such as, for instance, trying to influence who will become the successor to Dalai Lama, and things like that. They are not finished at all about how to influence Taiwan, and all that, things they have nothing to do with, and which they decided between Nixon and Zhou Enlai that America accepted the One-China policy and would not mix themselves into Taiwanese issues. But that is another broken promise. These media are state media in the U.S. If you take Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia, they are those, particularly the latter, who have disseminated most of these Xinjiang genocide stories, which then bounce back to BBC, etc. These are state media. As an agency for that in in Washington, it's financed by millions of dollars, of course, and it has the mandate to make American foreign policy more understood, and promote U.S. foreign policy goals and views. Anybody can go to a website and see this. Again, I'm back to this, everybody can do what I've done. And that law that has just been passed says the

U.S. sets aside 15 hundred million dollars, that's one point five billion dollars in the next five years, to support education, training courses, whatever, for media people to write negative stories about China, particularly the Belt and Road Initiative. Now I look forward to Politiken [Danish newspaper] or Dagens Nyheter [Swedish newspaper] or whatever newspapers in the allied countries who would say, "This comes from a state U.S. media" when it does.

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

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

The world is going towards diversity. And we have other

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Jan.

At skrive et nyt kapitel i menneskehedens historie

Den 17. februar (EIRNS) – “Hvorfor Ukraine? Hvorfor nu?”

Skønt det, der var blevet bekendtgjort som dagen for Ruslands invasion af Ukraine, er kommet og gået, og mens Rusland mobiliserer for at flytte tropper fra sine vestlige

grænseregioner og Hviderusland tilbage til deres baser, er den enorme trussel om militær konflikt ikke aftaget. Der lyder fortsat skingre råb fra USA, Storbritannien, NATO og de etablerede medier. Og truslen kan ikke løses ved tiltag på selve den "ukrainske" arena.

Den strategiske krise, der manifesterer sig i det østlige Ukraine, har ikke sin oprindelse i denne region og kan ikke forstås som en hændelse. Den er det lokale udbrud af en uforløst spænding, der er indeholdt i konflikten mellem de fysisk-økonomiske forudsætninger for en voksende og velfungerende menneskehed og det døende, unipolære angloamerikanske geopolitiske system, som ikke tolererer nogen rivaler til sit herredømme.

Selve dette oligarkiske systems eksistens, er truet af Kinas fremgang og Ruslands uafhængighed. Det er truslen mod denne oligarkiske identitet, der er drivkraften bag de konflikter, der i øjeblikket udspiller sig i Ukraine og Taiwan. Det er de bankerotte, hyperinflationære økonomier i det transatlantiske område, som kræver mere end uendelige redningspakker for at bevare deres position. Og det er denne elites anti-menneskelige natur, der kommer til udtryk i den nulvækstfascisme, som skal gennemtvinges i form af "grønne" forordninger.

Men den fælles aftale af 4. februar mellem Rusland og Kina udtrykker på det skarpeste, at det anglo-amerikanske finansielle nulvækst-imperium er fortid: "I dag gennemgår verden betydningsfulde omvæltninger, og menneskeheden er på vej ind i en ny æra med rivende udvikling og dybtgående transformationer... Der er opstået en tendens til en omfordeling af magten i verden, og det internationale samfund viser en stigende efterspørgsel efter lederskab, der tilstræber en fredelig og gradvis udvikling."

Det såkaldte Vestens "regelbaserede orden", vil blive fremtidens "international lovbasere orden". Det er slut

med at bruge "demokrati" og "menneskerettigheder" som påskud for at blande sig i andre nationers anliggender. Sikkerhed skal antage en global, inkluderende karakter. NATO har overlevet ethvert nyttigt formål, som det havde engang, og det er på tide at "i fællesskab opbygge internationale forbindelser af en ny karakter". Denne relation mellem Rusland og Kina "har ingen begrænsninger", og "der er ingen 'forbudte' samarbejdsområder".

Truslen om krig, en atomkrig, der kan afslutte civilisationen, kan kun overvindes ved globalt at indføre et nyt paradigme for internationale relationer og med en medmenneskelig selvforståelse. De bankerotte anglo-amerikanske eliter, kan ikke længere få lov til at pålægge hele jorden deres dagsorden. Verden – herunder helt klart USA selv! – må frigøres fra menneskehedens dårlighed, for at tage de smukke og inspirerende udfordringer op med at mestre fusionsenergi, at afskaffe fattigdommen på verdensplan inden for et årti, at udvide vores evner i rummet og at revolutionere jordens infrastrukturplatforme.

Faren og løftet i dette øjeblik, hvor paradigmer brydes, er emnet for Schiller Instituttets konference på lørdag: "100 sekunder til midnat på dommedagsuret": Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur!"

Udvalgt billede: Cottonbro, Pexels

Et skridt tilbage fra

afgrundens rand; men der kan ikke opnås varig fred uden en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur

Den 16. februar (EIRNS) – I den ugentlige webcast i dag erklærede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at verden tog et lille skridt tilbage fra afgrundens rand, da den britisk proklamerede deadline for en formodet russisk invasion af Ukraine i dag forløb uden hændelser. I stedet ser diplomatiet ud til at få en smule fodfæste, med den franske præsident Emmanuel Macrons og den tyske kansler Olaf Scholz' besøg i Moskva og Kiev i forlængelse af hinanden, samtidig med et voksende kor af amerikanske røster, der kræver strategisk fornuft fra den amerikanske regering.

“Dette er et vigtigt skridt,” kommenterede Zepp-LaRouche, “men der skal indlysende nok ske meget mere.” Hun bemærkede, at der er ved at blive opbygget et miljø “for at fremtvinge en diskussion om Putins krav til USA og NATO om at få sikkerhedsgarantier for, at NATO ikke vil udvide sig yderligere mod øst, og at der ikke vil blive installeret offensive våbensystemer langs den russiske grænse.”

“Jeg håber, at diplomatiet igen kan spille en større rolle,” fortsatte Zepp-LaRouche, herunder den idé, der har cirkuleret om, at der skal organiseres en ny “Helsinki 2-aftale” mellem supermagterne. “Men jeg tror, at end ikke Helsinki 2 er tilstrækkelig, for vi har brug for en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som tager hensyn til hvert enkelt lands sikkerhedsinteresser.”

Det, der er brug for, er “en global ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, som vil betyde geopolitikkens afslutning. Det er det

nødvendige skridt, som menneskeheden må tage, hvis man for stedse ønsker, at komme ud af dilemmaet om en potentiel verdenskrig.”

Blot at appellere til fred er gavnligt, fortsatte hun, men “det er helt utilstrækkeligt, fordi det ikke tager højde for, hvor krigsfare kommer fra. Selvfølgelig kommer krigsfare fra det militærindustrielle kompleks, som har brug for deres krige for at holde maskineriet i gang. Men man kan ikke adskille det militær-industrielle kompleks’ interesser fra Wall Street, City of London, Silicon Valley osv. Faktum er, at det neoliberale finanssystem er ved at sprænges, og krigsfare kommer af dette, fordi der er nogle mennesker i disse kredse, som foretrækker at risikere en tredje verdenskrig, frem for at tillade, at en multipolær verden udvikles. Især nu, hvor Kina og Rusland indgår i et fornyet strategisk partnerskab, hvilket er et helt særligt nyt aspekt i situationen. Krigsfare kommer af, at disse neoliberale kredse er ved at opleve deres Waterloo.”

Zepp-LaRouche konkluderede: “Dette er den krudttønde, som vi sidder på... Der findes ingen løsning inden for dette system. Dette system er kuldsejlet, og den eneste løsning ville være at gøre præcis det, som Lyndon LaRouche har foreslået i mange år, nemlig at gennemføre en fuldstændig reorganisering af det konkursramte system, en global Glass-Steagall-bankopdeling, og derefter gå over til et Hamiltonisk banksystem og etablere et Nyt Bretton Woods-system, som giver mulighed for langsigtet kredit med lav rente til gavn for udviklingen af især udviklingssektoren. Det kan gøres meget nemt i samarbejde med Bælte og Vej – Initiativet. Så en løsning er umiddelbart mulig.”

Tilmeld dig venligst Schiller Instituttets internationale konference den 19. februar, “100 sekunder til midnat på dommedagsuret: Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur !”

<https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2022/02/100-sekunder-til-midnat>

- paa-dommedags-uret-vi-har-brug-for-en-ny-sikkerhedsarkitektur-en-atomkrig-kan-ikke-vindes-og-maa-aldrig-udkaempes-schiller-instituttets-internationale-online-konferen/

https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/100_seconds_to_midnight_02192022

Helga Zepp-LaRouche webcast: Den historiske sandhed kommer frem, den transatlantiske krigspropagandamaskine får et slag

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 16. februar 2022

Selv om den strategiske situation omkring Rusland og NATO fortsat er yderst farlig, udtalte Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, at der er sket en ændring. Det lykkedes Putin at fremprovokere en diskussion om Ruslands sikkerhedsbekymringer, idet han effektivt argumenterede for, at en nation eller blok af nationer ikke må forbedre dens sikkerhed på bekostning af andre. Hun bemærkede fremadrettet bevægelse ved mødet mellem den tyske kansler Scholz og præsident Putin, selv om de transatlantiske krigshøge bliver ved med at insistere på, at Rusland kan invadere Ukraine "når som helst".

Idet LaRouche orienterede om en meddelelse fra den ukrainske statskvinde Natalia Vitrenko, sagde hun, at situationen i Ukraine fortsat er meget kompliceret, men at muligheden for en Minsk-2-aftale, som en del af en bredere Helsinki 2.0-diskussion kan muliggøre en ændring, hvor Ukraine bliver en bro mellem øst og vest i stedet for en krigszone.

Det er bemærkelsesværdigt, at deltagerne i drøftelserne i slutningen af Den kolde Krig, den tidligere franske udenrigsminister Roland Dumas og den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør i Rusland Jack Matlock, offentligt har grebet ind for at "sætte tingene på plads" med hensyn til krisens oprindelse, dvs. det brudte løfte fra Vesten om, at der ikke vil ske nogen udvidelse af NATO mod øst, hvilket afslører den historiske sandhed i modsætning til de løgnagtige fortællinger, der kommer fra den transatlantiske side.

Hun opfordrede alle seere til at mobilisere så mange mennesker som muligt til at se Schiller Instituttets konference denne lørdag den 19. februar, så det bliver klart, at der er et alternativ til det økonomiske sammenbrud, der ligger bag krigskampagnen, og det er det unikke sæt af løsninger, som Lyndon LaRouche har frembragt.

Schiller Instituttets konference på lørdag: "100 sekunder til midnat"

Den 15. februar (EIRNS) – Mens der vil ske flere skift i det internationale politiske terræn i de næste 72 timer, vil lørdagens konference i Schiller Instituttet, "100 sekunder til midnat på dommedagsuret: Vi har brug for en ny

sikkerhedsarkitektur!" inddrage disse momentane skift af det taktiske landskab. Som grundlæggeren af {Executive Intelligence Review}, Lyndon LaRouche, engang i en anden, men sammenlignelig situation bemærkede: "Verden er gået ind i en overgangsperiode, hvor gamle metoder med hensyn til vurdering og orientering er ubrugelige, og endog modstridende, for den konkrete vurdering af de fleste af de nye fænomener i den strategiske og nationalt-taktiske udvikling. Af denne grund er meget få personer i verden ... intellektuelt oplært til at forstå de processer, som vil være afgørende for udfaldet af nogle af de nærmeste uger og måneder, der ligger umiddelbart foran os."

Der vil uden tvivl dukke modstridende historier op i de kommende timer og dage – forudsat at der {er} kommende timer og dage – om, hvad der sker eller vil ske i de forskellige forhandlinger, der involverer Tyskland, Frankrig, Ukraine, USA og Rusland. {EIR} vil forsøge, ikke blot at "formidle nyhederne", men snarere at gribe ind i den aktuelle historie og fremme den, ved hjælp af en metode til statskunst baseret på LaRouches fire love for fysisk økonomi, som undertiden kort og godt kaldes " modsætningernes sammenfald ". Denne metode til politisk beslutningstagning, som LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche forfægter, ses i strategiske løsningsforslag som "Operation Ibn Sina", der for nylig blev præsenteret i det netop udsendte fælles forum mellem Schiller Instituttet og Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC), "Den humanitære krise i Afghanistan: På vej til en langsigtet løsning". <https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2022/02/faelles-video-konference-raadet-for-internationale-anliggender-i-rusland-og-schiller-instituttet-torsdag-den-10-februar-kl-14/>

Metoden indebærer, at man tager udgangspunkt i verdens behov som helhed – fødevarer, rent vand, sanitet, boliger, sundhedspleje og uddannelse – og udtænker nationale politikker og praksis, der resulterer i en vellykket skabelse af en teknologisk avanceret global platform, som kommer flest mulige

verdensborgere til gode, hvilket øger planetens potentielle relative befolkningstæthed.

Krig, især forebyggende krig, der blev fordømt ved Nürnberg-processerne som en forbrydelse mod menneskeheden, er i modstrid med menneskeheden og dens efterkommeres generelle velfærd. Uanset oprindelsen, bør den rovdyragtige opfattelse, at "det grundlæggende organisationsprincip i samfundet er krig", ikke på noget tidspunkt få lov til at blive "organisationsprincippet" for USA's udenrigspolitik. Et britisk domineret USA, en uacceptabel omstændighed, som eftertrykkeligt har været fremherskende siden Sovjetunionens sammenbrud i 1991, må erstattes af et borgerskab, der genetablerer denne nations sande identitet, ved at tilstræbe et samarbejde med Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre nationer, baseret på Den amerikanske Frihedskrigs oprindelige regeringsdokumenter, herunder Hamiltons Fire betænkninger om Økonomi, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremført i sit forslag om de Fire Love.

Den tidligere franske minister Roland Dumas, som var en central figur i forhandlingerne mellem NATO og Sovjetunionen efter 1989, har i sit seneste Les Crises-interview, som kan ses på Youtube, ikke efterladt nogen tvivl om, at han, James Baker og andre vestlige repræsentanter faktisk havde lovet Rusland, at NATO ikke ville udvides mod øst:

"I realiteten indså vi – Gorbatsjov, præsident Mitterrand og jeg selv, på det tidspunkt – at der ikke var nogen fredsaftale, der kunne afslutte krigen med Tyskland, og at det derfor var nødvendigt at gøre en ende på denne ustabile situation. Det er grunden til, at vi sammen med min ven Hans-Dietrich Genscher, den tyske udenrigsminister, udarbejdede en plan for at indlede forhandlinger om alle de mangler der var, eftersom der ikke var indgået nogen fredstraktat... Vi havde møder i London, møder i Paris og til sidst i Moskva for at få den sidste del af den globale aftale på plads i nærværelse af Gorbatsjov..." Hvad angår den senere diskussion om disponeringen

af NATO-styrkerne efter en tilbagetrækning af Warszawa-pagten fra Centraleuropa, berettede Dumas: "Udenrigsministeren (Shevernadze) tog ordet og sagde: "Vi, den russiske delegation, ønsker at vide, hvad der vil ske med NATO's oprustning som en del af nedrustningen." Dumas sagde, at den russiske delegation fremsatte to krav. For det første, at monumenterne for de sovjetiske soldater, der kæmpede mod fascismen under Anden Verdenskrig, skal bevares og respekteres. "For det andet, at tropper fra både Warszawa-pagten og NATO forpligter sig til, at der ikke vil ske bevægelse af NATO-tropper ind i de områder af Warszawa-pagten, der var ved at blive afvæbnet... Gorbatsjov talte, Sjevardnadze talte, jeg talte. Og jeg fremsatte idéen om, at [NATO's militære] styrker ikke må bevæge sig ind i tidligere militariserede områder." Dumas erklærede, at amerikanerne og tyskerne var enige i dette. "Før [den tyske udenrigsminister] Genscher døde, spurgte jeg ham, om han huskede denne diskussion. Han svarede; 'perfekt'."

På topmødet på Malta den 3. december 1989, mindre end en måned efter Berlinmurens fald, havde Bush og Gorbatsjov "erklæret Den kolde Krigs ophør". Der skulle ikke ske nogen udvidelse mod øst. Altså, NATO blev udvidet fra 15 nationer i 1989 til 30 nationer, og i strid med dette tidligere løfte forsøger at gøre Ukraine til nr. 31, klar ved den russiske grænse, hvor muligheden for en strategisk fejlvurdering, der fører til total krig, er større end på noget tidspunkt siden – og måske inklusive – Cuba-krisen i 1962.

Formålet med tidsskriftet {Executive Intelligence Review} og den særlige metode, som LaRouche skabte, for at oplyse om den vurderende proces for indsamling af efterretninger, som han ønskede af sine medarbejdere, er at tilskynde til at alle "selvindlysende" antagelser, der styrer borgerens "daglige" tænkning, fjernes og erstattes af en metode til at formulere den nødvendige politik, programmer og samarbejde for at sikre alles varige overlevelse og velstand. Dette er essensen af en

fornuftig økonomisk politik, og derfor også en fornuftig sikkerhedspolitik. At diskutere denne metode og foreslå en sådan ny sikkerhedsarkitektur er formålet med lørdagens konference, som alle tilhængere af sandheden bør deltage i.

Indsat billede: Khwanchai Phantong, Pexels

Kunne Biden udløse et værre helvede for Ukraine, end han gjorde i Afghanistan

Den 14. februar (EIRNS) – Biden-regeringen, der fejlvurderede de reelle forhold i Afghanistan efter 20 års NATO-krig i landet, foretog en forhastet tilbagetrækning, og gik derefter i gang med at beslaglægge alle landets kontanter og straffe befolkningen med manglende fødevarer, lægehjælp og husly i vinterens mulm og mørke. Man meddelte ikke engang USA's NATO-“allierede”, hvad man var i gang med. Det efterlader et ødelagt land.

Kan Bidens Hvide Hus nu få tilladelse til at forårsage en endnu værre katastrofe i Europa – endog en atomkatastrofe – i en konflikt, “Ukraine-krisen”, som kan udløse en krig, der kan ødelægge selve menneskeheden? Biden-regeringens voksende vrede og aggressive bluff over for Rusland i forbindelse med Ukraine har bragt os tættere på en atomkrig, end vi nogensinde har været siden oktober 1962, hvor hele verden blev skræmt af Cuba-krisen.

En mulighed er, at Biden og hans skumle nationale sikkerhedsteam leder efter en sejr at sælge i hjemlandet ved at fortælle os, at Rusland vil invadere Ukraine i næste uge, i

morgen, når som helst ... og så, når Rusland ikke invaderer, forklare os at Bidens trussel om en knusende økonomisk afstraffelse stoppede Putin. Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov erklærede i går på Twitter, at dette var det "udspekulerede skuespil". Den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør i Moskva Jack Matlock fremførte ideen i en klumme i dag, hvor han skrev på vegne af American Committee for U.S.-Russia Accord. Formand for Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy, Pelosi antydede det på sin egen måde i søndagens "ABC This Week": "Hvis vi ikke truede med sanktioner og den slags, ville Putin med garanti invadere... Så hvis Rusland ikke invaderer, er det ikke fordi, han aldrig havde til hensigt at gøre det. Det er bare fordi, at sanktionerne virkede." [https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-13-22-speaker-nancy-pelosi-sen/story?id=82849151]

Men vi kan ikke forlade os på håbet om, at dette er politisk fup. Bidens Hvide Hus straffer Afghanistan på inkompetent vis, dog med hævngherrighed. Man ønsker at straffe Rusland og ødelægge dets økonomi. Højtstående embedsmænd i Det Hvide Hus udtrykte det på et baggrunds-pressemøde den 25. januar: Målet er at "ramme Putins strategiske ambitioner om at industrialisere sin økonomi ganske hårdt... underminere Putins ambitioner om at udøve indflydelse på verdensscenen". Embedsmændene svor: "Vi taler om at nægte Rusland såkaldte "downstream-produkter", der er afgørende for landets egne ambitioner, om at udvikle højteknologiske kapaciteter inden for rumfart og forsvar, lasere og sensorer, det maritime, AI, robotteknologi, kvanteteknologi osv... Og så, mens vi opbygger denne indsats med vores allierede og partnere, er vi villige til at samarbejde med ethvert land for at nægte Rusland materialer, som det har brug for til at udvide sin økonomi." [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/01/25/background-press-call-by-senior-administration-officials-on-russia-ukraine-economic-deterrence-measures/]

Med dette formål vover Bidens hold – som havde "alt under

kontrol" i Afghanistan – at udfordre den russiske præsident Putin til at gå i krig. Det presser Ukraines præsident Zelinsky så hårdt, at han føler sig tvunget til at tilbagevise enhver prognose for en russisk invasion, som London og Washington kommer med.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i sin vidt udbredte analyse fra den 6. februar: "Vi er 100 sekunder før midnat på dommedags-uret: Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur". (<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/02/07/100-seconds-to-midnight-on-the-nuclear-war-clock-we-need-a-new-security-architecture/>) To europæiske bankfolk opfordrede Frankrig til at blokere Ukraines optagelse i NATO og omgående forlade NATO's strategiske kommando, med det formål at stoppe marchen mod krig. Den tyske kansler Olaf Scholz tog til Ukraine i dag for at sige: "Spørgsmålet om [Ukraines] medlemskab af alliancen [NATO] er ikke på dagsordenen," så Rusland bør holde op med at bekymre sig om det. Men de NATO-våben, som USA hælder ind i og omkring Ukraine, er uden fortilfælde: Ukraines forsvarsminister indrømmer, at landet nu har langt flere anti-tankmissiler end russiske kampvognsmål.

Vi er alle nødt til at mobilisere os selv, ikke til at "se på og vente", som de fleste blev skræmt til at gøre i oktober 1962. Der er ingen John F. Kennedy her til at løse dette. Løsningen er at tilskynde til flere pauser, frem mod forhandlingerne og at angribe årsagen, nemlig truslen om et hyperinflationært sammenbrud, som Biden-administrationen og centralbanken, Federal Reserve, har udrettet så meget for at påføre sig selv og os. Vores næste D-dag er lørdag den 19. februar, Schiller Instituttets heldagskonference, med budskabet i Helga Zepp-LaRouches artikel fra den 6. februar: Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, en arkitektur baseret på økonomisk genopretning og udvikling. For at tilmelde dig konferencen og organisere andre:

https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/100_seconds_to_midnight_02192022

Kampagnen mod krig er i gang ... men det haster med afgørende gennembrud

Den 13. februar (EIRNS) – Spørgsmålet om hvad der vil ske næste gang, og hvornår, i NATO-blokkens opdigtede konfrontation mod Rusland i Europa, svæver fortsat i luften og er meget farligt. Flere forstandige, modsatte kræfter tager bladet fra munden, men et afgørende gennembrud haster.

I weekenden fortsatte de amerikanske talsmænd deres påstande om russisk aggression og deres falske anklage om, at Rusland vil angribe Ukraine, i erklæringer fra udenrigsminister Antony Blinken, der talte fra Hawaii; fra den nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Jake Sullivan, og fra Pentagon-talsmand John Kirby. De var militært set vage med hensyn til hvornår og hvordan. Sullivan sagde i morges på CNN om tidsrammen for et russisk angreb, at vi er "i vinduet", og at det kan ske "når som helst nu" eller måske "efter de olympiske lege", som slutter den 20. februar. Sullivan sagde, at Rusland kan forventes at iscenesætte en hændelse under falsk flag, fordi det bl.a. af den grund netop er "i overensstemmelse med den russiske drejebog" at gøre den slags. Der er ikke behov for beviser.

I en vurdering af situationen sagde Schiller Instituttets formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i dag, at " uklarheden omkring potentielle falske flag vil bestå, indtil nogen gennemskuer dette... Vi har brug for et afgørende gennembrud."

Forhenværende kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI) udtalte sig kraftfuldt i weekenden, og afslørede dem der står bag den vanvittige krigskampagne mod Rusland. Hun tweetede et 4-minutters indslag fra sin optræden på Fox News lørdag aften, med et tweet der forklarer, hvordan "Biden meget let kan forhindre en krig med Rusland ved at garantere, at Ukraine ikke bliver medlem af NATO". På tv hævdede hun, at "Biden og militære ledere faktisk ønsker, at Rusland invaderer Ukraine. Hvorfor skulle de gøre det? Det giver Biden en undskyldning for at indføre vidtgående sanktioner... og det cementerer den kolde krigs relevans... Det er det militærindustrielle kompleks, der nyder godt af dette; de kontrollerer tydeligvis Bidens regering; krigsmagere på begge sider i Washington, der har opildnet til disse spændinger."

Der er også en voksende, fremtrædende mobilisering af krigsmodstandere i USA.

Udover NATO's fokus på konfrontationen om Ukraine, er den globale NATO-mobilisering i Indo-Stillehavsområdet i fuld gang. Efter QUAD-ministtermødet i Australien i sidste uge udsendte Det Hvide Hus et 19-siders dokument med titlen "Indo-Pacific Strategy of the United States". Blinken tilsluttede sig synspunktet om verdensherredømme i går, da han talte fra Honolulu, hvor han mødtes med Japans og Sydkoreas udenrigsministre. Blinken sagde, at "på det møde som vi tre havde, drøftede vi den trussel som Ruslands aggression udgør – ikke kun for Ukraine, men for hele den internationale regelbaserede orden, som har dannet grundlag for årtiers fælles sikkerhed og velstand for vores folk her i denne region og, tillige, i hele verden." (<https://www.state.gov/secretary-antony-j-blinken-joint-press-availability-with-republic-of-korea-foreign-minister-chung-eui-yong-and-japanese-foreign-minister-hayashi-yoshimasa/>)

Han sagde om sine regeringskolleger, at "vi var enige om at holde sammen i vores indsats over for Rusland."

Det strider imod hans triumferen, at der tydeligt ses visse modsatrettede synspunkter, som kommer fra anerkendte personer i Europa. Den 11. februar bragte det franske ugeblad Marianne en artikel med overskriften: "NATO-exit: Uopsættelig nødvendighed", hvori Frankrig opfordres til at forlade NATO. Det "vil signalere Europas uafhængighed af amerikansk enegang, en fornyelse af multilateralisme, fremkomsten af en multipolær verden..." Den er skrevet af den tyske økonom Peter Dittus, tidligere generalsekretær for Bank for International Settlements, og den tidligere viceguvernør for Banque de France Hervé Hannoun, tidligere vicedirektør for BIS.

I dag kommer der en advarsel fra den russiske politiske ekspert Fyodor Lukyanov: "How the World Sleepwalked into Another Cuban Missile Crisis" (Hvordan verden gik i søvne ind i endnu en Cuba-krise). I sin artikel i RT tilråder han, efter at have fremhævet den aktuelle fare i forbindelse med konfrontationen i Ukraine, at "i bedste fald ville scenariet være det samme som under Cuba-krisen. På et tidspunkt ville begge parter erkende den alvorlige fare, som en yderligere optrapning udgør, og indlede direkte realitetsforhandlinger med henblik på at udarbejde de grundlæggende principper for gensidige garantier."

Lørdag den 19. februar er Schiller Instituttets internationale internet-konference et vigtigt bidrag til det "afgørende gennembrud", vi har brug for, for at stoppe den vanvittige mobilisering mod sammenbrud og krig. Tilmeld dig og spred budskabet. Den finder sted den 19. februar kl. 10.00 (EST – kl. 16, dansk tid): "100 sekunder til midnat på dommedags-uret: Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur!" https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/100_seconds_to_midnight_02192022

Udvalgt billede: Pixabay (CC0)

Lyndon LaRouches økonomisk udviklingsvidenskab i anledning af 3 årsdagen for sin død

En tale af Renée Sigerson ved en videokonference den 12. februar 2022: