

Verdensborgere foren jer! Live-dialog med Helga Zepp- LaRouche

Starter 07;35

Oversættelse uden korrekturlæsning

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hej, velkommen igen til vores ugentlige dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlæggeren og formanden for Schiller Instituttet. I dag vil vi introducere et nyt indslag. Jeg beklager, hvis vi er lidt forsinkede, men vi har arbejdet på nogle tekniske ting her. Men ved at lave en livestream får du mulighed for at kommunikere direkte med fru LaRouche med dine spørgsmål og idéer, som kan gøre dig i stand til at være en aktiv del af diskussionen. Så hvis du har et spørgsmål eller en idé, som du vil dele med Helga, kan du sende det til os på questions@schillerinstitute.org, eller du kan skrive dem i chatten, hvor Anastasia står klar.

Så, Helga, lad os starte med dig. Der har været en masse vigtige udviklinger. Hvorfor begynder du ikke med din oversigt over, hvad du ser som de vigtigste af disse?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jamen, jeg hilser jer alle sammen velkommen og inviterer jer til at stille så mange spørgsmål, som I har lyst til. Lad mig blot fremhæve et par ting, som jeg mener er de virkelig afgørende ændringer i situationen.

Her til morgen var den store historie naturligvis i New York Times, at man pludselig har fundet de skyldige i sabotagen af Nord Stream-rørledningen. Angiveligt var det en pro-ukrainsk gruppe, der lejede en yacht og derefter gjorde det med seks personer – to dykkere, to dykkervagter, en kaptajn og en kvindelig læge. Og angiveligt gjorde de det helt selv. Hvis De husker, var der, da selve sabotagen fandt sted, en masse

diskussion om, at den del af Østersøen er den mest kontrollerede og overvågede, at det var fuldstændig umuligt for russerne at komme derhen på en hemmelig måde uden at blive opdaget. Det gør allerede denne forsinkede historie meget tvivlsom.

Men så her til morgen i Tyskland afslørede pludselig flere journalister sig selv, fra First Channel TV i Tyskland, Southwest Radio (SWR) og magasinet Die Zeit. Angiveligt har de i lang tid undersøgt, efterforskningen, statsadvokatens undersøgelse af dette, og de fandt ud af, at denne yacht angiveligt gik fra havnen i Rostock, at den grundlæggende blev lejet af et firma med hovedkvarter i Polen, men ejet af to ukrainere.

Det er alt sammen yderst ildevarslede, for Seymour Hersh afslørede sin undersøgelse i begyndelsen af februar, og det har skabt bølger på internationalt plan. Historien bliver ikke skubbet ind under gulvtæppet igen, for det giver simpelthen ingen mening. Seymour Hersh var mange gange i internationale medier, herunder kinesisk tv. Ray McGovern var på CGTN; og det blev opfanget over hele verden. Det lagde et enormt pres på Biden, fordi historien altid var, at Biden var på en pressekonference – et pres på Scholz, fordi Scholz var på en pressekonference med præsident Biden den 7. februar 2022, hvor Biden kom med denne berømte meddelelse om, at hvis russerne invaderede Ukraine, ville de finde måder at afslutte rørledningen på. Da en journalist spurgte Scholz, som stod ved siden af Biden, hvad betyder det, hvad siger du, når det er en tysk rørledning, der er bygget af Rusland? svarede Scholz med et fåmælt smil: "Vi gør alt sammen", og han understregede "sammen". Så det har rejst spørgsmålet, om de sprængte rørledningen i luften sammen? For et par dage siden, for lidt over en uge siden, aflagde Scholz et meget usædvanligt besøg i USA uden følgeskab og uden pressekorps. Han havde et en times møde med Biden bag lukkede døre under "fire øjne kun", og det var angiveligt meget hemmeligt, og intet blev afsløret. Og så,

blot et par dage senere, kommer de tilbage med denne historie.

Nu tror jeg, at dette øger sandsynligheden for, at dette er en CYA-historie, at dette er skadeskontrol, men meget dårligt. Og jeg synes, at Seymour Hersh i interviewet med CGTN faktisk ganske passende citerede Edgar Allan Poes novelle "The Purloined Letter", som er den novelle, hvor politiet ikke kan finde et stjålet brev ved at gennemsøge lejligheden, og hvor brevet faktisk hænger åbent i en ramme på væggen. Men da disse politifolk ikke kan tænke ud af boksen, fatter de det ikke. Jeg tror, at dette er en lignende ting. Fordi Hersh sagde: "Hvordan kan det være, at når dette er så stor en historie, og præsident Biden er så magtfuld, hvorfor beordrede han så ikke bare sin efterretningstjeneste til at undersøge hele denne sag og finde de skyldige?", som angiveligt, naturligvis, er russerne. Det er en meget mærkelig sag, og jeg tror bestemt, at det øger presset for at få en international undersøgelse, som skal omfatte Rusland, for ellers vil dette ikke forsvinde. Hvis det forbliver sådan, tror jeg, at tilsløringen kan vise sig at være mere ødelæggende end den egentlige forbrydelse.

Så jeg vil gerne lade det blive ved det, og måske har De flere spørgsmål i den forbindelse, men jeg tror ikke, at dette vil forsvinde. Og jeg tror, at hvis det ikke bliver opklaret, er det enormt erosivt for NATO's fremtid, for hvis det viser sig, at det var USA i samarbejde med Norge, som Hersh siger, hvad skal man så bruge fjender til, hvis man har sådanne venner? Hvad betyder det for Tyskland? Tyskland har allerede æg i ansigtet, i hvert fald regeringen, fordi folk siger: "Hvad er der galt med den tyske regering, at de lader sig behandle på denne måde?" Den tyske økonomi har i mellemtiden utrolige vanskeligheder. Vi står over for en afindustrialisering, og energipriserne er en meget stor del af det. Så det er en ting, jeg gerne ville nævne.

Den anden ting, som jeg mener er virkelig meget vigtig, er, at situationen med krigen i Ukraine bliver farligere for hver dag, der går. Der er flere og flere eksperter, der advarer om,

at hvis der ikke findes en løsning, kan det eskalere til tredje verdenskrig. Det faktum, at folk som Victoria Nuland, der er kendt fra Maidan-kuppet i 2014 – vi må ikke glemme hendes rolle i det – opfordrer ukrainerne til at sige: “Hvis I vil indtage Krim, er det fint nok. Vi står helt og holdent bag det.”

Det er en rød linje for Rusland. Situationen er i bund og grund ekstremt farlig. Den militære situation på stedet er en opkværnelse af den ukrainske befolkning, og lige nu er det meget svært at se, hvem der kan vinde militært. For Rusland har ikke råd til at tabe. Ukraine vil helt sikkert ikke vinde. Rusland kan ikke tabe, fordi de er en atommagt. Så det nylige forslag fra kineserne, som har fremsat et 12-punkts fredsforslag, der omfatter krav som respekt for suverænitet, territorial integritet og mange andre forslag, som alle giver meget god mening. Dette forslag blev værdsat af mange mennesker i det globale syd. Rusland hilser det kinesiske forslag velkommen som et udgangspunkt for diskussionen. Det blev straks afvist af Biden, som sagde, at det er irrationelt. Det er afvist af EU-Kommissionen. Spørgsmålet er, hvorfor der ikke skulle være en indsats fra Vestens side for at begynde at afslutte en krig, hvilket kun kan ske ved det ukrainske folks absolutte offer.

Jeg tænkte på det og skrev en artikel i sidste uge. Jeg tænkte: “Hvorfor er det sådan, at Vesten ikke reagerer på noget fornuftigt forslag?” Paven har fremsat endnu et forslag, som vi støtter og organiserer. Hvorfor gør de ikke det? Jeg genlæste en masse gamle rapporter osv., og jeg stødte igen på noget, som vi havde offentliggjort dengang, men som i det nuværende lys får en ny betydning: Det er, at der siden nogen tid – faktisk kan man gå tilbage til Brzezinski og hans planer for Rusland – men i den seneste tid har der været en hel masse diskussioner bl.a. fra den såkaldte amerikanske Helsinki-Kommission i Kongressen, hvor der blev foreslået en såkaldt “afkolonisering” af Rusland. Det vil sige, at Rusland ikke

skulle fortsætte med at eksistere som én sammenhængende stat, Den Russiske Føderation, men at det skulle opdeles i mange stater, måske 10 stater. Og der var en hel række andre internationale konferencer, i Gdansk i Polen, i Warszawa, i Prag, og så sent som i december var der en konference i Washington arrangeret af Jamestown Foundation og Hudson Institute, som havde samme emne, hvor man grundlæggende sagde, at Rusland skulle opdeles i mange forskellige stater. Og i juni 2022 sagde Lech Walesa, Polens tidligere præsident, også, at Rusland bør skæres ned til kun at være 50 millioner mennesker i stedet for 144 millioner, som det er nu, og at det bør opdeles i forskellige stater.

Det skal man huske på, for hvis man kun ser på den daglige politik, glemmer folk nogle gange disse lange historiske buer. Putin og Lavrov og nogle andre russiske embedsmænd har i mellemtiden altid sagt, at målet er at nedbryde Rusland. Det blev altid skubbet til side som paranoia eller bare propaganda, men hvis man nu tænker over det, har det været på bordet. Det er en af grundene til, at Putin i december 2022 krævede juridisk bindende sikkerhedsgarantier for, at Ukraine ikke ville tilslutte sig NATO, at der ikke ville blive opstillet offensive våbensystemer ved Ruslands grænse. Og han krævede et svar fra USA og NATO. Og der kom ikke rigtig noget svar på de centrale spørgsmål, kun nogle tilbud om våbenforhandlinger, men ikke rigtig noget svar på det.

Nu viser det sig – det er i hvert fald hvad Seymour Hersh sagde – at forberedelserne til sabotagen af Nord Stream-rørledningerne begyndte ni måneder tidligere. Hvis man går fra juni ni måneder tilbage, så er det et sted i 2022, længe før Putin krævede disse sikkerhedsgarantier, og længe før det, der altid betegnes som en “uprovokeret aggression” fra Ruslands side.

Så hele historien er naturligvis meget, meget mere kompliceret. Og man kan være sikker på, at den russiske efterretningstjeneste absolut ville være bekendt med sådanne

diskussioner og konferencer og hvem ved hvad mere, for at nedbryde Rusland. Det er derfor, at Putin flere gange, og Shoigu og Lavrov sagde, under hvilke betingelser Rusland ville bruge atomvåben, nemlig når Ruslands eksistens ville være på spil.

Alt det bliver naturligvis altid stryget ud af fortællingen i medierne, og derfor synes jeg, at det er meget vigtigt, at vi kigger på det hele på en frisk, at vi kigger tilbage på kronologien i det, der faktisk skete. Disse konferencer – konferencen i Jamestown Foundation, konferencen i den amerikanske Helsinki-Kommission – er offentligt tilgængelige, så det er ikke noget, der er et spørgsmål om en mening, men alle kan se og kontrollere det.

Jeg mener, at dette er meget vigtigt, for der er en anden udvikling, som jeg kun kan berøre her, og som vi kan uddybe senere: Og det er, at det, der sker lige nu, faktisk er et tektonisk skift i den strategiske omlægning. Som svar på alt dette ønsker det globale syd – som nu er den globale majoritet, dvs. det store flertal af lande i Afrika, Latinamerika og Asien – at skabe et nyt system. På grund af dollarens bevæbning – USA konfiskerede 300 milliarder dollars fra Rusland, 10 milliarder dollars fra Afghanistan og forskellige beløb fra andre lande – er disse lande nu ved at af-dollarisere sig, de skaber deres egen valuta. Det er størstedelen af den menneskelige art. Tilsyneladende har to dusin lande ansøgt om medlemskab af BRICS+. BRICS havde allerede, før dette skete, et højere BNP end G7, så der er helt klart tale om en fuldstændig omlægning. Der er tale om enorme ændringer. F.eks. er der på de to nylige konferencer, der finder sted i Beijing, sket en fuldstændig ændring i den kinesiske tone. Jeg tror, at de nu åbent siger, at USA forsøger at dæmme op for dem, at forhindre deres fremgang, og at der er en indsats for at udvide NATO til Stillehavet.

Det, jeg forsøger at sige, er under alle omstændigheder, at vi bevæger os i en anden retning, og vi må have en diskussion om,

hvordan vi kommer ud af dette. Jeg har foreslået, siden krigen i Ukraine begyndte i februar, og vi har haft konferencer i Schiller Instituttet siden april, at vi har et presserende behov for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som tager hensyn til interesserne for hvert enkelt land på planeten. Jeg har foreslået ti principper for, hvordan en sådan ny arkitektur kan organiseres. Og jeg mener, at det er yderst presserende, at vi får en international diskussion om, hvorvidt den menneskelige art er i stand til at undgå tredje verdenskrig – som denne gang ville være atomar, og som ingen ville overleve – og om vi kan give os selv en orden, der giver mulighed for overlevelse og velfærd for alle nationer på denne planet. Det er det, jeg gerne vil opfordre Dem til at diskutere i dette program og andre kommende programmer og i en kommende ny Schiller-konference.

Så jeg vil gerne stoppe på dette punkt. Jeg synes, der er noget stof til eftertanke, og jeg er meget interesseret i at høre jeres spørgsmål.

SCHLANGER: Helga, der er mange spørgsmål, og jeg vil komme til dem om et øjeblik. Hvis der er andre, der har spørgsmål, kan I sende dem til questions@schillerinstitute.org. Dette er den ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og det er første gang, vi forsøger os med livestreaming. Så hvis vi ikke kan nå at besvare alle jeres spørgsmål – og jeg kan allerede nu sige jer, at det kommer vi ikke til – men bliv ved med at komme med dem, for vi vil besvare dem.

Helga, i betragtning af det, du lige sagde i indledningen, var der to eller tre spørgsmål om det samme grundlæggende emne, men jeg tager det fra Dr. S., som lige sagde: "Hvordan kan vi få Rusland og Ukraine til at forhandle sammen så hurtigt som muligt?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Tja, i betragtning af, at Ukraine ikke rigtig er sin egen herre, men at det i virkeligheden er USA,

Storbritannien og NATO, som virkelig har styret denne krig siden lang tid – længe før, faktisk, den russiske intervention fandt sted i februar sidste år – mener jeg, at der er behov for pres på NATO og USA, og det er en af grundene til, at vi støtter et tilbud fra pave Frans, som allerede for nogle måneder siden havde tilbudt Vatikanet som et neutralt sted, hvor forhandlinger uden forhåndsbetingelser kan begynde. Jeg ved, at Rusland på nuværende tidspunkt ikke ønsker at gøre det, fordi de siger, hvorfor skulle vi stole på nogen i Vesten, efter at selv Merkel og Hollande, den tidligere franske præsident, og Porosjenko naturligvis har indrømmet, at de aldrig har villet gøre alvor af Minsk-processen, men at de kun har deltaget i den for at vinde tid, for at opruste og opbygge militæret i Ukraine. Så russerne er lige nu ikke tilbøjelige til at stole på nogen i Vesten. Ukrainerne kan ikke rigtig handle, fordi de ikke er deres egen aktør. Så jeg tror, at den eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan få dette løst, er, at vi er nødt til at have et internationalt kor af kræfter, som siger: Dette fører til Tredje Verdenskrig, hvis det ikke stoppes. Derfor er det automatisk et spørgsmål for alle mennesker på planeten. Derfor har vi brug for en verdensbevægelse af verdensborgere – det er faktisk det, som Schiller Instituttet er begyndt at fremme siden oktober sidste år – og vi har brug for stemmer, der siger, at vi kræver, at sådanne forhandlinger finder sted, for at skabe et internationalt miljø.

Hvis nu alle landene i det globale syd grundlæggende ville sige det, og de har allerede givet udtryk for dette synspunkt ved at nægte at fordømme den russiske invasion, fordi de ikke køber historien om, at dette var en "uprovokeret krig"; på det seneste G20-finansministermøde i Indien fordømte flertallet af disse lande ikke Rusland, fordi de ikke er enige i denne fortælling. Den begyndende fredsbevægelse, demonstrationen den 19. februar i Washington, de 50.000 demonstranter i Berlin [den 25. februar], de meget store demonstrationer i Frankrig – i går var der mere end 1. Jeg tror, at hvis alle disse

mennesker, fredsdemonstrationerne i Europa, i USA og andre steder og landene i det globale syd alle ville gå sammen og sige: "Vi kræver, at denne krig stopper, vi kræver forhandlinger, det ukrainske folk er ofre, og vi mener grundlæggende, at kun hvis vi går over til et nyt samarbejdsparadigme, kan dette problem løses", kan vi skabe et miljø, der vil gøre det meget vanskeligt at holde denne krig i gang.

SCHLANGER: Helga, her er et spørgsmål til dig fra JT, som starter med at sige, at han bifalder dit 10-punktsprogram, der er inspireret af Westfalske Traktat. Men, siger han, han mener, at et 11. punkt er nødvendigt, fordi han tror, at folk i Vesten, i ledelsen, er bange for, at de vil blive retsforfulgt, når krigen er slut, og at de vil blive angrebet på grund af deres rolle i at fremme krigen. Han spørger: "Kunne der være et 11. punkt i dit forslag, som ville være et punkt for tilgivelse, absolution eller forsoning?"

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Ja, det er bestemt værd at overveje. Der er naturligvis en Nürnberg-statut, der siger, at hvis man forbereder en angrebskrig, er det en Nürnberg-forbrydelse, så det er en overvejelse. Men hvis man ser på den vestfalske fred, som afsluttede 150 års religionskrig i Europa, fordi alle indså, at der ikke ville være nogen tilbage, hvis krigen fortsatte, kom de frem til principper. Og et af de vigtigste principper, ud over at ethvert fredsforslag skal tage hensyn til den andens interesser, var tanken om, at man for fredens skyld skal tilgive den ene eller den anden sides forbrydelser. Og jeg mener, at det ikke kun gælder for krigsforbrydelser på den ene eller den anden side, men man kunne måske overveje det, De siger. Men jeg vil ikke besvare dette spørgsmål så letfærdigt, for jeg er nødt til at tænke dybt over det. Men der er disse to muligheder, Nürnberg-tribunalet og fremgangsmåden i Westfaliefreden: Og jeg lover Dem, at jeg vil overveje det yderligere og også åbne det for diskussion med andre mennesker.

SCHLANGER: Hvis du lige er kommet til os, så er dette en dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Det er en livestream, så jeg er nødt til at flytte spørgsmålene hurtigt, men hvis du har spørgsmål, så send dem til questions@schillerinstitute.org

Her er et spørgsmål til dig, Helga: "Hvad er holdningen hos det tyske folk til presset for at indføre tunge sanktioner mod Kina og til anti-Kina-politikken?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Tja, det er meget kompliceret, fordi der lige nu er en opdeling f.eks. mellem øst og vest, hvor mange mennesker i Østtyskland på grund af f.eks. G.D.R.s historie absolut ikke køber dæmoniseringen af Rusland. Folk i Vesttyskland er mere påvirket af de vestlige medier.

Med hensyn til Kina er det mere kompliceret, for jeg tror, at indtil der skete et skift i holdningen i sikkerhedsbladene i USA og andre NATO-lande, fra omkring 2017-2018, var folks generelle billede af Kina meget, meget mere positivt. Og den indledende diskussion om den nye silkevej, det, der blev kendt som Bælte- og vejinitiativet, var faktisk meget entusiastisk. Men så, da man havde et permanent bombardement fra massemedierne, der begyndte at fremstille Kina som "autokratisk" og et "diktatur" og alt dette – hvilket absolut ikke er sandt. Det vil naturligvis ikke blive accepteret af mange mennesker, men jeg kan fortælle Dem, at jeg har været i Kina mange gange, startende i 1971, og at udviklingen i Kina er noget, som de fleste mennesker i Vesten kun ville drømme om! De har udført et økonomisk mirakel, løftet 850 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom og derefter tilbudt den kinesiske mirakelmodel i form af Bælte- og vejinitiativet til udviklingslandene, som for første gang begyndte at se chancen for at overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling.

Så den kinesiske model er noget, man bør studere. Og hvis man gør det, vil man opdage, at den økonomiske model, især hvad angår det finansielle system, ligger meget tættere på Alexander Hamiltons amerikanske økonomisystem end, lad os

sige, den nuværende City of London- eller Wall Street-model.

Så jeg tror ikke, at det tyske folk er virkelig forenet. De mennesker, der har kendskab til Kina, som har rejst der, som har gjort forretninger, som er gift med en kinesisk ægtefælle, alle disse mennesker har et yderst positivt billede af Kina. Og jeg kender mange af disse mennesker. Men hvis man kun lytter til mainstream-medierne, og man får det hver dag osv., så er det naturligvis meget sværere.

Så jeg tror slet ikke, at det er besluttet. Men jeg tror, at det tyske folk, der er under – jeg vil sige, at måske halvdelen af folket stadig sover, men der er et voksende oprør af folk, som virkelig indser: “Hey, vent lige lidt, hele denne her ting fungerer ikke. Og den nuværende politik repræsenterer ikke det tyske folks egeninteresse.” Og jeg tror, at det vil blive stærkere og stærkere, især hvis I også hjælper os med at mobilisere folk.

SCHLANGER: Helga, her er et spørgsmål fra M i Dublin, Irland. Han siger: “Som EU-borger, hvorfor er det vigtigste land i vores union”, med henvisning til Det Forenede Kongerige, Storbritannien, “så besat af at opretholde USA’s hegemoni i stedet for samarbejde og multipolaritet?”

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Ja, det er et godt spørgsmål! Jeg tror, at den eneste måde at forklare det på, er, hvis man forstår princippet om oligarki. Fordi op til det 15. århundrede var alle lande, i hvert fald i det vestlige Europa og videre frem, oligarkier, hvilket betyder et system, hvor man har en lille oligarkisk elite, som organiserer alting i overensstemmelse med deres privilegier og for at holde befolkningens masse så underudviklet som muligt, fordi det gør det lettere at regere.

Nu er der sket en ny udvikling: Den moderne nationalstat er opstået. Man havde stater, som var helliget det fælles bedste. Men jeg vil sige, at det britiske imperium f.eks. stadig eksisterer. Jeg tror, det er en stor illusion at tro, at det

britiske imperium er ophørt: Det eksisterer fortsat, i en moderne form. Jeg vil sige, at de finansielle institutioner i City of London, Wall Street, er det, man kan kalde det nuværende britiske imperium, herunder dets kontrol i nogle af Commonwealth-landene. Og jeg tror, at eliten i dette imperium, i USA, vil jeg sige, at det er en blanding af Wall Street og det militær-industrielle kompleks – eller hvad Ray McGovern kalder MICIMATT, det militær-industrielle-kongres-efterretnings-medie-akademia-tænk tank-kompleks – men flertallet af befolkningen, tror jeg, er normale mennesker. Og hvis jeg ikke ville tro på, at de normale mennesker generelt er gode, ville jeg have opgivet håbet for meget længe siden. Så jeg tror, at vi lige nu virkelig er nødt til at få de normale mennesker og dem i de institutioner, der repræsenterer disse menneskers interesser, til at hjælpe os med at mobilisere befolkningen, før det er for sent.

SCHLANGER: Helga, vi er ved at løbe tør for tid, men jeg har et andet spørgsmål til dig fra Jack Gilroy, som har arbejdet sammen med os om "Rage Against the War Machine"-demonstrationen og andre aktiviteter. Og han skriver, at "der er behov for at engagere generation Z i den ikke-voldelige kamp mod det dominerende militaristiske system". Og han foreslår, at vi bruger Jordens Dag i november til at "afsløre dødens købmænd, militæret, investeringsbankfolk osv. som er en trussel mod planeten". Hvad mener du om dette generationsspørgsmål og hans idé?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg ved, at du også arbejder med Pax Christi, og jeg mener, at det er ekstremt vigtigt, at vi, ja – at vi får folk til at forstå, hvad universets love er, hvad der er den egentlige mission, som mennesket har. Og man kan diskutere det i religiøse termer – det er derfor, at jeg i det 10. af mine ti principper sagde, at vi må gå ud fra den antagelse, at mennesket er godt af natur. Det har været det mest kontroversielle punkt. Men hvis man ser på alle de store religioner, kristendommen, jødedommen, islam og nogle af de

andre religioner eller andre filosofier, så er de gode religioner altid gået ud fra den idé, at mennesket grundlæggende er godt, og at alt ondt kommer af manglende udvikling.

Det er et meget vigtigt udgangspunkt, for også hvad angår jorden, er mennesket ikke bare et dyr: Mennesket adskiller sig grundlæggende fra alle andre skabninger, fordi vi har den skabende fornufts gave, som sætter os i stand til igen og igen at opdage universelle principper for skabelsen, for det fysiske univers: Og det er derfor, at vi med den moderne videnskab nu i stigende grad er i stand til at afstemme og bringe vores politiske, økonomiske og sociale liv på jorden i overensstemmelse med skabelsens love. Og jeg tror, at det er en enorm udfordring, men jeg tror, at vi tidligere kun har kunnet diskutere det filosofisk. I den europæiske historie blev det kaldt naturlov: At der findes en højere lov end den, der er givet af mennesket. Men i dag har vi naturvidenskaben, og vi kan undersøge, hvad denne lov er, der er givet i skabelsen. Når vi f.eks. udvikler termionuklear fusion, efterligner vi fusionsprocessen på Solen. Det er en lov i universet: Så vi kan opnå energisikkerhed for hele menneskeheden, når vi først får kommerciel fusionskraft, hvilket ikke ser så langt væk længere i betragtning af de nylige gennembrud, vi har gjort – vi efterligner noget, der finder sted som en naturlig proces på Solen. Og det er blot et eksempel på, hvad jeg mener med at sige, at vi er nødt til at afstemme vores aktivitet på planeten med skabelseslovene eller det fysiske univers.

Jeg kunne give dig mange andre eksempler, hvor opdagelser, det vi gør, f.eks. inden for rumvidenskab eller rumfart, ny viden, som vi får fra James Webb-rumteleskopet, f.eks.: Om den faktiske tilstand i vores fysiske univers, som består af mange, mange trillioner af galakser! Jeg synes altid, at dette er den mest forbløffende idé, men med den moderne videnskab, med Hubble-teleskopet og James Webb-teleskopet kan vi nu

faktisk med videnskabelig stringens se på, hvad vores univers er. Og vi kan drage konklusioner heraf med hensyn til vores eksistens på planeten.

Så der er ingen grund til at være pessimistisk. Jeg tror, at hvis vi kommer ud af denne nuværende fare, som er en eksistentiel fare for hele menneskeheden, men der er også et nyt paradigme i horisonten, hvor vi, hvis vi foretager det skift, at vi får alle nationer til at samarbejde i stedet for at gå efter konfrontation, så er det allerede synligt, at vi er i begyndelsen af en ny civilisationsepoke: Og det er et meget glædeligt perspektiv.

SCHLANGER: Tak for dette svar, Helga. Vi er ved at være løbet tør for tid, og måske vil jeg blot benytte mig af det privilegium at besvare de to sidste spørgsmål. En person spørger: "Kan vi få en international konference for at organisere os omkring disse principper?" Det har vi jo gjort. Hold øje med Schiller Instituttets websted for at se, hvad vores næste arrangement bliver.

Og så er der en, der spørger: "Hvad med et internationalt parti omkring disse principper?"

Meld dig ind i Schiller Instituttet. Hjælp os med at opbygge denne bevægelse, som Helga lige har beskrevet, som er bevægelsen for et nyt paradigme.

Så, Helga, tak fordi du kom til os i dag. Har du nogle afsluttende ord?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Ja. Jeg er glad for, at der er flere spørgsmål, end vi kunne besvare. Jeg vil helt sikkert forsøge at indarbejde dem i mit næste liveprogram i næste uge, og hvis der er meget presserende spørgsmål, kan vi også kommunikere i mellemtiden i skriftlig form. Så vær venlig at holde denne dialog i gang: Jeg mener, at det er meget vigtigt at engagere så mange mennesker som muligt og blive aktive sammen med os.

SCHLANGER: Så fortsæt med at sende spørgsmålene til questions@schillerinstitute.org. Tak, fordi De kom i dag, og vi ses igen i næste uge.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Vi ses igen i næste uge.

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, welcome again to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. Today, we will be introducing a new feature. I'm sorry if we are a little late, but we've been working on some technical matters here. But by doing a livestream, you'll have an opportunity to communicate directly with Mrs. LaRouche with your questions and ideas that can enable you to be an active part of the discussion. So, if you have question, or an idea to share with Helga, you can send it to us at questions@schillerinstitute.org, or you can list them in the chat, where Anastasia is standing by.

So, Helga let's start with you. There have been a lot of important developments. Why don't you begin with your overview of what you see as the most important of these?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I greet all of you, and welcome you, and invite you to ask as many questions as you want to do. Let me just highlight a couple of things which I think are really the decisive changes in the situation.

This morning, naturally, the big story was in the *New York Times*, that all of a sudden the culprits of the Nord Stream pipeline sabotage have been found. Supposedly, a pro-Ukrainian group which rented a yacht and then did it with six people—two divers, two assistant divers, a captain, and a female doctor. And supposedly they did that all by themselves. If you remember, when the actual sabotage occurred, there was a lot of discussion about how that part of the Baltic Sea is the most controlled, most surveilled, that it was completely impossible for the Russians to get there in a secret way without being noticed. Now, that makes this belated story

already very questionable.

But then this morning in Germany, all of a sudden, several journalists outed themselves, from the First Channel TV in Germany, the Southwest Radio (SWR), and *Die Zeit* magazine. Supposedly, they have been investigating for a long time, the research, the investigation of the Attorney General investigating that, and they found that this yacht supposedly went from the seaport of Rostock, that it basically was rented by a firm with its headquarters in Poland, but owned by two Ukrainians.

Now, this is all extremely ominous, because Seymour Hersh revealed his investigation at the beginning of February, and this has caused waves internationally. The story is not being pushed under the rug again, because it just does not make any sense. Seymour Hersh was many times on international media, including Chinese TV. Ray McGovern was on CGTN; and it was picked up around the world. That put an enormous pressure on Biden, because the story always was that Biden was in a press conference—pressure on Scholz, because Scholz was in a press conference with President Biden on Feb. 7, 2022, where Biden made this famous announcement that if the Russians would invade in Ukraine, then they would find ways to end the pipeline. Then, when a reporter asked Scholz, who was standing beside Biden, what does this mean, what are you saying, given the fact that this is a German pipeline built by Russia? Scholz said, with a sheepish smile, “We are doing everything together,” and stressed “together.” So, that has raised the question, did they blow up the pipeline together? Then a few days ago, a bit more than a week ago, Scholz went in a very unusual visit to the United States without an entourage, without press corps. He had a one-hour, closed-door meeting with Biden under “four eyes only,” and basically this was supposedly very secret and nothing was revealed. And then just a few days later, they come back with this story.

Now, I think this is putting the likelihood that this is a CYA

story, that this is damage control, but very poorly. And I think Seymour Hersh in the interview with CGTN actually quite fittingly quoted Edgar Allan Poe's short story, "The Purloined Letter," which is the short story where the police can't find a stolen letter, by searching the apartment, and the letter is actually openly in a frame, hanging on the wall. But since these police can't think outside the box, they don't get it. I think this is a similar thing. Because Hersh said, "How come that this is such a big story, and President Biden is so powerful, why did he not just order his intelligence community to investigate this whole affair and find the culprits?" which supposedly, naturally, are the Russians. It's a very strange affair, and I think it definitely is increasing the pressure to have an international investigation which must include Russia, because otherwise, this will not go away. If it stays like that, I think the cover-up may turn out to be more devastating than the actual crime.

So, I want to leave it at that, and maybe you have some more questions pertaining to that, but I think this is not going away. And I think if it's not clarified, it is tremendously erosive for the future of NATO, because if it turns out that it was the United States in collaboration with Norway, as Hersh says, then, what do you need enemies for, if you have friends like that? What does it mean for Germany? Germany has already egg on its face, at least the government, because people are saying, "What's wrong with the German government that they let themselves be treated this way?" The German economy in the meantime is having incredible difficulties. We are facing a deindustrialization, and the energy prices are a very large part of it. So, that is one thing I wanted to mention.

The other thing which I think is really very important is that the situation with the Ukraine war is getting more dangerous by the day. There are more and more experts who are warning that if no solution is found, this may escalate into World War

III. The fact that people like Victoria Nuland, of fame from the 2014 Maidan coup—we should not forget her role in that—she is egging on the Ukrainians, saying, “If you want to take Crimea, that’s fine. We are totally behind it.”

Now, that is a red line for Russia. The situation basically is extremely dangerous. The military situation on the ground is a grinding up of the Ukrainian population, and as of now, it is very difficult to see who can win militarily. Because Russia cannot afford to lose. Ukraine will definitely not win. Russia cannot lose because they are a nuclear power. So the recent proposal by the Chinese, who made a 12-point peace proposal, including such demands as respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and many other proposals, which all make a lot of sense. This proposal was appreciated by a lot of people in the Global South. The Chinese proposal is welcomed by Russia as a starting point of discussion. It was immediately rejected by Biden, who said it’s irrational. It’s rejected by the EU Commission. The question is, why would there not be an effort on the side of the West to start to end a war, which can only be at the absolute sacrifice of the Ukrainian people?

I was thinking about it, and writing an article last week. I thought, “Why is it that the West is not responding to any reasonable proposal?” The Pope has made another one, which we are backing and organizing for. Why are they not doing that? I was rereading a lot of old reports and so forth, and I came across again what we had published at the time, but which in the present light gains a new importance: That is that since quite some time—actually, one can go back to Brzezinski and his plans for Russia—but in the recent period, there were a whole bunch of discussions among others from the so-called U.S. Helsinki Commission in the Congress, proposing so-called “decolonization” of Russia. Meaning that Russia should not continue to exist as one coherent state, the Russian Federation, but it should be cut into many states, maybe 10 states. And there were a whole bunch of other international

conferences, in Gdansk in Poland, in Warsaw, in Prague, and just as recently as December, there was a conference in Washington organized by the Jamestown Foundation and the Hudson Institute, which had the same subject, basically saying that Russia should be split up into many different states. And in June 2022, Lech Walesa, former President of Poland, also said that Russia should be cut down to only be 50 million people instead of 144 million as it is now, and it should be cut into different states.

Now, one has to keep that in mind, because if you only look at day-to-day politics, people sometimes forget these long arcs of history. Putin and Lavrov, and some other Russian officials in the meantime have always said that the aim is to dismantle Russia. That was always pushed aside as paranoia or just propaganda, but now if you think about it, that has been on the table. That is one of the reasons why Putin in December 2022 demanded legally binding security guarantees that Ukraine would not join NATO, that offensive weapons systems would not be put at the border of Russia. And he demanded an answer from the U.S. and NATO. And there came really no answer to the core questions, only some offers of arms negotiations, but not really answering to that.

Now, it turns out—at least that's what Seymour Hersh said—that the preparations for the Nord Stream pipelines sabotage started nine months earlier. If you go from June nine months back, that puts it somewhere in 2022, long before Putin demanded these security guarantees, and long before, for sure, what is always termed to be an “unprovoked aggression” by Russia.

So the whole story is obviously much, much more complicated. And you can be sure that Russian intelligence would absolutely be aware of such discussions and conferences, and who knows what else, to dismantle Russia. That is why Putin several times, and Shoigu and Lavrov said under what conditions Russia would use nuclear weapons, namely, when the existence of

Russia would be at stake.

All of that is naturally always ironed out of the narrative in the media, and therefore I think it's very important that we take a fresh look at this whole thing, that we look back at the chronology of what actually happened. These conferences—Jamestown Foundation conference, the U.S. Helsinki Commission conference—these are in the public domain, so this is not something which is a matter of opinion, but everybody can look and check it.

I think this is very important, because there is another development, which I only can touch upon here, and we can deepen it later: And that is the fact that what is occurring right now is, indeed, a tectonic shift in the strategic realignment. That basically, in response to all of this, the Global South—which by now is the Global Majority; it's the vast majority of countries in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia—that want to basically create a new system. Because of the weaponization of the dollar—the U.S. confiscated \$300 billion from Russia, \$10 billion from Afghanistan, and various sums from other countries—these countries are now de-dollarizing, they are creating their own currency. It's the majority of the human species. Apparently, two dozen countries have applied for membership in the BRICS+. The BRICS already, before this happened had a higher GDP than the G7, so there is clearly a complete realignment. There are tremendous changes. For example, the recent Two Sessions conferences which are taking place in Beijing, there is a complete change in the Chinese tone. I think that they are now openly saying that the United States is trying to contain them, to prevent their rise, and that there is an effort to expand NATO into the Pacific.

In any case, what I am trying to say is that we are moving in a different alignment, and we have to have a discussion of how we get out of this. I have proposed since the Ukraine war started in February, we had conferences of the Schiller

Institute since April, that we urgently need to have a new international security architecture and development architecture, which takes into account the interests of every single country on the planet. I have proposed Ten Principles for how such a new architecture could be organized. And I think it is extremely urgent that we get an international discussion of, is the human species capable to avoid World War III—which this time would be nuclear and nobody would survive it—and can we give ourselves an order which allows for the survival and well-being of all nations on this planet? That is what I would like to encourage you to discuss in this program and others to come, and in an upcoming new Schiller conference.

So, I want to stop at this point. I think there is some food for thought, and I'm very interested to hear your questions.

SCHLANGER: Helga, there are a lot of questions, and I'll get to them in a second. If there are others who have questions, you can send them questions@schillerinstitute.org. This is the weekly webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and this is the first time we're trying livestreaming. So, if we can't get to all of your questions—and I can tell you now, we're not going to—but keep them coming, because we will answer them.

Helga, given what you just said in the introduction, there were two or three questions on the same basic topic, but I'll take the one from Dr. S— who just said: "How can we bring Russia and Ukraine together to negotiate as quickly as possible?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, given the fact that Ukraine is not really its own master, but it's really the U.S., the British, NATO, which are really running this war since quite some time—long before, actually, the Russian intervention occurred last February, I think it needs pressure on NATO, on the U.S. and that is one of the reasons why we are supporting an offer by Pope Francis, who already had offered some months ago, the

venue of the Vatican as a neutral place, where negotiations without preconditions can start. I know that at this point, Russia doesn't want to do that, because they say, why should we trust anybody in the West, after even Merkel and Hollande, the former President of France, and Poroshenko, naturally, admitted that they never meant for the Minsk process to be serious, but they only engaged in it to gain time, to arm and build up the military in Ukraine. So, the Russians right now are not inclined to trust anybody in the West. The Ukrainians cannot really act, because they're not their own actor. So I think the only way, how we can get this resolved, is we have to have an international chorus of forces, who say: This leads to World War III, if it is not stopped. Therefore it is automatically a question of every person on the planet. That is why we need a world movement of world citizens—that is actually what the Schiller Institute has started to promote since last October—and we need voices to say, we demand that such negotiations take place, to create an international environment.

Now, if all the countries of the Global South would basically say that, and they have expressed that view, already, by refusing to condemn the Russian invasion, because they don't buy the story that this was an "unprovoked war"; at the recent G20 Finance Ministers' meeting in India, the majority of these countries did not condemn Russia, because they don't agree with this narrative. The beginning peace movement, the demonstration on the Feb. 19 in Washington, the 50,000 demonstration in Berlin [on Feb. 25], the very large demonstrations in France—yesterday there were more than 1.5 million out in the streets, mostly against the pension reform, but also a large part of that for peace; there were demonstrations in Italy; I think if all of these people, the peace demonstrations in Europe, in the United States, and elsewhere, *and* the countries of the Global South would all join in, and say, "We demand that this war stop, we demand negotiations, the Ukrainian people are the victims, and we

basically think that only if we move to a new paradigm of cooperation can this problem be solved," we can create an environment which will make it very difficult to keep this war going.

SCHLANGER: Helga, here's a question for you from JT, who starts by saying he applauds your 10-point program inspired by the Treaty of Westphalia. But, he said, he thinks an 11th point is necessary, because he thinks people in the West, in the leadership, are scared that they'll be prosecuted once the war ends, and that they would be under attack because of their role in promoting the war. He asks: "Could there be an 11th point on your proposal, that would be a point of forgiveness, absolution, or atonement?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, that is definitely worth considering. Obviously, there is a Nuremberg Statute that if you prepare a war of aggression, that that represents a Nuremberg crime, so that is one consideration. But then, if you look at the Peace of Westphalia, which ended 150 years of religious war in Europe, because everybody realized that there would be nobody left, if the war would continue, they came up with principles. And one of the major principles, apart from the fact that any peace proposal has to take into account the interests of the other, was the idea that, for the sake of peace, the crimes of the one side or the other have to be forgiven. And I think that not only applies for war crimes on the one side or the other, but one could possibly consider what you are saying. But, I don't want to answer that question so lightly, because I have to give it some deep thoughts. But there are these two options, the Nuremberg Tribunal and the Peace of Westphalia approach: And I promise you, I will give it some more thought, and open it also for discussion among other people.

SCHLANGER: If you just joined us, this is a dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's a livestream, so I've got to move the questions quickly, but if you have questions, send them to questions@schillerinstitute.org

Here's a question for you, Helga: "What is the attitude of the people of Germany toward the push for heavy sanctions against China, and the anti-China policy?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it's very complicated, because there is right now division, for example, between East and West, where many people in East Germany, because of the history of the G.D.R., for example, do absolutely not buy the demonization of Russia. People in West Germany are more influenced by the Western media.

Concerning China, it is more complicated, because I think, until there was a shift in the attitude by the security papers in the United States and other NATO countries, starting about 2017-2018, the general picture of people of China was much, much more positive. And the initial discussion of the New Silk Road, what became known as the Belt and Road Initiative, was actually very enthusiastic. But then, when you had a permanent bombardment by the mass media, starting to portray China as "autocratic," and a "dictatorship," and all of this—which is absolutely not true. That will obviously not be accepted by many people, but I can tell you, I have been in China many times, starting in 1971, and the trajectory of development in China is what most people in the West would only dream about! They have performed an economic miracle, lifting 850 million people out of poverty, and then offering that Chinese miracle model in the Belt and Road Initiative form to developing countries, that started to see for the first time the chance to overcome poverty and underdevelopment.

So, the Chinese model is something one should study. And if you do that, you find that the economic model, especially concerning the financial system, is much closer to the American System of economy of Alexander Hamilton, than, let's say, the present City of London or Wall Street model.

So, I think the people of Germany are not really united. The people who have knowledge of China, who have travelled there,

who have done business, who are married with a Chinese spouse, all of these people have an extremely positive image of China. And I know of many such people. But, naturally, if you only listen to the mainstream media, and you get it every day, and so forth, then it's much harder.

So I think it's not decided, at all. But I think the German people, there is underneath—I would say, maybe half of the people are still sleeping, but there is a growing revolt of people who really realize, “Hey, wait a second, this whole thing does not function. And the present policies do not represent the self-interest of the German people.” And I think that will become stronger and stronger, especially if you also help us to mobilize people.

SCHLANGER: Helga, here's a question from M in Dublin, Ireland. He says: “As an EU citizen, why is the main country in our union,” referring to the United Kingdom, Great Britain, “so obsessed with maintaining U.S. hegemony, rather than cooperation and multipolarity?”

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, that's a good question! I think the only way how to explain it, is if you understand the principle of oligarchy. Because up to the 15th century, all countries, at least in the western—in Europe and beyond—were oligarchies, which means a system where you have a small oligarchical elite, which organizes everything according to their privileges, and to keep the mass of the population as underdeveloped as possible, because that makes it easier to rule.

Now, there have been new developments: The modern nation-state developed. You had states which were devoted to the common good. But I would say, the British Empire, for example, which still exists. I think it's a big illusion to think that the British Empire has stopped: It continues to exist, in a modern form. I would say that the financial institutions of the City of London, of Wall Street, they are what you would call the

present British Empire, including its control in some of the Commonwealth countries. And I think the elite of that empire, in the United States, I would say it's the mixture of Wall Street and the military-industrial complex—or what Ray McGovern calls the MICIMATT, the military-industrial-congressional-intelligence-media-academia-think tank complex—but the majority of the people, I think that they're normal people. And if I would not believe that the normal people are generally good, I would have given up hope a very long time ago. So, I think right now, we have to really get the normal people and those in the institutions who represent the interests of those people, to help us to mobilize the population before it is too late.

SCHLANGER: Helga, we're running short on time, but I have another question for you, from Jack Gilroy, who's been working with us on the "Rage Against the War Machine" demonstration and other activities. And he writes, that "There's a need to engage Generation Z in the nonviolent fight against the dominant system of militarism." And he suggested using Earth Day this coming November, to "expose the merchants of death, the military, investment bankers and so on, who are a threat to the planet." What do you think about this generational question and his idea?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I know that you are also working with Pax Christi and I think that's extremely important that we, indeed—that we get people to understand what are the laws of the universe, what is the actual mission that man has. And you can discuss it in religious terms—that's why, in the 10th of my Ten Principles said that we have to proceed from the assumption that man is good, by nature. That has been the most controversial point. But if you look at all the great religions, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and some of the other religions, or other philosophies, the good ones always proceed from the idea that man is fundamentally good, and that all evil comes from a lack of development.

Now, that is a very important entry point, because also concerning the Earth, man is not just an animal: Man is fundamentally different from all other creatures, because we have the gift of creative reason which enables us to discover, again and again, universal principles, of the Creation, of the physical universe: And that is why, with modern science, we are now in a position more and more, to attune, to bring into accordance our political, economic, and social life on Earth, with the laws of Creation. And I think that that is a tremendous challenge, but I think, in the past, we could only discuss it philosophically. In European history, it was called natural law: That there is a higher law than that given by man. But natural law, today, we have natural science, we can study what is this law given in the Creation. For example, when we develop thermonuclear fusion, we are imitating the fusion process on the Sun. Now, that is a law of the universe: So we can gain energy security for the entire human species, once we get commercial fusion power, which is looking not so far away any more, given the recent breakthroughs we have been making—we are replicating something which is taking place as a natural process on the Sun. And that's just one example, what I mean by saying, we have to attune our activity on the planet, with the laws of Creation or the physical universe.

I could give you many other examples, where discoveries, what we make, for example, in space science, or in space travel, new knowledge we gain from the James Webb Space Telescope, for example: About the actual condition of our physical universe, which consists of many, many trillions of galaxies! Now, I find this always the most mind-boggling idea, but with modern science, with the Hubble Telescope, with the James Webb Telescope, we can now actually look, with scientific rigor, at what is our universe. And we can draw conclusions from that for our existence on the planet.

So there is no reason to be pessimistic. I think if we get out of this present danger, which is an existential danger to all

of humanity, but there's also, on the horizon a new paradigm, where, if we make that shift that we get all nations to cooperate, rather than to go for confrontation, it's already visible that we are in the beginning of a new epoch of civilization: And that is a very joyful perspective.

SCHLANGER: Thank you for that answer, Helga. We're just about out of time, and maybe I'll just take the privilege of answering the final two questions. One person asks, "Can we have an international conference to organize around these principles?" Well, we've been doing that. Watch the Schiller Institute website to see what our next event will be.

And then someone asks: "How about an international party around these principles?"

Join the Schiller Institute. Help us build this movement that Helga just described, that is the movement for a new paradigm.

So, Helga, thanks for joining us, today. Do you have any final words?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes. I'm happy that there are more questions than we could answer. I will for sure try to incorporate them in my next live program next week, and if there are very urgent ones, we can also communicate in the meantime in a written form. So please keep this dialogue going: I think it's very important to engage as many people as possible, and become active with us.

SCHLANGER: So, keep the questions coming in at questions@schillerinstitute.org Thank you for joining us today, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Till next week.