

# Helga Zepp-LaRouche giver interview til pakistansk tv om “Ukraine-krisen og Kinas udenrigspolitik”

28. april 2023 (EIRNS)-Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav et interview til Pakistan TV Worlds “Views on News”-udsendelse den 27. april med titlen “Ukraine-krisen og Kinas udenrigspolitik”. Anker Jawad Tehami talte med fru Zepp-LaRouche og i studiet med admiral Farhat Hussain Khan (pensioneret), formand for Center for Aerospace and Security Studies.

JAWAD TEHAMI: Hello and welcome to Views on News; I’m Jawad Tehami.

Chinese President Xi Jinping says that as a responsible nation, Beijing can’t be a bystander to the Ukraine conflict, and China always stands on the side of peace, and China’s goal position regarding the Ukraine conflict is to promote peace via talks. Now, this is what Chinese President Xi Jinping during a phone call with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy which was an hour-long call. And this particular call has been termed as “meaningful” by Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

Earlier we saw that China released a 12-point peace proposal regarding the resolution of the Ukraine conflict, which was welcomed by both Russia and Ukraine, that urged for an immediate ceasefire and the resumption of the peace talks between the two conflict sites. [[https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt\\_665385/2649\\_665393/202302/t20230224\\_11030713.html](https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt_665385/2649_665393/202302/t20230224_11030713.html)]

However, the West, the U.S. and its NATO allies didn't accept that particular peace proposal, rather questioned the position regarding China being a peace mediator or peace broker in this particular conflict.

Now, specifically, talking about this phone call between Ukrainian President and Chinese President, Russia has welcomed Chinese initiative for a negotiated political settlement. The U.S. has also welcomed this particular phone call, yet, it has said that it is too soon to tell whether it will lead to a peace deal.

On the other hand, we have seen that NATO's chief Jens Stoltenberg has said that the U.S.-led alliance has provided over 98% of the combat vehicles. At the same time, in another major development, we've seen Britain's Armed Forces Minister [James Heappey] told Parliament that the government has already started the shipment of depleted uranium ammunition to Ukraine. When the U.K. decided to provide Ukraine with the depleted uranium ammunition, it was strongly condemned by Russian President Vladimir Putin, who said that Russia would be forced to act accordingly. Russian Defense Minister at the time had said that the British decision left fewer steps before the potential nuclear collision between Russia and the West. After that, Russia also decided to deploy tactical nuclear weapons in the neighboring Belarus.

In today's show we will be talking about how likely is the chance of a success of China's mediation regarding the resolution of the Ukraine conflict, given the fact that recently we have seen a success on the foreign policy front for China, regarding the Iran-Saudi rapprochement and amid the continuity of the supply of weapons from NATO and the Western nations to Ukraine: What are the chances, is there any potential threat of a nuclear war between the West and Russia?

To understand the entire gambit of this particular situation,

we are honored to have been joined in the studio by Air Marshal (ret.) Mr. Farhat Hussain Khan; he's president of the Center for Aerospace & Security Studies. Mr. Farhat, thank you very much for your time for being with us on "Views on News." We really appreciate that. On Skype at the same time, from Wiesbaden, Germany, we are being joined by Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. She is the founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. Mrs. LaRouche, thank you very much for your time, also for being with us on "Views on News" tonight.

Let me begin with the first question towards you, Mrs. LaRouche: How important and significant was this call between the Ukrainian and Chinese President? And also Beijing saying it wants to send an envoy to Kiev, to mediate a political settlement. How do you see that, also?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think this is extremely important and urgent, given the fact that the world really is on the verge of a nuclear catastrophe. I think that if there's any country which has the power and credibility to mediate this conflict, it is China. First of all, I think China proven in the past, absolutely, that it is impartial. It was able, as you just mentioned, to get the governments of Iran and Saudi Arabia to the negotiation table, and now the President of Iran has been welcomed by Saudi Arabia, in a brotherly way—that's a big jump forward. And so I would really say that while the situation is extremely complex in Ukraine and around Ukraine, that there is a glimpse of hope, definitely.

I think that what will come out of it, I personally think that President Zelenskyy is happy that President Xi Jinping has reached out to Ukraine in the way he did, because the Ukrainian people are the worst victims of this proxy war between the West and Russia, and they're being slaughtered. And especially after the recent Pentagon leaks, where it came out that the United States government judged the military

situation as being much worse than they were saying publicly—that, in my view, makes the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian military the victims, the pawn, in a larger chess game. And the sooner that ends, the better. So I think this is extremely important.

If it will succeed? I think everybody has to be extremely watchful, because I think the United States is very factionalized. There are some people whom I would say are realists, like General Milley, who already several months ago demanded that there should be negotiations right now—and that is the military! So, there are some people who I think will be also backing this proposal, but there are also some hawks. For example, this week alone, there is a meeting of the “Free Nations of Post-Russia Forum” from the Hudson Institute and others, in Washington, even on Capitol Hill, who are talking about splitting Russia into 10 or 12 different pieces. And certain other people have talked about that the whole aim is to “weaken Russia,” to “ruin Russia,” and from the British side came not only the depleted uranium weapons, which I think is a total escalation, but also they have been pushing the Ukrainians to retake Crimea, and have what they call a “Cuban missile crisis on steroids.”

So this is a very complex situation, but I think if any country can do something, it is China. ...

TEHAMI: ... Air Marshal, your take on the phone call?

FARHAT HUSSAIN KHAN: Thank you very much. Actually, to stay right at the onset, this telephone call is very significant, even if it has made a small icebreaking. The reason being the Ukraine has taken a lot of toll in many fronts, politically, strategically, in military terms and also in the economic front of the entire world. And if you would allow me to call

it, it is a mini-world war. So any dent into pushing this crisis backward is a success.

So therefore, we encourage it. It has been acknowledged by Russia and well as the United States, that's one. Secondly, whenever such things happen, it is the credibility of the overture that matters. Now, look at China: go back by 20-30 years, in the entire process of world politics and the world order that we've been talking about, China has never been aggressive to any country, one. They have always talked of peace. When the U.S.-led coalition raised the hype of Indo-Pacific strategy to contain China, they also presented a five-point peace formula. So, Mr. Xi has demonstrated his abilities to conduct peace. That's the viability behind the entire force.

The other thing is, it has a relationship with Russia that can make the difference, second.

Therefore, what is the cause of the war? The cause of the war is the Russian concern of security, that Ukraine should not form part of NATO. And there are other things also, but the prime demand here, they should not join NATO, so that we have a buffer between. So the players that are there, Russia and Ukraine, have assembly to look at in the form of President Xi as a peace mediator.

I think while results will come later, this call, which lasted for a long time, about an hour or so, and is welcome by the players. It has greatly impacted the world environment! Look, if there is someone who can make the fact, that is Mr. Xi, and he is moving in that direction. Of course, it's a bloody war and has caused devastation; it'll probably take time. But the movement forward, the presentation of the 12-points, that first point is, OK, at least de-escalate. And then stop the war, and then start to talk. What to talk about is something later, but at least, small, little steps that the environment matters, the environment that the world has perceived today,

after this call, is a message of peace from China, a country that has recently put two warriors at peace, in terms of Saudi Arabia and Iran that have been fighting for the last 35 years! On various fronts, I think China has proved its credentials and it will make a lot of difference in the peace process.

TEHAMI: Mrs. LaRouche, when we talk about Ukraine's perspective, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy at that time, when China released its 12-point peace proposal, the resolution of the Ukraine conflict, he welcomed that. Now, out of this particular call, he termed it as being "meaningful." But we saw, on the other hand, when NATO Secretary General was in Ukraine, Mr. Volodymyr Zelenskyy asked for more weapons to continue with the war. What do we understand out of it? On one side, he wants this particular stride of the efforts that are being made by China, he welcomes those; on the other side, he calls on NATO for supplying more weapons. What do we understand out of this particular thing?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have not looked into the head of Mr. Zelenskyy, but he already was once ready to have peace negotiations, and that was in March 2022. This was in Turkiye, where the chances that it could have come to a negotiated end of this war were there; and then it was [then British Prime Minister] Boris Johnson who personally flew into Kiev and put pressure on the Ukrainian government to not do that. So given the fact that the Ukrainian economy is completely smashed, a lot of the infrastructure is destroyed, the economy is—I don't know how many percent they're still functioning, but it's devastated, and before the war, China was the largest trade partner of Ukraine. And if Ukraine has any hope to go back to a normal life, and to have reconstruction, I think there are some people in the West who are already speculating on investment, and basically integrating Ukraine into the West.

But the West is not so attractive right now, because if you look at the banking crisis, the United States, only six weeks after the first, Silicon Valley Bank went bankrupt, and you have a new banking crisis erupting. The UBS took over the Credit Suisse, but that is not going smoothly. So the West has severe economic problems. And frankly, what is the long term, or the medium-term perspective, would be that the Belt and Road Initiative would be extended as Eurasian perspective, in that case, Ukraine would be in a completely different position, and could become a bridge between Europe and the rest of Asia.

So if people in Ukraine think about it right, it is in their best interests that China should play a mediating role, and therefore, I personally think that President Zelenskyy is being pressured by the hawks in the West to go into the confrontation and have the military victory on the battlefield. Now, I think that many military experts are basically saying that the chances for Ukraine to win "on the battlefield" (in quotes) are practically nonexistent, because...

TEHAMI: Why are they less or nonexistent, for that matter, Mrs. LaRouche? Pardon me for the interruption, but why are they are less, in the chances for Ukrainian victory in battle?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it's the estimate, and this is the view of several military experts from Germany, Italy, Switzerland, France, and the Pentagon papers have said that themselves. Because the Ukrainian population is much smaller than the Russian population. The idea that you can pump this country full of weapons, naturally, you can escalate, and then you reach a trip-wire, and then you are risking a large war, but

nobody wins either. So, I don't think the idea of "winning" this war in Ukraine is—even in the United States several people have dropped that recently among others—Richard Haass, who is the president of Council on Foreign Relations. So the voices who basically say, look, let's stop this, it was a terrible thing, it should never have happened, that number of people are growing.

So, naturally, you could fight this war forever, and have a grinding up of the population, but I think that that is not a realistic perspective. If people push the Ukrainians, for example, to use weapons which hit long into the territory of Russia, then you are in danger of crossing a red line. And Mr. Medvedev has warned, and not only Medvedev, but several Russian officials in the recent weeks, have warned dramatically that we're inching step by step toward the great catastrophe. And also if people are urging the Ukrainians to retake Crimea, that is another red line.

So I think this intervention of President Xi Jinping coming into the picture, is really one second before 12. And I really can only hope that all the reasonable people in the world cooperate to make this work...

TEHAMI: Let me take Mrs. LaRouche's view on this also: Do you think if Ukraine has finally realized that the efforts, or the strides that China is trying to put in for peace and the resolution of the Ukrainian conflict through talks, is it in a position to strike a peace deal without the influence of the West?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, that remains to be seen. I don't think the Ukrainian government is very independent. I think that it has more to do with what the factional lineup is in the West. For example, Mr. Macron has clearly indicated in the recent



period, that he does not want to be totally in the camp of the United States. He said that in respect to Taiwan, where he said Taiwan is an internal Chinese affair and the Europeans should not get drawn by the United States into this conflict. Which many people, even in Germany, agree with him. Naturally, the United States and Great Britain say the opposite, and call the question of loyalty of the West and values of the West and all of this verbiage which is being used. But the reality is, any peace-loving person, anybody who is not a madman or madwoman, should understand that the continuation of the escalation threatens the annihilation of the human species! I have been studying this a lot, and if you listen to people like Steven Starr, who is a nuclear analyst in the United States, or other people who are studying what happens in the case of one nuclear weapon being used, the danger is almost 100% certainty that all nuclear weapons will be used. Because I don't think that a regional nuclear war is possible: It's the logic of nuclear war, that the entire arsenal comes into play. And that means that all life on the planet will be destroyed in a nuclear winter that follows for about 10 years after such a nuclear war. And then there will be absolutely nobody left to even study the causes, because no historian will be alive to look into the matter!

And I think if people would be aware of the fact that, given the fact that the warning time when one side would realize there is a nuclear missile launched, the warning time the leadership on one or the other side is a few minutes, somewhere between 5 and 10 minutes, when the decision has to be made, when the flight time of ICBMs is about maximum 20-30 minutes: And then, it's all over! That means that the warning time is so short, and if you think how many irrational people are around, and how many near-incidents have already happened, where a disaster was only avoided because one pilot was able to make a very good flight maneuver to escape a conflict—I think if people would understand how much the human species is at risk, we all would be in the streets demanding an immediate

end to the war.

Because if people, the life of the human species and the existence of the human species is so precious: We are the most creative species of all the other species, we're the only ones that can discover things, who can make beautiful art, who can make scientific discoveries. And all of that would be lost—and for what?

So, I think the brinkmanship, or the very idea of geopolitics has to be stopped. I really think we have to move out of the idea of—unipolarity is not functioning; that has disappeared already. But also multipolarity is not good enough, because you still have the danger of geopolitical conflict between one bloc and another bloc. And I think we have to urgently move into a new paradigm, where we think about the one humanity first, before we think about national interests. And this is also why I think that President Xi Jinping is uniquely qualified, because he has in the recent period, not only launched the Belt and Road Initiative, but also the Global Security Initiative, the Global Development Initiative, and more recently, the Global Civilizational Initiative, which is one way of putting a dialogue of cultures, or dialogue of civilizations on the table. And I think a combination of all of these approaches is really necessary to defuse this situation.

TEHAMI: Mrs. LaRouche, as you have very comprehensively shed light on the existential threat to humanity, the threat of the use of thermonuclear weapons, now, when we specifically talk about those 12 points, the point No. 8 by China categorically says that “Reducing strategic risks. Nuclear weapons must not be used and nuclear wars must not be fought. The threat or use of nuclear weapons should be opposed...”  
[[https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt\\_665385/2649\\_665393/-202302/t20230224\\_11030713.html](https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt_665385/2649_665393/-202302/t20230224_11030713.html)]

On the other side, we see the U.K. shipping depleted uranium shells to Ukraine, as a result of which, we saw a condemnation by the Russian President. And then, Russia also decided to deploy tactical nuclear weapons to neighboring Belarus.

So on one side, we see the initiatives by China to discourage the use of nuclear weapons, on the other side, we continuously see the escalation on this front. How much bigger a threat of use of nuclear weapons regarding Ukraine conflict at this point in time happens to be?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think Ukraine would just be the trigger point. Because the United States official doctrine—and Biden, I think had promised at one point, he would change that, but then he did not—the U.S. has in their strategic doctrine the possibility of a preemptive use of nuclear weapons. And in the recent period, a few months ago, or maybe less than two months ago, Russia, or actually President Putin has said that because of this existing U.S. doctrine, because of the general strategic situation, it forces Russia to do likewise! That means, Russia has now said because the United States has the preemptive use of nuclear weapons in their doctrine, that Russia is basically abandoning its idea that they're not using first-strike of nuclear weapons.

Now, that is why I was making so much alarm on the question of how close we are. Because if you have the two largest nuclear powers in the world basically not trusting each other—the trust has been completely destroyed, the usual kinds of back-channels do not exist, this is why I really think we are in a situation much more dangerous than even at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis, because if you look at the historical records, even when that crisis was at its high point, you had between Kennedy and Khrushchev, a quite reasonable negotiation in the background. And I don't think that exists right now! And that makes the situation right now much, much more

dangerous, and that is why the Schiller Institute—we have been pushing the idea that we urgently need a new security and development architecture, which takes into account the interests of every single nation on the planet. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/30/ten--principles-of-a-new-international-security-and-development-architecture/>]

Unfortunately the idea of a European security architecture, no longer looks very likely. That existed at the time of the German reunification and the end of the Soviet Union: Gorbachev talked about the “common European house”; Putin talked many times in the beginning about a security structure from Vladivostok to Lisbon. But that in a certain sense, the chemistry does not exist any more, because of so many things which have happened, especially the destruction of trust to which [former German Chancellor] Merkel and [former French President] Hollande contributed by saying the whole Minsk agreement was just a charade to gain time to arm the Ukrainian troops.

So that’s why I think we have to take it a step higher, and that is, the idea of having a security architecture which includes {every} country: Russia, China, United States, and all the other countries. And the only way how one could do that, is by having a development: I wrote Ten Principles for how such a security architecture could look like, and it’s a very comprehensive idea. But it connects to the Peace of Westphalia, which ended 150 years of religious warfare in Europe, by coming to the conclusion that if the fight would continue, there would be nobody left to enjoy the victory, because everybody would be dead. And that’s I think exactly the point that we are at, because if it comes to the use of nuclear weapons, there will be absolutely nobody who will enjoy the victory, because we all will be dead: And I think that has to be the starting point.

We are the creative species: Can we give ourselves an order,

which allows the survival of the human species? Or are we stuck in stupid geopolitical games which risk—I think war in the time of thermonuclear weapons is not an option of conflict resolution any more. And that's why I think the 12-point proposal by Xi Jinping is the best formula to start negotiations with. It doesn't answer all questions, yet, but the whole point is to enter discussion, to enter a process of sorting things out: Finding out what are the vital interests of the one side? What are the absolutely non-negotiable arguments on the other side? And then, to arrive a compromise at a higher level, you know, when you take a policy which benefits everybody, then you can find a peaceful solution. But I think we are really in an absolutely urgent need of that. ...

TEHAMI: Mrs. LaRouche, when we talk about the 12-point peace proposal, now, as you already mentioned in one of your takes that I just collected from your website, in which you talk about the U.S. and NATO allies rejecting this 12-point peace proposal for certain reasons. I would like you to shed a bit of light regarding that one as well.

When we talk about China's position on Ukraine conflict, it has neither condemned Russia's special military operation in Ukraine, nor endorsed it. And that is what exactly irritates the Western nations, particularly the U.S.

So what does basically China have to do now, after it has set a good example, where it can act as a peace mediator, given the fact it has mediated the restoration of diplomatic ties between Iran and Saudi Arabia, at the same time?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think China is a country which I think is based on a 2,500-year tradition of Confucianism. I think that plays for sort of the "genes" of the Chinese philosophy, or the Chinese people, a much deeper role than even

Marxism—that's my view. I don't think that the Chinese would all agree with that, but that's my conclusion. Or, they call it socialism with Chinese characteristics, and these characteristics are Confucian, in my view, in my observation. And that means that they have an idea of a harmonic development, that you have to have harmony in the family, so that there's harmony in the state, and there has to be harmony among the states, so there's harmony in the world.

And that is actually a world outlook which is the reason why, after 10 years of Belt and Road Initiative, there are now 150 countries that are cooperating with China, and they feel that they have a lot of benefits by doing so. There is also a complete renaissance of the Non-Aligned Movement, which I think is a big factor in the world situation: Xi Jinping talks about that we are experiencing changes as they have not been seen in 100 years. I would say maybe even longer: Because the developing countries, the countries of the Global South do not want to continue with a modern form of colonialism, because colonialism formally ended many decades ago, but in reality it continued to exist in the form of IMF conditionalities, of the World Bank policies. But now, the BRICS countries are there, and in the recent period, 19 countries have made requests to join the BRICS—13 of them formally and 6 of them informally. But the BRICS already has, without that, more GDP than the G7. Now, if you add these 19 countries, they will be the largest economic bloc. The growth rates around these countries of China are 5% for this year; if you look at the West, it's basically zero and with a galloping inflation.

So it is very clearly that the momentum is going in the direction of the new paradigm. The BRICS countries have just reinvigorated the New Development Bank. [Former President of Brazil] Mrs. Dilma Rousseff is the new president of the New Development Bank, and Brazilian President Lula has just said that the New Development Bank has the great potential to become the great bank of the Global South. Now, that is a

dynamic which I think that any country, including Ukraine, which sees that and says, "Look, maybe it is more advantageous if we find a way of getting to peace, becoming part of this development, and go towards a harmonic resolution of this conflict." And I keep saying that the West should stop trying to contain China, which it will not be possible peacefully in any case, because how can you contain a country which has 1.4 billion people and which has an economic policy which is extremely successful, for 40 years! China did not experience the kind of cycles which exist—

TEHAMI: Mrs. LaRouche, do you mean to say that the West should take the Chinese proposal for peace seriously, rather than going for containing it—a population of 1.4 billion people?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, exactly!

TEHAMI: Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute, joining us via Skype from Wiesbaden, Germany. Thank you very much for being with us on "Views on News" tonight. We really appreciate that. In the studio we were joined by Air Marshal (ret.) Farhat Hussain Khan, President of the Center for Aerospace and Security Studies, thank you very much for your time being with us, also. It was an enlightening discussion indeed! And with that we come to the end of today's show.