

Politisk orientering med formand Tom Gillesberg den 10. marts 2023: Bakmut står for fald. Ukraine vil tabe. Er Vesten fanget i Thykadid-fælden eller skifter vi kurs?

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/K.mp3>

Lydfil med talen

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 ildevarslenende, 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 CIA-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 opkværnelser 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

rettsforfulgt, 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-LAROUCHE: 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 termonuklear 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-LAROUICHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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-LAROCHE: 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 accord 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

China-Europe ties – exploring new heights

What would the future of China-Europe relations hold? Join CGTN for a forum featuring experts from both China and Europe as they dive into the opportunities and challenges of this crucial bilateral relationship. From existing challenges to opportunities for collaboration, this panel will provide valuable insights into the future of China-Europe relations.

Politisk orientering den 23. februar med formand Tom Gillesberg; Resten af verden afviser Vestens krigshysteri og hykleri og vil ikke fravælge Rusland og Kina

Politisk orientering den 23. februar 2023 med formand Tom Gillesberg

Kontakt os: +45 53 57 00 51; +45 35 43 00 33,
si@schillerinstitut.dk Dansk: www.schillerinstitut.dk

English: www.schillerinstitute.com
www.laroucheorganization.com www.larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com

Et gennembrud i amerikansk tankegang: "Houston, vi har en løsning!"

Den 19. februar 2023 (EIRNS) – Denne uge markerer en vending i verdenssituationen, hvor folk i de "fangne transatlantiske

nationer" bevæger sig for at afvise den tåbelige march mod atomar ødelæggelse. Har menneskeheden brug for krig? Menneskeheden har hverken brug for eller råd til krig. Krige er blevet sværere at vinde, selv om de er blevet lettere at føre. Nu er krigens umenneskelighed i det større perspektiv blevet den daglige oplevelse af umenneskelighed i det mindre perspektiv i form af masseskyderier, mord og selvmord i USA, herunder nedskydningen af en katolsk biskop i Los Angeles i går.

Det våben vi må anvende er ikke krig eller vold, men sandheden, som kan "jage løgnens ondskab ud sindet". Og vi skal bruge det uafloadeligt. I denne uge har Schiller Instituttet iværksat en række "eksperimenter med sandheden", en kombination af symposier, publikationer og gadeorganisering, hvorved først tusinder og siden titusinder inddrages i en folkeoplysende masseuddannelse på det højeste mulige niveau, under de for nogle måske mest usandsynlige omstændigheder.

Et eksempel: I Washington, D.C., ved afslutningen af søndagens "Rage Against the War Machine"-møde, blev en samtale mellem en arrangør fra Schiller Instituttet og en tilsyneladende mangeårig modstander af LaRouche vendt på hovedet via en diskussion om, hvorfor Gottfried Leibniz, og ikke den tidlige Karl Marx, var kilden til den revolution i videnskaben om fysisk økonomi, som var det rette grundlag for at fremme menneskehedens udvikling. "Modstanderen" havde netop skrevet en bog indeholdende en diskussion om Leibniz og hans Theodicy, som organisatoren, uden at vide det, havde bragt på bane over for ham et øjeblik forinden. "Ingen har nogensinde diskuteret Leibniz i denne økonomiske kontekst med mig før". Ved at fastslå denne uerkendte betydning af Leibniz, som også var den vigtigste filosofiske indflydelse på Den amerikanske Frihedskrig, blev de tilsyneladende "forskelle" med LaRouche, der "går næsten fem årtier tilbage", pludselig omsat til en helt ny sammenhæng.

Denne "coincidentia oppositorum" – "sammenfald af modsætninger", som blev løst på et højere plan – var det optimistiske syn og ønske hos de fleste af deltagerne blandt de over 3.500 mennesker, der deltog i søndagens demonstration. Den nationale, alders- og generationsoverskridende og politisk mangfoldige begivenhed var enestående. Ingen havde deltaget i noget lignende før. Det begejstrede og opløftede flere af talerne ved demonstrationen. Selve arrangementets særlige karakter neutraliserede de skrøbelige forsøg på at forstyrre, gav mange af talernes indhold en følelse af ikke blot lettelse og begejstring, men også af "noget bedre", som forsamlingen både bebudede og repræsenterede. Der er et nyt potentielt reservoir af god vilje og solidaritet blandt amerikanerne, hvis vi ønsker det, med resten af verden.

Blandt de festlige bannere, som blev fremvist under hele livestreamingen af demonstrationen, var der et banner med et verdenskort. Det proklamerede: "Peace Through Development-Schiller Institute" med illustrationer af World Land-Bridge, North American Water And Power Alliance Project (NAWAPA), Transaqua Project for Africa osv. Et andet banner proklamerede: "Join the Chorus for Peace-Dona Nobis Pacem" med billeder af pave Frans og Brasiliens præsident Lula. Et tredje viste billeder af lederne af BRICS-landene, herunder Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping, med overskriften: "Helga Zepp-LaRouche siger: For at stoppe 3. verdenskrig må USA tilslutte sig det nye paradigme-Schiller Instituttet." Under livestreamet var det sidste banner særligt fremtrædende i baggrunden bag hver taler, og alle tre bannere blev fremvist under hele forløbet.

"Dona Nobis Pacem", som blev sunget af omkring 30 medlemmer af den 70-personer store Schiller-delegation, gav genlyd, da omkring 700 mennesker marcherede fra Lincoln Memorial til Det Hvide Hus. Dette var overraskende nyttigt til at afværge i hvert fald et delvist organiseret forsøg på at forstyrre. Da andre demonstranter hørte sangen, kommenterede de til de øvrige, herunder medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet: "Det er

præcis, hvad vi skal gøre". Skab et glædeligt postyr, ja, men med et optimistisk indhold og i bel canto-form. Så giver det genlyd og udstråler derfor den optimisme, uden hvilken det ikke er tænkeligt, endsiige muligt at stoppe krigen.

Selve tanken om at de ti principper for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, der bygger på ideer fra Nikolaus af Cusa fra det 15. århundrede, bliver grundlaget for en folkelig massebevægelse for social forandring, er så dristig og så indlysende rigtig, at den kan og vil kunne fungere.

NATO's terrorbombning af Nord Stream imod Tyskland og Rusland; opretholdelsen af dødbringende "Caesar-sanktioner" mod syriske børn og familier, der går så vidt som til at bruge de nylige jordskælv som våben mod dem; den ufølsomme indrømmelse fra flere fejlagtige ledere om, at "vi aldrig har haft til hensigt at forhandle fred med Rusland, selv om vi fortalte både russerne og offentligheden det modsatte"; og den bevidste affolkning af Ukraine ved fortsat britisk/amerikansk støtte til en krig, som de ikke kan vinde, hvilket gør dem til en militær stedfortræder i en total finansiel krig mod Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og den nye globale udviklings-, sundheds- og sikkerhedsarkitektur, der er ved at blive omfavnet i Sydamerika, Afrika og Asien i en genopstået "Bandung-ånd" – alt dette afslører, at de nuværende regeringer i alle de transatlantiske nationer, hver og en, er "blevet kontrolleret på vægten og fundet utilstrækkelige". Det råber på det nye lederskab, der dukkede op som en spirende kim ved søndagens Lincoln Memorial-møde.

I denne uge, startende med gårsdagens Washington-møde; tirsdagens (21. februar) Schiller-symposium: "Syriens sanktioner må ophæves!"; torsdagens (23. februar) "Undersøg Nord Stream afsløringerne": Stop Nuclear World War Three!" og lørdagens kulminerende serie af verdensomspændende demonstrationer, herunder måske op til 200 demonstrationer i de næste dage alene i Tyskland, udgør samlet set et forslag

til en måde at ændre hele den nuværende banale "aktivistiske politik".

Vi kan sige farvel, hvis vi vælger det, til den mediedrevne "mangel på identitets"-politik, til venstre-højre-stilstand, til FBI's orkestrerede "vold er din ven"-ungdomsstunts. Den tidligere præsidentkandidat Tulsi Gabbards skarpe karakteristik af realiteten af atomkrig og Helga Zepp-LaRouches overraskende præsentation på skærmen i slutningen af atomvåbeneksperten Steve Starrs skarpe videopræsentation viste både situationens alvor samt de omhyggelige foranstaltninger for at komme væk fra ragnarok. "Der kan være noget, der er for sent", formanede Martin Luther King Amerika. Måske vil tiden i denne uge begynde at ændre sig, når vi nu skynder os at bevæge det moralske univers i retning af retfærdighed.

Webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche: With NATO In Disarray, Use Hersh Revelations to Build Movement for Durable Peace

The revelation from acclaimed journalist Seymour Hersh that the U.S. was behind the explosions which hit the North Stream pipelines raises a series of issues which open the potential to end the war. As NATO defense ministers meet, there are signs of deep problems within the alliance, including the lack of an industrial base needed for the long war to weaken Russia that many had intended. Hersh's reporting not only makes

Germany a “global laughing stock” over its silence and inability to defend its security and economic interests, but makes clear this was an “act of war,” exhibiting the recklessness” of the Global NATO policy.

This is fueling a mobilization of anti-war forces, with a potential to break through the “left-right” profiles that keep opponents of the war divided. Zepp-LaRouche urged viewers to join the marches and demos in all countries. She announced that the Schiller Institute will sponsor Zoom meetings in the next two weeks, one on the broader implications of the Hersh story, the other on the urgency of breaking the sanctions policy increasing the death and suffering in Syria.

In conclusion, she reviewed her thinking behind her drafting of the Ten Fundamental Principles to create a durable peace. These are not a laundry list of policy points, but the basis of the kind of deliberative process which engages people in the manner of philosophical thinking which can produce the transformation in the population necessary for such a durable peace. She called on viewers to send her their thoughts on these principles, as part of that dialogue.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 8.
februar 2023:
NATO's bluf og løggen om
Ukraine krakelerer.**

Lad os undgå verdenskrig og i stedet samarbejde.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Stemme-052.mp3>

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

**POLITISK ORIENTERING med formand Tom Gillesberg den 27. januar 2023:
Er alle hjernevaskede?
Stil kritiske spørgsmål om**

Ukraine og vanviddet med at sende flere våben.

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Stemme-051-4.mp3>

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

At erkende fejl som nøglen til genoprettelse

Den 22. jan. 2023 (EIRNS) – Har det amerikansk-britiske NATO-system fejlet? Mon dets kontrollører ville opdage det?

Det engang så stolte USA, der blev dannet i en revolution mod det, som på daværende tidspunkt var verdens ondeste imperium, ser sin økonomiske magt smuldre, sin valuta miste den fremtrædende plads, den forventede levealder falde, og dets bestræbelser på at samarbejde med Storbritannien og NATO for at knuse Rusland og inddæmme Kina vakle. Den finansielle slimskimmel, der er mest udbredt i City of London og Wall

Street, nægter at slippe sit snyltende greb om den fysiske økonomi og kræver uophørlig pengetrykning og eksploderende gælds niveauer for at tilfredsstille sine krav.

Alliancen mellem USA og Storbritannien er nu som en galning, der truer Rusland: "Jeg er skør nok til at indlede direkte krigsførelse mod jeres territorium, og jeg tror I vil bøje jer. I kommer ikke "rigtig" til at bruge atomvåben!"

Har galningen ret? Bluffer Rusland?

Hvad vigtigere er: Skal hele verden holdes som gidsel i en strid om, hvem der administrerer den lille del af kloden, som det drejer sig om her? Hvem skal bestemme udfaldet? Er befolkningerne i NATO-landene parate til at tage udfordringen op?

Nogle giver udtryk for et dybfølt engagement i at overvinde sexisme, hvidt overherredømme, transfobi osv., men hvor er opstanden mod en atomkrig, der vil kunne udrydde alt menneskeliv på planeten og det meste andet liv i øvrigt?

I nogle områder er sugerør og plastikposer og gaskomfurer ulovlige, mens marihuana er OK. Man må måske ikke have lov til at bruge sine penge på mentolcigaretter, men 45 milliarder dollars sendes uden videre til Ukraine.

Der kan ikke gøres noget for at afhjælpe de katastrofale transportproblemer, og forskningen i kernefusion er sørgeligt underfinansieret, men vi har alle pengene i verden (eller som vi kan trykke) til at modarbejde Kina, som er den førende motor for økonomisk vækst på verdensplan, samtidig med at vi er på vej mod en atomudveksling med Rusland.

Der er masser af simple sammenligninger fra Anden Verdenskrig – skal vi igen høre om "eftergivenhed" og "München" – men den mest dramatiske parallel, nemlig at tyske kampvogne bevæger sig ind på russisk territorium (som i et vanvittigt forsøg på at indtage Krim), er tilsyneladende blevet forbigået af

kommentatorerne.

I visse situationer må man fastholde sine principper og droppe alle praktiske hensyn! Men spørgsmålet om, hvem der skal varetage forvaltningen af Krim-halvøen, er ikke et sådant tilfælde.

Dette vanvid – hvis det forbliver upåagtet, uanfægtet og uændret – vil betyde den frygtelige død for alle mennesker på jorden samt at intet nyt menneske nogensinde vil blive født igen.

Men sådan er vores fælles fremtid, såfremt magthaverne – som nægter at overveje en verden, som de ikke regerer, som nægter at acceptere, at verdensøkonomiens tyngdepunkt er flyttet til Asien og det Globale Syd, som lukker af for den sandhed, der indhyller dem, at deres system, deres herredømme er ophørt – hvis disse mennesker ikke bliver stoppet. Det vil udelukkende være muligt gennem en massiv og lidenskabelig indsats for en verden, der er engageret i fred gennem udvikling, i erkendelse af at alle mennesker er skabt lige og er udstyret med de kreative åndsevner, der adskiller vores art fra alt andet kendt liv, i vores evne til at ændre vores forhold til naturen, til hinanden og til fremtiden.

Se LaRouche-Organisationens interview med Steven Starr om dybden af det ragnarok, vi står over for, og det kommende interview med Paul Gallagher om den epokegørende transformation af økonomien, som vil udspringe af fusionskraft.

(<https://laroucheorganization.com/article/2023/01/21/interview-nuclear-expert-steven-starr-could-we-win-nuclear-war>)

Den 4. februar bør du sørge for sammen med dine venner at deltage i Schiller Instituttets konference "The Age of Reason or the Annihilation of Humanity?" (Fornuftens tidsalder eller menneskehedens udslettelse).

(https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_202302

“At fremme samarbejdet i en splittet verden”

Den 18. januar 2023 (EIRNS) – Det er overskriften, som CGTN har placeret på en 14 minutter lang video-kommentar af Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der blev lagt ud den 18. januar både på news.cgtn.com og på CGTN's YouTube-kanal, som har næsten 3 millioner abonnenter verden over.

I sine bemærkninger udtalte Zepp-LaRouche følgende:

“Selv om det er meget vanskeligt at forudsige det nøjagtige tidspunkt, hvor den systemiske krise i det neoliberale system vil nå til vejs ende, kan det ikke udelukkes, at beslutningen om at foretage en fuldstændig reorganisering af det internationale finanssystem kunne trænge sig på dagsordenen i dette år 2023.” Hun fortsatte: “Jeg tror derfor, at det er meget muligt, at finanskrisen i løbet af 2023 kommer til at blusse endnu mere dramatisk op, og at det vil være det rette tidspunkt til at sætte kombinationen af det Globale Sikkerhedsinitiativ og det Globale Udviklingsinitiativ [foreslået af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping] på den internationale dagsorden.”

Ugens begivenheder bidrager til at fremhæve, hvor presserende det øjeblik er, som Zepp-LaRouche beskriver. World Economic Forum har været samlet hele ugen i Davos i Schweiz for at udstede bankernes marchordre om udplyndring og krig til Vestens finansielle og politiske etablissement. Et af deres centrale budskaber er behovet for at forsyne Ukraine med

samtlige tunge våben og anden støtte, der er nødvendig for at sikre en evig NATO-ledet kødhakker-krig mod Rusland – uanset omkostningerne for Ukraine og hele Europa og uanset den voldsomt stigende fare for at udløse en atomkrig.

Ukraines præsident Zelenskij talte til mødet via video, og hans kone samt amerikanske kongresmedlemmer og repræsentanter for Biden-administrationen var personligt til stede for at slå et slag for alle de våben, man kunne skaffe. Tillige sendte den 99-årige Henry Kissinger en video med en opfordring om at sende flere våben til Ukraine, og at Ukraine på sigt formelt bliver optaget i NATO.

Fredag den 20. januar, den dag WEF afsluttes, har det nyligt udvidede Global NATO til hensigt at fastsætte de fornødne betingelser for den næste fase af deres aggression mod Rusland og Kina på det tredje møde i Ukraines forsvars kontaktgruppe på luftbasen Ramstein i Tyskland. Her vil forsvarsledere fra næsten 50 lande samles for at modtage deres retningslinjer fra London og Washington. Et kritisk spørgsmål er, om den tyske regering endelig vil give helt efter for Londons og Washingtons krav om at sende sofistikerede tunge våben til Ukraine. Kievs borgmester, Vitali Klitschko – en sværvægtsbokser af profession – er håbefuld. Han sagde til AFP, at “jeg håber, at det [Ramstein-mødet] vil blive meget godt for Ukraine. Uofficielt oplever jeg meget gode og positive signaler.”

Rusland forbereder sig militært og arbejder samtidig på at organisere alternativer til det kollapsende vestlige finanssystem. Forsvarsminister Shoigu bekendtgjorde i går planer om at øge størrelsen af Ruslands stående hær fra 1,15 millioner til 1,5 millioner. Udenrigsminister Sergey Lavrov meddelte på en pressekonference i dag, at Rusland er ved at opbygge økonomiske alliancer med “lande [der] er ved at blive udviklet økonomisk... Se på Kina og Indien (vores strategiske partnere), Tyrkiet, Brasilien, Argentina, Egypten, mange lande på det afrikanske kontinent. Der er potentialet for udvikling

... enormt. Nye centre for økonomisk vækst er ved at blive dannet.” Lavrov tilføjede: “Inden for rammerne af vores kontakter gennem SCO, BRICS, CIS, EAEU, i samarbejde med sammenslutningerne i Asien, Afrika og Latinamerika, forsøger vi på alle mulige måder at opbygge nye former for gensidig forståelse...”.

Zepp-LaRouches CGTN-kommentar, som i sin helhed er tilgængelig i Dokumentationen, indeholdt en detaljeret programmatisk køreplan for, hvordan man kan opbygge sådanne “nye former for samspil”, en ny international udviklings- og sikkerhedsarkitektur. Schiller Instituttets grundlægger konkluderede ved at understrege behovet for et afgørende paradigmeskift:

“Der er behov for en stor vision om, hvordan der kan fremlægges en løsning, som imødegår samtlige store problemer samtidigt... Jeg mener, at vi er nået til et punkt i menneskehedens historie, hvor vi virkelig må tage den internationale orden af relationer mellem nationerne alvorligt, og overveje hvordan vi kan organisere dem på en sådan måde, at vi kan leve som en selvstyrende art, der er begavet med kreativ fornuft.”

Link til
video: <https://news.cgtn.com/news/2023-01-18/WEF-2023-Fostering-cooperation-in-a-fragmented-world-1gHl9T2Q2Q0/index.html>

Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga

Zepp-LaRouche

EU og Japan tilslutter sig NATO; atomkrig er lige rykket meget tættere på dit dørtrin

Den 11. januar 2023 (EIRNS) – “Hvem har givet EU og NATO tilladelse til at danne en alliance for at etablere et globalt NATO-diktatur?” forespurgte Helga Zepp-LaRouche i sin ugentlige webcast i dag. “Vælgerne i de pågældende lande er ikke blevet spurgt om det; der har ikke været nogen offentlig debat; jeg tror ikke, at nogen parlamenter er blevet adspurgt,” hævdede hun skarpt. Og alligevel har denne beslutning forværret en allerede glohed strategisk situation, der når som helst kan udvikle sig til en atomar konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina.

Zepp-LaRouche henviste til den “fælles erklæring om EU-NATO-samarbejde”, der blev udsendt den 10. januar, hvori der blev bekendtgjort et “strategisk partnerskab mellem NATO og EU”, der er centreret om en tæt koordinering af deres provokatoriske kampagner mod “russisk aggression” og “Kinas voksende selvhævdelse”. Alle 27 EU-medlemsstater blev instrueret om, at de, om de vil det eller ej, uanset om de også er medlemmer af NATO eller ej, skal sikre “den størst mulige inddragelse ... med [NATO] Alliancen i organisationens initiativer”.

I dag indledte USA og Japan desuden deres 2+2-møder i Washington mellem deres forsvars- og udenrigsministre, som vil blive fulgt op af et møde mellem premierminister Fumio Kishida og præsident Joe Biden i Det Hvide Hus den 13. januar. På dette møde vil de to lande ifølge Washington Post bekendtgøre “en uddybning af de to landes strategiske alliance”, herunder at forsyne en 18.000 mand stor styrke fra det amerikanske

marinekorps i Okinawa "med avancerede kapaciteter, såsom missiler, der kan affyres mod kinesiske skibe i tilfælde af en Taiwan-konflikt". En unavngiven højtstående embedsmand i administrationen efterlod ingen tvivl om rækkevidden af den radikale optrapning: "Dette handler om, at Japan i realiteten skal tilpasse sig til USA, i mange henseender som en NATO-allieret." En anden bifaldt: "Dette er et af de mest betydningsfulde fremskridt i USA's styrkeposition i regionen i mindst et årti."

Washington Post-artiklen er også meget klar og tydelig omkring, hvordan dette kan føre til en direkte militær konfrontation mellem USA og Kina: "Japan og Kina har også været involveret i en langvarig territorial strid om Senkaku-øerne i det Østkinesiske Hav nordøst for Taiwan, hvor en optrapning kunne trække USA – som har lovet at forsvare Japan i henhold til en sikkerhedsaftale – ind i en konflikt med Kina."

Modellen for Global NATO's planlagte krigsførelse mod Kina er Ukraine – som generalløjtnant James Bierman, øverstbefalende general for den tredje flådes ekspeditionsstyrke (III MEF) og for Marine Forces Japan, ærligt indrømmede i et interview med Financial Times den 8. januar. I begyndelsen af 2014 "gik vi seriøst i gang med at forberede os på en fremtidig konflikt: uddannelse af ukrainerne, klargøring af forsyninger, identifikation af steder, hvorfra vi kunne yde støtte og opretholde operationer", sagde han. "Vi kalder dette arrangement for "skuepladsen". Og vi er i gang med at etablere "skuepladser" i Japan, på Filippinerne og andre steder."

Bierman gjorde det også krystalklart, hvem der ville sætte det første slag ind: "Når vi står over for den kinesiske modstander, hvem er det så, der har startpistolen og har mulighed for potentielt at indlede fjendtligheder...."

For at opsummere: USA har opildnet til en strategisk konfrontation mod Rusland i Ukraine med et beløb på langt over

100 milliarder dollars (og stigende) i militærudgifter, der er havnet i de dybe lommer hos virksomheder i det militærindustrielle kompleks som Raytheon og Lockheed Martin – mens amerikanerne bliver flået af inflationen, fattigdommen er stigende, og grundlæggende infrastruktur kollapser overalt. Og USA og NATO er nu ved at lancere yderligere en asiatisk front i en angrebskrig, der skal krydse Kinas røde linje omkring Taiwan-spørgsmålet!

“Vi må kræve, at krigen stoppes, fordi den risikerer at komme ud af kontrol” og udvikle sig til en fuldstændig atomkrig, advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, i sin webcast. “Hvis det kommer til atomkrig, hvis der blot bruges ét våben, er det civilisationens tilintetgørelse. De fleste mennesker i dag, især den yngre generation, har ingen anelse om, hvad en atomkrig ville indebære. Hele den menneskelige race ville blive udslettet. Ingen ville være i live til overhovedet at undersøge, hvorfor det skete!”

Zepp-LaRouche understregede, at de omfattende konsekvenser af en sådan atomkrig må erkendes af folk som udgangspunkt for enhver seriøs diskussion om strategi. “Jeg mener, at man er nødt til at starte med det, for atomkrig skal undgås for enhver pris.... Medmindre man gør netop dette krystalklart, befinder man sig ikke i den virkelige verden”. Hun opfordrede indtrængende til, at millioner, hvis ikke milliarder, af mennesker verden over burde se den detaljerede dokumentation af atomkrigens beskaffenhed, som den amerikanske atomkrigsspecialist Steven Starr har udgivet. (<https://youtu.be/X0zlyfhz7hk>)

“Vi bør absolut mobilisere os internationalt”, fortsatte hun, “for at tage imod opfordringen fra pave Frans, der har tilbudt Vatikanet som mødested for forhandlinger mellem Ukraine og Rusland, uden nogen forhåndsbetingelser. Vi er nødt til at have et internationalt pres indefra især USA og Europa” for at standse den vanvittige kamp mod atomkrig. “Og så må vi meget

hurtigt gå over til en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som tager hensyn til samtlige lande på klodens interesser.”

“Enten formår vi at foretage dette spring, dette skift,” konkluderede hun, “eller også er menneskehedens skæbne tvivlsom.”

Zepp-LaRouche redegjorde for karakteren af dette nødvendige skift i den afsluttende del af sine bemærkninger til Schiller Instituttets forum den 10. januar, “What About International Law, Mrs. Merkel?”: (<https://youtu.be/Go0sZ0B0i2Q>)

“Hvis vi skal finde en udvej på dette sene tidspunkt, sekunder før midnat, så må der skabes en bred, overvældende opmærksomhed verden over med krav om, at der findes en diplomatisk løsning. Pave Frans’ tilbud om Vatikanets lokaler til ubetingede forhandlinger er den bedste mulighed; andre mæglingsforslag, såsom dem fra præsident Lula og andre stater i det Globale Syd samt præsident Erdoğan’s bestræbelser, må samles omkring Vatikanets initiativ. Jeg vil derfor bede jer alle om at underskrive vores åbne brev fra de latinamerikanske parlamentarikers initiativ til paven... [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2023/01/05/open-letter-to-pope-francis-from-political-and-social-leaders-support-call-for-immediate-peace-negotiations/>]

“Vi har brug for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som omfatter alle staters interesser, herunder Ukraine, Rusland, Kina og alle andre nationer. Med henblik herpå har jeg fremlagt ti principper til rådighed for drøftelserne, som jeg beder jer alle om at læse og diskutere. Grundtanken i dem er, at vi som mennesker udgør den kreative art i universet og derfor er i stand til at finde det højere niveau af fornuft, hvor ethvert problem kan løses.”

Zepp-LaRouche insisterer på risikoen for omfattende finanskriser i 2023 i debat på CGTN

Den 8. januar 2023 (EIRNS) – CGTN's "Road to Recovery" sendte i dag et program om at åbne Kinas økonomi og dets internationale handel, især dets forbindelse med Europa, efterhånden som Kina bevæger sig ud af deres "Nul Covid"-program. Det første af to spørgsmål, der blev stillet til "grundlæggeren og præsidenten for Schiller Institutet", Helga Zepp-LaRouche, vedrørte emnet om Kinas forsyningskæde, og hun benyttede lejligheden til at fokusere diskussionen på den klare og aktuelle fare for et omfattende finansielt sammenbrud i 2023.

Zepp-LaRouche forklarede (kl. 21:53), at de tidligere deltagers kommentarer generelt havde været optimistiske med hensyn til indeværende år, men hun vurderede, at tænkende mennesker skulle være mere agtpågivende. Europa og USA har problemer med deres centralbanker, og det problem, der kommer til udtryk i omvæltningerne fra krypto-valutaerne, udgør blot begyndelsen. Centralbankerne er fastlåst i en skruestik: højere renter øger konkurserne, men flere kvantitative lempelser giver mere inflation. En stor finanskriser, meget større end 2008, vil indtræffe – selv om det er vanskeligt at forudsige det nøjagtige tidspunkt. Lande, der prioriterer den fysiske økonomi, vil være i en bedre forfatning og meget bedre beskyttet mod finansielt kaos. Der er imidlertid ingen tegn i "Vesten" på, at de vil afvikle deres kasinoøkonomi.

Det andet spørgsmål, som Zepp-LaRouche svarede på, drejede sig om regeringens rolle i en krisetid (38:18). I krisetider er regeringens foranstaltninger naturligvis af afgørende betydning. Så Kina har en fordel i en sådan situation. Men som sagt vil de lande, der nu forbereder sig på et finansielt sammenbrud, være bedre rustet. På nuværende tidspunkt vil vi have i en depression i Europa. Vi har en enorm energikrise. Hvis den tyske økonomi får alvorlige problemer, vil hele Europa blive berørt. Det er bedre at forberede sig på en krise end at have et optimistisk synspunkt og derefter blive overrasket. Den Eurasiske økonomiske Union (EAEU) og nogle andre lande i det Globale Syd bevæger sig i en mere realistisk retning. Jo hurtigere Europa følger denne tilgang, jo bedre vil det gå for dem.

Især professor John Gong tilsluttede sig Zepp-LaRouches fremhævelse af, at en større krise er sandsynlig i Europa, idet han påpegede, at det europæiske marked er i store vanskeligheder. "Jeg er helt enig med Helga om dette punkt." Han tilsluttede sig også sent i udsendelsen Zepp-LaRouches opfattelse af, at det er meget bedre at forberede sig på en alvorlig krise end at blive overrasket af en krise.

Link til udsendelsen:

(<https://news.cgtn.com/news/2023-01-07/Watch-China-s-optimized-COVID-19-measures-and-2023-growth-prospects-1goIay1ReSc/index.html>)

Schiller

Instituttets

**ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche:**

**Konsekvenserne af Minsk-
løgnene: Udhuling af
folkeretten og tab af tillid**

**Nyhedsorientering med Tom
Gillesberg:**

**Alt Vesten har sagt om
Ukraine er manipulation og
løgn**

**Ny multipolær verdensorden
overtager verden**

Helga

Zepp-LaRouches

nytårshilsen

Kan ethvert barn blive et musikalsk geni? Sagen om den unge komponist Alma Deutscher.

Her er et foredrag, som jeg holdt for "Forældre for klassisk kultur" om den undervisningsmetode i klassisk musikkomposition, som den unge komponist Alma Deutscher lærte for at udvikle sin musikalske kreativitet.

Det var den metode, der blev brugt til at undervise forældreløse drenge i Italien fra slutningen af 1600-tallet til slutningen af 1800-tallet, kaldet partimenti, og som nu er ved at blive genoplivet.

God fornøjelse!

Og her er en baggrundsartikel, som jeg har skrevet:

Den dybereliggende proces bag Alma Deutschers musikalske geni

Helga Zepp-LaRouche omtalt på CGTN

Det strategiske landskab for BVI: Fortid, nutid og fremtid

Helga Zepp-LaRouche omtalt på CGTN

Det strategiske landskab for BVI: Fortid, nutid og fremtid

“Så, landene i Vesten bliver nødt til at træffe et valg i den kommende tid: Enten vil de holde fast i deres ideologisk motiverede politik og blive mere og mere marginaliserede, eller også vil de ihukomme deres bedste traditioner og beslutte sig for at samarbejde med den nye økonomiske orden, som er ved at opstå.”

Fru LaRouche var med i et CGTN-indslag i denne uge, hvor hun skarpt beskrev den virkelighed, som den vestlige verden står over for.

CGTN TV:

“Når man ser tilbage på de seneste ni år, har Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet (BVI) frembragt en lang række resultater, såsom højhastighedsbanen Jakarta-Bandung, Phnom Penh-Sihanoukville-ekspressbanen, Kina-Laos-jernbanen, Velana Internationale Lufthavn osv.

Hvad er de vigtigste faktorer for en vellykket gennemførelse af BVI-projekterne? I 2023 markerer Kina 10-årsdagen for BVI i Kina. Hvilken udviklingsretning bør man koncentrere sig om i de kommende år? Og hvilket område vil være toneangivende i fremtiden? Hør Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og præsident for Schiller Instituttet, for at få mere indsigt.”

Link til video her:

<https://news.cgtn.com/news/2022-12-03/A-strategic-landscape-of-BRI-Past-present-and-future-1fsxJB1SHsc/index.html>

Engelsk transskription:

Dec. 3, 2022 (EIRNS)—CGTN TV broadcast a 15-minute special video featuring Schiller Institute founder and leader Helga Zepp-LaRouche, on Dec. 3, under the headline, “Strategic Landscape of the Belt & Road Initiative—Past, Present and Future.” Her presentation was illustrated with beautifully composed photography. Below is a transcript, giving the questions and her answers. (<https://news.cgtn.com/news/2022-12-03/A-strategic-landscape-of-BRI-Past-present-and-future-1fsxJB1SHsc/index.html>)

Looking back at the past 9 years, BRI has made a lot of achievements, such as the Jakarta-Bandung High-Speed Railway, Phnom Penh-Sihanoukville Expressway, China-Laos Railway, Velana International Airport, etc. What are the key factors to implementing all these BRI projects successfully? Do you think these cases can be replicated on other projects? Do these cases prove that BRI is of interest for both parties?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: In all of these cases, and one could add the CPEC [China-Pakistan Economic Corridor] or projects in Africa, these transport projects provided, often for the first time, the beginning of the construction of modern infrastructure in countries of the developing sector. They always bring an improvement in the speed and access for the movement of goods and people, save an enormous amount of time, always create the framework for investments in industry and agriculture, sometimes are enlarged with investments in energy production and distribution and communication, and often are the beginning of entire development corridors, opening up landlocked areas for development.

As one could see with the joy and pride with which President Widodo announced the opening of the Jakarta-Bandung High-Speed

Railway at the occasion of the G20 summit in Bali, these projects contain within them the hope for a better future of the respective country. The tragic earthquake occurring within days after the G20 summit in Indonesia on the island Java, killing so far 162 people, just underlines the need to finally install a global earthquake early warning system, since the effect of such natural disasters can only be minimized through better infrastructure systems.

If one looks in the history of the development of the so-called advanced countries, let it be the United States, Germany, Japan, or Russia, the building of a grid of national infrastructure was always the beginning of industrialization. The criticism by the West of the BRI, that it would be an effort by "China to take over the world," create debt traps, create dependencies, etc. are thinly veiled cover stories. The former colonial powers had a long time to build railways, roads and industrial parks in their former colonies, but obviously they didn't. So the BRI has spread so quickly by finding the cooperation with 140 countries, because these nations often see the participation in the BRI as the first real chance to overcome poverty and underdevelopment and create a hopeful future for their citizens.

It is the natural course of the advancement of mankind, that eventually all nations will enjoy the infrastructural, industrial and agricultural conditions for a decent living standard of their populations. In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, which destroyed approximately 500 million jobs and the ongoing threat of a world famine, the world needs the creation of around 1.5 billion new productive jobs. Many of these can be facilitated by developing continentally integrated grids of railways, highways, waterways in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, as well as creating the energy requirements for an improved living standard of the people in the Global South. The fact, that circa 2 billion people don't have access to clean water, points to the need to create new

fresh water sources, through water management, as well as the investments in desalination projects with the help of small nuclear reactors, ionization of the atmosphere, or accessing aquifers.

One of the most exciting projects of the BRI is the ongoing engagement of Chinese companies building a massive science city in Iraq, under the landmark oil-for-projects agreement signed with Baghdad in 2019. There are other such science-city projects underway with different countries of the Global South, which will allow them to educate a great number of students in advanced sciences, and in this way make it possible for the country to leapfrog from underdevelopment, to a modern, science-oriented economy.

Until August 2022, nearly 60,000 China railway expresses have been launched, and more than 250 companies joined the "Silk Road Maritime Association," 12 trillion yuan invested in BRI countries, besides, BRI created over 340,000 jobs. What are the impacts of these developments for the global economic landscape?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: While the world economy overall has been sluggish, investments in infrastructure in Europe and the U.S. are dangerously lagging behind and geopolitically motivated sanctions are completely backlashing against especially European economies, the Chinese economy and the BRI have been the true motor of the the world economy. China is the largest trade partner for the U.S., the EU and ASEAN. But the most important aspect of the BRI projects is that they are all investments in physical economy, therefore, they represent real assets, as compared to investments in monetary values, which can evaporate in a crash. These investments remain physical assets, even if many of the monetarist values are being wiped out by the hyperinflation now threatening the financial sector of the neoliberal system.

What are the challenges to the BRI so far?

The most significant challenge comes from a negative shift in

the attitude of some Western governments, think tanks and media, which first ignored this largest infrastructure project in the history of mankind, the BRI, for about four years, but then from 2017 on started to portray the BRI as an expression of China's "imperial designs." Initially many people and entrepreneurs in the U.S. and European nations reacted very enthusiastically to the "New Silk Road," once they learned about it, for example from the Schiller Institute or people doing business with China. After these politicians, think tanks and media started to paint China as a "strategic competition" and "systemic rival," the public opinion became influenced negatively.

This could be reversed, however, because of the present tumultuous political developments, with challenges even to the existence of some European nations as industrial states. More efforts have to be made to show the advantages these European nations would have if they engage in joint ventures together with China in investments in third countries. Under conditions of hyperinflation and even energy blackouts, the cooperation with China can become the lifeboat for many countries.

Follow up questions: according to BBC, EU launches €300 billion bid to challenge Chinese influence, meanwhile, leaders detail \$600 billion plan to rival BRI at G7 summit 2022. What is your assessment of all the initiatives which are similar to BRI (e.g. Partnership for Global Infrastructure and Investment (PGII), Build Back Better World (B3W) Partnership, Global Gateway initiatives, etc.)?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: So far, neither the United States nor the EU has come up with anything to match China's Belt and Road Initiative. The so-called Build Back Better plan was repeatedly reduced in size, scope and cost, ultimately rejected through procedural tactics used in the Congress, and bits of it finally included in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. "The EU's Global Gateway is already delivering," Ursula von der Leyen claimed during her State of the Union speech in

September, but the question is, for whom? She did not mention the word “development” once, there is no fresh money allocated for it, and it is just a rebranding of previous plans like the Juncker plan, which went nowhere, since it counted on a combination of public investments, loan guarantees and private investments, which never came.

The key problem is that the G7 has no passion to alleviate poverty in the Global South through real economic development, but they want to export their Malthusian ideology as a geopolitical weapon against China. But they don't realize that the countries of the Global South can see that the Emperor is naked. As long as the leaders of the G7 are sitting on their high horse, like Josep Borrell, who thinks the EU is a garden and the rest of the world is a jungle, their ideological blindfolds will mean that they are living in a delusional world.

[Continued exchange:]

In 2023, China will mark the tenth anniversary of BRI, which development direction should be concentrated on in the next 5 years? And what field will be trending in the future? What do you think about the 'Digital Silk Road' and the 'Green Belt and Road Initiative'?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think that one of major foci should remain building basic infrastructure in all the countries who wish to cooperate. That is the key precondition for everything else. Then, the pandemic has demonstrated that the building of the Global Health Silk Road, a modern health system in every single country on the planet, is a top priority.

Obviously the Digital Silk Road carries the promise that the countries of the Global South can leapfrog to some of the most advanced technologies provided it is combined with appropriate education programs. They do not have to march through all stages of development which the industrial countries passed through during the last 200 years, but, with the help of China

and like-minded countries, they will be able to catch up in the foreseeable future.

The Digital Silk Road will bring dramatic changes in the next period as artificial intelligence and robots will increasingly replace traditional human physical work, setting human beings free to spend much more time for lifelong learning. This means that coming generations will have a much greater opportunity to develop all potentialities embedded in every single individual, something which is now completely wasted for billions of people who have to worry that they get their meal for the next day. Naturally the education of the mind and the aesthetic education of the character have to go along with these breakthroughs in science and technology and their application in the production process. But many Asian countries have already found the key to that problem, by reviving their sometimes 5,000-year-old cultures with an optimistic outlook for the potential of the future. So the Digital Silk Road and the Cultural Silk Road should be seen as part of the same project.

Also the Space Silk Road is related to that, because the extension of infrastructure into nearby space will represent the indispensable next phase in the evolution of mankind. Several countries of the Global South already have demonstrated great interest in participating in space programs. So there is all reason for optimism for the future of humanity.

Facing the severe global economic situation, how do BRI projects help participators cope with the economic downturn?
ZEPP-LAROCHE: As one can see now the central banks of the G7 are trapped in the hopeless contradiction between quantitative easing (QE) and quantitative tightening (QT). Eventually soon, only an end to the casino economy can resolve that problem. Several countries of the Global South are already reacting to the weaponization of the dollar system by designing their own international currency and a new credit system.

The Chinese economic miracle demonstrates also another interesting aspect, namely that continuous innovation eliminates the occurrence of so called long term economic cycles.

So the countries of the West will have to make a choice in the coming period, either they will stick to their ideologically motivated policies and become increasingly marginalized, or they will remind themselves of their better traditions and decide to cooperate with the emerging new economic order.

Given the immediate threat of deindustrialization of the German economy, because the German government follows policies dictated by the Anglo-Americans in the confrontation against Russia, the sanctions, and weapons deliveries to Ukraine, we will go into a very dramatic weeks and months in the coming winter. And if the German economy collapses, it will affect all other European economies. There are more and more people demonstrating in many German cities, against the sanctions, against the high food and energy prices, and for a negotiated end to the war. Germany is an export-oriented economy, and therefore, the possibility to participate in projects of the BRI, in joint ventures together with China and other participating countries, is the only recognizable way how a deep depression in all of Europe can be avoided. And naturally, in many countries of the Global South there is already a total spirit of optimism concerning the chances the BRI offers to them. [dns][mgm]

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Schiller

Instituttets video interview (med afskrift) efter han blev fyret af Folkeuniversitetet for politiske årsager

Mandag den 14. november 2022

Her er afskriftet på engelsk, som kom i Executive Intelligence Review Vol. 49, Nr. 46, November 25, 2022

Interviewet af Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand.

Videoen findes også på Schiller Instituttets amerikanske YouTube kanal her, hvor knap 6.000 personer har set den indtil den 20. november.

Her er en pdf version. En tekst version findes nedenunder.

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

INTERVIEW: Jens Jørgen Nielsen

Danish Historian Fired After Ukraine Blacklists Him

Jens Jørgen Nielsen has degrees in the history of ideas and communication, was the Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s, is the author of several books about Russia and Ukraine. He is a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization, and an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark; he has been a teacher at the Copenhagen adult night school Folkeuniversitetet for eight years.

Mr. Nielsen has participated in several Schiller Institute conferences, including the Institute's Danish-Swedish videoconference on May 25, 2022 for a new international security and development architecture. Then, on July 14, 2022 he, along with other speakers at the May 25 conference, was put on the blacklist of "information terrorists" put out by Ukraine's UK-supported and U.S.-funded Center For Combating Disinformation. There was widespread coverage of this in the major Danish media. The Danish parliament conducted a consultation about this affair with the Danish Foreign Minister Jeppe Kofod on Aug. 28, 2022.

He was interviewed for EIR and the Schiller Institute by Michelle Rasmussen in Copenhagen on Nov. 14. The transcript has been edited, and subheads added.

EIR: You have just been fired from one of your teaching posts for political reasons. You are currently teaching a course about the history of Crimea, which you will be allowed to finish, but next year's courses about "Russian Conservatism" and "History of Ukraine" have been canceled.

Why have you been fired, and what led up to that?

Nielsen: Well, I would say I was not fired for anything which took place in the classroom. Because there have been some evaluations of my teaching and they have always been very good. The latest evaluation was from February this year. And when people were asked about the professional level, 100% were very satisfied. So that's nothing to do with it. And I'm not politicizing in my teaching. When I teach, I objectively lay out various interpretations and sources, the interests of various nations and actors in the political process. So, it's not for something I've done in the classroom. It's obvious. Even though the board of directors who wrote me this letter tries to legitimize it by saying that I may be politicizing in the classroom, but they have never attended any of my lessons. They didn't know what's going on there, and they never invited

me to talk about it. They never invited any of the students who attended the courses. So it's obvious.

There's no doubt that it was for something which happened outside the classroom. I was on this Ukrainian blacklist that you mentioned. And I gave also an interview to Vladimir Solovyov, a Russian on a Russian TV channel. And I didn't endorse the war, like some would say. We talked about the explosion of Nord Stream 2, and who may have done it, who might not have done it, what the Danes thought about this kind of thing, and things like that.

I was not endorsing the war. That's very important, because I have my doubts about this Russian engagement in Ukraine. That is another question. But I didn't endorse it. But the fact that I gave an interview brought about a crisis in the board. The old board had left, and there was a new board. And the old, original board supported me, and the leader of the school said it was okay because there was nothing wrong with my teaching... What I do outside the classroom, which points of view I had, was up to me. They didn't have anything to do with it as long as the teaching in the classroom was done objectively and people were satisfied with this.

So it was because I was considered to be a person who showed understanding for Putin. Showed understanding for Putin. And I was asked by a journalist, do you really show understanding for Putin? I said, you have to be aware that you use the word understand. What does it mean? It is very important to understand Putin, what his situation is, his background and his way of thinking, and things like that. It's absolutely not the same thing as to say it is very good, but you have to understand him. But I think in the Danish media, journalists think it's an offence, in itself, to understand Putin, and to understand Russia, not either endorsing or not endorsing, but to understand them...

%%'No, We Don't Have Freedom of Speech'

Well, it seems like we are living in—our thinking—something has happened. It resembles something that happened in Stalin's time. You have very strict control with people at the university, or you're allowed to say some things, and you have a lot of taboos you're not allowed to talk about.

So, for me, it was really a surrealistic experience in my own country, which I was brought up to believe is one of the best countries. We have freedom, and we have freedom of speech. We have all these kinds of things. No. It doesn't really work that way today. And I was surprised about it because I had some illusions about my own country, which I don't have now. So, freedom of speech. No, we don't have freedom of speech.

Of course I have not been killed. I will not be put in the gulag... But when you fire people, you indirectly also tell people at other universities, "Beware about what you write and what you say. Don't try to say something which is opposed to government policy right now." This is the logic. This is the conclusion I have reached, that you have to get in line with the government policy...

So I think it's a sad day. Firstly, I think it's a sad day for democracy, because in a democracy, we come up with various points of view, and we discuss them, and we find a solution. Secondly, how do you develop new knowledge, if the young people who enter a career as a researcher in this field, indirectly they have been told, 'Beware. Look at what happens to people who have some controversial points of view... And I think this is the sad thing. For me, of course, personally, but a sad thing for the country, in terms of developing and knowledge, in terms of having a vibrant working democracy. I think it's a disaster for those two endeavors, for those two very, very important things in a democracy.

EIR: One of the things that immediately tipped off the

controversy was that three of your fellow teachers resigned, saying that if you were allowed to continue, then they would resign. And then, the board of directors started an investigation and they accused you of "politicizing your teaching in favor of the Russian understanding of the war in Ukraine." On the radio interview on Radio 24/Seven after you were fired, the chairman of the board of directors simply said that you have very strong, very biased opinions.

First of all, is this this true in terms of "politicizing in favor of the Russian understanding of the war in Ukraine" in your classroom? Have you brought your own political views into your classroom?

Nielsen: No, of course not, because normally when I start a course, I say that I have my own points of view, of course, but I will work here as a professional historian. I will present various interpretations and various viewpoints about this conflict, the situation, because I'm also teaching very ancient history. Regarding Crimea, the first two, three classes were from ancient times and from the Middle Ages, 2000 years of history. So it's impossible. Putin has not really anything to do with Crimea a thousand years ago. That's one thing.

And secondly, these people who criticize me, those of my colleagues who would not want to teach if I teach, they have never attended even a second of any of my courses. So, I don't know what is going on there. And there was one colleague who also participated in this debate on the radio. He has never read any of my books. He did not understand the interview with Vladimir Solovyov because it was in Russian. Well, I asked very humbly, on what basis have you made this decision? Because you don't know anything whatsoever about me, apart from what some people say on Facebook, and other social media.

So I couldn't call it anything other than a witch hunt. It seems like a kind of a witch hunt, because it's as much a

witch hunt, as we had here in Denmark and northern Europe 400 years ago, where we picked out some women, and we killed them because, we said that they were probably evil, but we didn't know exactly how, but probably, they were evil....

%%Students Shocked

We are not discussing anything I said, anything I wrote, anything I have done. We are discussing a picture which someone has made about me being like a Putin follower who likes what is going on, who likes to kill Ukrainian children, and things like that. That's what's going on. And I think it's not at all worthy for a democracy like the Danish democracy. I think it's outrageous.

EIR: You said that neither you, nor any of your students were spoken to by the board of directors. Have any of your students complained that you were politicizing your teaching, and now, after your firing, have any of the students protested against your being fired?

Nielsen: Yes. Of course. Many of the students there have been protesting now. And if you go back, there was one remark in February. But an evaluation was made where 100% were satisfied with the professional level of the teaching. And 75% were very satisfied and 25% were satisfied. There was no one who was dissatisfied or less satisfied. But there was one who mentioned that it was a little bit too pro-Putin. That was one among 30 people who made this remark. But that was compared to the other 29 or so. It couldn't, by any means, be a reason for this. Of course, it's not. Because you could also say that it was at the beginning of the war, and actually, in the classroom, there were several people who were very staunch supporters of Putin—a small group—and a small group who very much disliked Putin; and they had some quarrels between themselves, which has nothing to do with me, because I was not part of that. I think that this was the reason why one person said this. But before that, there hadn't been anything like

that. Nothing of the sort. There have been several evaluations, and apart from this, there haven't been any remarks at all.

EIR: And you said that that many of your students have written to you protesting your being fired.

Nielsen: Yes. I don't know exactly how many, but many said they would protest it. How many actually have done it? I'm not quite aware, but I think that there probably will be a lot, because it was a shock, because people have been following me for years. Some of those ... have attended all my courses, or many of my courses, and they were shocked, because they didn't understand it at all.

And I also gave a course on the history of Ukraine last year, and there were really many participants. And the people said they were in shock because I didn't politicize, I didn't do anything. I just put forward some facts and various viewpoints. Because when you're talking about Ukraine, you have very different narratives about what Ukraine is. And even inside Ukraine, you have very different points of view. What constitutes actually a country like Ukraine? I have several Ukrainian friends who have very, very diverging ideas and concepts of what Ukraine is, what constitutes Ukrainian identity. It's not a simple or unambiguous concept, because it's very controversial, what it actually constitutes. It's not that easy. So I had to put forward something.

But many of the people who criticize me, they criticize me because they think I should say exactly what the Western governments and the Ukrainian government say. This is the thing, that I have to say something exactly like the public version of the Ukrainian nationalist government's interpretation of Ukrainian history. But as an historian, that's very easy to criticize. Because there are historical facts which run counter to much of the Ukrainian [government's] way of thinking.

EIR: Along that line, the one thing that the board of directors did do, besides referring to these very few student remarks, was that they read one of your books called Ukraine in the Field of Tension. What did they criticize about your book?

Nielsen: They criticized me when I wrote about the so-called annexation. First, I would say that it's a book written six years ago. So a lot of things have happened since then. But there was a discussion about what does annexation mean? Because, I admit also that the Russian troops did not adhere to the agreement between Russia and Ukraine regarding the lease of the Sevastopol naval port. They were allowed to have 25,000 soldiers to defend the fleet and the port, but the Russian troops had no right to stay in Simferopol. They went from Sevastopol to Simferopol. It's true. But on the other hand, it's a very strange annexation where there was hardly any bloodshed. There were two or three people who were killed by accident, and there were 21,000 soldiers in the Ukrainian army in the Crimean garrison, but 14,000 decided to join the Russian side.

So it means that it's a very split country, whatever you may call it. And I also said that, I think it was in the Summer of 2014, Q International American Polling Institute made a survey in Crimea saying that 80 or 90% of the population endorsed the status as a part of Russia. And the same result was arrived at by the German polling company GfK in 2015. So, when the majority of the population accepts this transfer from Ukraine to Russia, is it an annexation? I had a discussion in the book about it: Because you can say, on the one side, it depends, if you look at it like that, you can consider it to be an annexation. But in other ways, it's not a very typical

annexation, because of what I've just mentioned.

So they really made a mistake, because they said it shows that I am teaching the history of Russia in favor of the Russian war in Ukraine going on right now. So they are manipulating things to get it to fit into their own narrative. It's not serious. Not at all. And I'm open to debate about this. Of course I am. But they are not interested in a debate. I wrote a letter to them and they have, of course, not answered the letter.

And whatever I wrote six years ago, it is not what I'm saying in the classroom.

%%Liberties Only in Time of Peace?

EIR: As a teacher at the Folk University, don't you have the right to take part in the public debate, even if some may object to your views? What do you think about that? And why do you participate in the public media debate about Russia and Ukraine?

Nielsen: Well, my case seemed to prove the fact that if you take part, and have some points of view, which do not suit public opinion, or does not suit the government, you will lose your livelihood. You will lose your job. So this is what it proves, that you can lose your job. I have lost two jobs because of this. So it's obvious that there are some costs connected to it. It shouldn't be like that. You should not be fired because of some points of view you have, and that you bring into the public discussion such a very, very important question as the war going on in Ukraine right now. So it's difficult. At any rate, it comes with big costs for those who participate. They can be fired. There can be a witch hunt against them. There can be a campaign against them, smear campaigns, and such kind of things. It has taken place here, and I also understand—I just followed some of my German

colleagues, and they have been exposed to something like that.

EIR: Yes, you liken this to a German word "Berufsverbot". What is that?

Nielsen: Beruf means your work. Verbot means you're blocked, you're fired, you're not allowed to work there. And some years back, 40 or 50 years ago, we had this discussion. Are you allowed to work at university, if you have certain points of view? And also at this time, there were people who were fired, some from the right and some from the left, by the way. And we had a discussion. Well, I don't recall precisely, but it was in around the '70s, Vietnam, the '80s, where we had this discussion. I was very young at this time. And I think it ended up with the fact that we agreed that you should not be fired because of your public opinions. One of the leaders of the Nazi Party in Denmark was a teacher at Aalborg University. I knew this guy. I didn't like him. But that is off the mark. But there was discussion, and actually, he was allowed to stay there, because there was no complaint about his teaching. He was teaching German language and literature. There was a discussion about it.

So it's not a new thing. We didn't have this discussion for many years. Now it's come back, and it tells that when you have some tension, some conflict, and things like that, our highly valued liberties, they immediately fly away. So it's a thin layer. Our democracy, the democratic culture here, is maybe a very thin layer. So I wonder, if Denmark enters the war more directly, I think we'll probably lose all our liberties. We can have liberties when you have peace. There's no danger. But when you have some tension, they should prove themselves. These liberties should prove themselves in times of tension.

%%'Europe Should Not End Up in Nuclear War'

EIR: And why is it that you have participated in the debate

about Russia and Ukraine in the public media?

Nielsen: Because I'm very dissatisfied with the policy. I think that the policy the West is pursuing towards Russia—and also Ukraine—I think it's hopeless. I think it's very, very foolish, and is very dangerous, by the way. Well, for Russia, of course, but also for ourselves. I think we're playing with fire. It's a very dangerous situation. I think this is the most dangerous situation we have, including the Cuban Missile Crisis, which was 60 years back. Of course, I'm driven by this, that the West, that Europe should not end up in nuclear war. Because I know exactly, that if there will be a nuclear war, Europe will be the first theater which will be hit, and it will really, really, really have consequences which we have not seen in the history of mankind, ever.

We know the potential for nuclear war. We know where it is. And you can be angry with Putin around the clock. But, at the end of the day, there's no alternative to have some kind of agreement with Russia to find some kind of solution. To defeat Russia is stupidity. And I'm not talking, maybe, because I feel sorry for the Russians. I feel sorry for ourselves. I feel sorry for the Europeans who are following a very shortsighted policy, especially from America, the United States of America. I think Europeans, we should find another approach to the policy, because it's obvious for everyone now, because of the sanctions, Europe is really in straits. Europe is the part of the world which is hit most by the sanctions. It's actually not really Russia. It's Russia to some extent, of course. But Russia can sell their oil anywhere. And we buy their oil. Much of the gas and oil from Russia goes to India, and China, and they sail around the globe, and they end up in Germany for four-five times the price. It's stupidity. It's pure stupidity, and that's why I engage in the debate.

EIR: You've also said that in your media debates, you have not legitimized Russia's military intervention in Ukraine, but that you have stressed that it's important to find out how we

got here. Also the responsibility on the western side. I have made interviews with you, actually, before the start of the war in February. I interviewed you in December of last year, and you were warning about—that was at the point where Russia had just proposed two treaties to try to avoid crossing their red lines. But you said that you have also participated in the media debate to find out how can we reach a peaceful solution?

Do you think that you being put on the Ukraine blacklist, and that being widely publicized in Denmark, could have been a factor that led to this situation where you've been fired?

%%Arrogance of the West

Nielsen: Definitely, among other factors. But it definitely has played a role, There's no doubt about it.

And I also need to just add that the two questions are actually interrelated, because to find out what brought us to this point, it will also be very meaningful when you find out how we proceed from here, how to get to a more peaceful solution. So those questions are interrelated actually. You can't find a road to peace, really, if you don't find out how we how we got here and how to proceed. So I think that is very interrelated.

But when I look at many of the researchers in Denmark, they have some strange ideologically fixed pictures of Russia. There's a lot of things to criticize in Russia. That's not the point. But to find out, more exactly, what's taking place. And I think that the West should take off their ideological glasses, and look much more realistically at what's happening on the ground. And then, they will probably, maybe, come to some more effective solutions, I don't know. But then there's a chance of it, at least.

EIR: You have also warned in your media debates that people

who think that if you just get rid of Putin, then the problem is solved—you have warned that there are factions which are very anti-Western.

Nielsen: Yes, sure. Because I think many in Denmark, and in the West in general, tend to forget that Putin was actually very pro-Western in the beginning of his term when it started more than 20 years back. He was President in 2000. They seem to forget it. He actually wanted Russia to become part of NATO. He appealed to the West in his speech in the Bundestag, in the German parliament, and so on, and met with George W. Bush, and things like that. He was very good friends with Tony Blair, I think. There was a hope for the world, but things changed, and I think is very interesting to understand what changed in those years. I think that there were many steps. It's a little complicated to put it shortly here, but a lot of it, I think, was the West's arrogance, and the West saying we can do anything, without asking Russia.

The first thing was the bombing of Serbia in 1999, and the extension of NATO, and things like that. And secondly, was the Iraq war, and things like that. So things changed in Russia... I lived in Russia in the '90s, and I talked to the Russians. I had another picture. I knew, at this time, that Russia would rise again as a superpower.

And it was important, also, to have some kind of confidence in each other, and to get into a more comprehensive cooperation with Russia. It didn't happen for several reasons... And does the West's attitude have anything to do with it? It definitely has. But this is the discussion.

I think that's also where many of the discussions tend to stop today, because in the West, many politicians, and also people from think-tanks in the West, tend to think that our way of thinking is the only way of thinking... I think it's a very, very dangerous way of thinking. I think they will end up with conflicts.

So, I think it's important to have, in universities, but also among politicians, to have a discussion. Where has this American-led world brought us today? It has brought us to the brink of catastrophe, to the brink of a breakdown of a lot of things. And many of the Russians are aware of this. They look at it this way, but many in the West have difficulties to see it, because we are blindfolded, more or less, ideologically, and it's dangerous.

%%Voices of Dissent Are Important Now

EIR: Just to conclude, what has to change now, on the western side, and also in Russia, to make it possible for us to switch over to peace negotiations to avoid nuclear war?

Nielsen: The first thing is to have a ceasefire. And it's interesting: Everyone knows that there had been some steps to make ceasefire in March and April. And it's very interesting to see who stopped it? It was actually not the Ukrainians, in the first place. It was first, the European Union, and then Boris Johnson from the UK, and also Biden. It was the West that stopped it. There were some attempts in Belarus in the first place, and later on in Turkey. Erdogan invited Russia and Ukraine to some talks, and there are still some talks. There are still some talks about the export of wheat from Odessa, and they're sitting in Istanbul, while we are talking. And it was because of Erdogan. There are many people in the West who do not like Erdogan. I'm not very much in love with Erdogan, but this is a very, very—it's the most reasonable step which has been taken. It's been taken from Erdogan, because he invited Russia and Ukraine.

And now, maybe, it could seem that it's too late. I don't know exactly, But it seems now that—because the Ukrainians, Zelensky has now changed his mind. He wants to go to the end, to have a military victory. So he believes that Ukraine can

kick all the Russian soldiers out of Ukraine, and the Crimea included. I don't believe it will be that easy. Definitely. If you look at it a little cynically, it might seem that the Americans want a war of attrition against Russia, so that Russia will be weakened. Because they're saying that what happened, probably in the beginning of the '80s, ... the Americans made some new armaments, and the Soviet Union could not follow. Eventually, the Soviet Union collapsed. And maybe they are thinking about the same strategy now, which they had in the '80s with the war in Afghanistan, and also with the armaments, that it will break the back of Russia. But it's a very dangerous game they're playing.

I'm definitely not sure it will happen this time, because Russia and China are allied this time, and Russia has strong allies, also, in India, Pakistan and all the Asian countries. Russia has integrated itself into the Asian environment. And I think that it's not a realistic policy from the United States and Europe. So I think, eventually, it will be bad for us, definitely.

I think it's important for us that there is a voice of dissent. As I said, that there are some people who will present some other ways of thinking, because many of us who think like that, we are in a minority right now. But things can change very quickly. And I wouldn't be surprised if, suddenly, there will be a situation where people in the West, people in Europe, and also in America, will say enough is enough. We can't do it any more, because this huge amount of money we're sending to Ukraine, I mean, we are taking the money from other projects: infrastructure, education, hospitals, health care system, things like that. So I think that there's a limit to how long time we can continue this war. And I also think that that goes for Ukraine. How much can they destroy the country, and how many people should be killed? It's very important that some voices in the West demand that we have this peace process taking place as fast as

possible.

EIR: Jens Jørgen, thank you very much. And thank you for your courage in standing up for your views, for your personal views in the media, and for having a professional attitude towards your teaching, where you have been presenting different viewpoints.

Webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche og vært Harley Schlanger

Fare for tredje verdenskrig på grund af et dødeligt missilangreb i Polen bekræfter behovet for en ny strategisk arkitektur

Torsdag den 17. november 2022

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag, velkommen til den ugentlige dialog med Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Jeg er Harley Schlanger, og det er torsdag den 17. november 2022. Helga, i de sidste par dage i den forgangne uge, så det ud til, at vi har undvejet et potentielt atomprojektil med missilhændelsen i Polen. Jeg er endnu ikke sikker på, at de fleste mennesker er klar over, hvor alvorligt dette er, men jeg tror, at det er meget vigtigt for dig at

forklare folk din opfattelse af, hvad der foregik i forbindelse med denne hændelse.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg mener, at vi virkelig alle bør studere denne hændelse, fordi den anskueliggør, hvor hurtigt vi på grund af dumhed, provokationer, overreaktioner, en kombination af alle disse ting, kan komme i en situation, hvor man har en fuldbyrdet NATO-Rusland-konfrontation, for det var det, der var på nippet til at indtræffe.

I tirsdags kom nyheden om, at et missil havde ramt et sted i Polen, og straks var der en hel række medier og nogle politikere, der påstod, at dette var et russisk angreb på Polen, et NATO-medlem. Folk begyndte endda at tale om NATO's artikel 5, dvs. den forsvarsmæssige betingelse, hvor hele NATO skulle have forsvaret Polen. Nogle af medierne, især de britiske medier, Daily Telegraph, The Mail, gik grassat og talte om et russisk angreb på Polen; Bildzeitung og flere tyske medier gik helt amok med overskrifter som "Putin leger med Tredje Verdenskrig". Sådan lød overskrifterne onsdag; endog i en lederartikel. Dette på trods af at præsident Biden allerede tirsdag aften, naturligvis grundet tidsforskellen, havde sagt meget klart, at der ikke var noget bevis for, at der var tale om et russisk missil, men at mistanken var, at det var et ukrainsk luftforsvarsmissil, som på den ene eller den anden måde var endt i Polen.

Så på trods af at USA's præsident og efterfølgende Pentagon benægtede, at det var et russisk missil, bragte medierne stadig overskrifter, endog om morgenen onsdag, hvor der blev rapporteret om sagen. Zelenskyj og Kuleba insisterede naturligvis hele dagen på, at det uden tvivl var et russisk missil, og da det blev tydeligt fastslået, at det ikke drejede sig om et russisk missil, sagde Kuleba, at det var en "konspirationsteori" at påstå dette.

Det er utroligt, men det er på en måde forståeligt – Ukraine er én ting. Men så fremturede nogle vestlige politikere,

f.eks. fra det tyske liberale parti, FDP, [Marie Agnes] Strack-Zimmermann, formanden for forsvarsudvalget, og Lamsdorff, de påpegede alle sammen, at der ikke var nogen tvivl om, at det var et russisk missil. Så det som disse mennesker talte om, var muligheden for en militær konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland i denne ekstremt anspændte situation. Det viser, at de ikke spekulerede på, om vi havde beviser, om de var blevet verificeret. Ved vi det?" De anmodede ikke om en undersøgelse, men de hoppede blot til konklusionen og gav Rusland skylden.

Jeg mener dette må analyseres, for det viser simpelthen, at i tider med utilsigtede hændelser eller forhold, kan det gå galt, hvis vi ikke bevæger os i en anden retning og udvikler en sikkerhedsarkitektur, hvor en sådan potentiel udslettelse af menneskeheden kan forhindres; Dette bør virkelig udgøre et varselssignal for alle, der ikke er fuldstændige idioter, om at vi helt klart skal gå i den retning, som Schiller Instituttet har påpeget siden april i år, nemlig at vi har brug for en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som tager hensyn til alle verdens landes interesser, baseret på principperne i den Westfalske Fred.

Der er i kølvandet på sagen naturligvis krav om en grundig undersøgelse. Nu er der ligefrem røster, der taler om, at det måske var en provokation. Der er endda politikere i Polen, som udtaler, at Warszawa er nødt til fuldstændigt at genoverveje sin strategi i forhold til Ukraine. Så jeg er ikke i stand til at besvare disse spørgsmål nu, for det er naturligvis af største vigtighed, og man skal være ekstremt grundig for at finde ud af præcis, hvad der skete.

Nu var det sandsynligvis, som alle tegn vidner om, et sovjetisk produceret russisk missil, som Ukraine bruger, men hvem der affyrede dette missil, og var det et uheld, eller var det en provokation, det er endnu uvist. Jeg finder politikernes opførsel absolut skandaløs, og de medier der løj, på trods af at det fra USA's præsident allerede var blevet

afkræftet; jeg synes, at folk egentlig burde smide disse aviser væk og i virkeligheden indse, hvor farlige de er som et redskab til geopolitisk krigsførelse.

SCHLANGER: Da det først blev klart, at det ikke var et russisk affyret missil, er det interessant, hvordan diskussionen fortsatte: Stoltenberg sagde, at det fortsat er Ruslands skyld. Der var denne skøre Anne Applebaum fra Atlantic Council, der sagde, at det er ligegyldigt, hvad der skete: Det er Ruslands skyld. Der fulgte et yderligere skift til dette argument om, at vi nu er nødt til at spendere flere penge på Ukraine, de har brug for et bedre luftforsvarssystem. Helga, du har en Schiller Institut-konference på vej den 22. november, som virkelig får større betydning nu som følge af denne hændelse, ikke sandt? [“Stop faren for atomkrig”: https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122]

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Jo, for det viser ganske enkelt, at vi, som vi drøftede på den sidste Schiller-konference den 5. november, hvor denne ekstremt vigtige korte video blev fremvist, virkelig er ved at finde ud af, hvad der rent faktisk ville ske under atomare krigsforhold: Når denne tingest først er udløst, har man højst 10 minutter, eller absolut maksimalt 10 til 15 minutter, før et angreb meddeles, og i bund og grund er atomvåbenarsenalet ramt; 2 minutter til at identificere det, 30 sekunder til at den amerikanske præsident kan beslutte, hvad han skal gøre – nogle få minutter – hvis vi kommer ind i denne form for dynamik, så burde folk have søvnløse nætter, indtil vi har afklaret sagen.

Næste tirsdag, den 22. november, afholder vi den tredje Schiller-konference, som er et resultat af initiativet fra latinamerikanske kongresmedlemmer. Det startede i oktober, og derefter havde vi meget hurtigt endnu en konference, og nu har vi den tredje, men i mellemtiden har disse kongresmedlemmer, især to fra Mexico, udsendt en international opfordring til alle valgte embedsmænd på internationalt plan og deres vælgere

om at etablere en ny fredsbevægelse af verdensborgere. ["Hastesag: Stop faren for atomkrig!" <https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2022/11/16/letter-to-current-and-former-legislators-of-the-world/>] Det faktum, at hvis man udkæmper en atomkrig, er det et anliggende for hele menneskeheden, fordi det kan føre til den fuldstændige ødelæggelse af hele civilisationen, og det gør automatisk enhver borger til en verdensborger, der har ret til at rejse sig og erklære, at "dette må stoppe, så vi har brug for en anden politik".

Således vil vi have adskillige parlamentarikere fra Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Brasilien og også nogle folk fra Europa med; også nogle af de mennesker, der lige nu demonstrerer for en afslutning på denne krig og indledende fredsforhandlinger. Det bliver virkelig et meget betydningsfuldt møde med to paneler, for det udvikler sig meget hurtigt, og vi er nødsaget til at have to paneler. Jeg vil virkelig opfordre alle jer, der er bekymrede over faren for atomkrig, til at deltage i denne konference, for vi er nødt til at lægge et meget virkningsfuldt alternativ på bordet, hvilket er præcis hvad jeg tidligere omtalte: Vi er nødt til at tvinge verdens regeringer til at udarbejde en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som ikke udelukker noget land. For hvis man udelukker nogen, selv om det er en såkaldt autokratisk stat (hvilket man også kan sige meget om), skal der tages hensyn til alle, ellers fungerer det ikke!

Det er den store lære fra den Westfalske Fred, hvor folk erkendte, at man er nødt til at tage hensyn til alle landes interesser, hvis en fred skal være varig. Når man ikke gør det, som det skete med Versailles-traktaten, fører det til den næste krig: Det var den store forskel mellem den Westfalske Fred og Versailles-traktaten, at den ene fred etablerede international ret som et fungerende organ af lovmæssighed, mens Versailles-traktaten netop var kimen til den næste store verdenskrig, der skulle opstå.

Vi vil diskutere dette, og vi vil også præsentere brugbare foranstaltninger, der kan iværksættes for at afholde en sådan traktatkonference. Så I burde virkelig deltage.

SCHLANGER: Man kan tilmelde sig på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside

(https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122); der er en boks og en tilmeldingsformular, som I kan udfylde.

Resten er på engelsk:

Now, you were mentioning the importance of the motion from Ibero-America, from especially the Global South: It's interesting that this incident in Poland occurred during the G20 conference, where there were clearly tensions between the Global South and these so-called G7 nations. What's your sense of what came from there, because there were a number of meetings between leaders—Xi Jinping was very active. How do you think that conference went overall?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think it showed several things. First of all, the developing countries, but especially the host country Indonesia, they were very concerned that the so-called Western countries would not just come and complain, and harass and attack. But they wanted to have a constructive approach, focussing on the real challenges which are a threat to humanity, which is naturally, the world food crisis. Beasley, from the World Food Program, said this is the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II, what we're experiencing right now. So they succeeded to a very large extent.

There was still an effort to condemn Russia and so forth, but it did not really function, because I think it has dawned on at least the more intelligent people, that there is no way how you can go back to the unipolar world. The multipolarity has become a reality; the Global South is playing a much bigger

role, they want to overcome colonialism in its new form. And I think that that is a completely new dynamic. That does not mean that everybody in the Western establishment immediately will adapt to that, because they're arrogant, and if you listen to [EU foreign policy chief] Josep Borrell, who thinks only Europe is a "garden" and the rest is a "jungle," naturally your ears are so full of flowers and whatever your garden is growing that you can't hear what people are saying!

But the reality is that there is a new reality, a new realignment, where 130, 140 countries have allied with the Belt and Road Initiative. They're forming new systems with the BRICS countries, many more countries are applying to become members of the BRICS—Argentina, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey—so there is a lot of motion to actually build a completely new system based on sovereignty, the five principles of coexistence, the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement, and that is really the new dynamic.

Other than that, I think quite important was the first physical meeting between President Biden and President Xi Jinping, at least since Biden has been President, and according to Foreign Minister Wang Yi, this meeting was a breakthrough. We have to see; I'm always of the opinion, let the deeds follow the words. But I think the fact that these two people met for more than three hours is very important, and one can only hope that this will constitute a lasting shift toward cooperation and an ending to this extreme confrontation which was going on.

Xi Jinping also met with about a dozen or more leaders, with Macron, with Albanese from Australia, with Rutte from Holland, and many others. And especially the meeting between Xi Jinping and Macron reestablished the intention that the two countries should work together. Then you had the Scholz visit to China earlier.

So there are clear motions that there is a recognition that

you don't get around China, because China is the locomotive of the world economy. And all the other Asian countries, as well! The only place where there is growth is Asia—it's not Europe, it's not the United States.

It was quite interesting that the Indonesian President Joko Widodo proudly announced the opening of the Jakarta-Bandung High-Speed Railway at the occasion of Indonesia being the host country of the G20. I think this is important, because the developing countries look for cooperation with those countries that bring them real development. They don't want to have just "democracy" and Sunday sermons, they want to have development, and they go to the countries that bring them that.

In that sense, it would be the best, and that is the whole aim of the Schiller Institute, we want the United States and European nations to cooperate with the Global South. There has to be an equal footing, and the demands from the developing sector that they want to overcome their poverty, that's legitimate! And if Germany and France and Japan, and other so-called "industrial" countries, that are almost formerly industrialized countries by now, they have to listen and they have to come down from their high horse, and they should not think they are so superior to everybody else—and that, in any case, will not be accepted any longer.

So, I think with all caution, and the Polish missile event shows you that caution is adequate, nevertheless, I think this G20 meeting did reflect a change in the realities of the world, and that's a little step in the right direction.

SCHLANGER: The final communiqué, in which the G7 nations wanted it to be a condemnation of Russia, and it was obviously a compromise. The final communiqué said, "Most members strongly condemned the war in Ukraine..." not even condemning Russia. And it mentioned that "There were other views and different assessments of the situation and sanctions."
[<http://static.kremlin.ru/media/events/files/en/> -

u82esHnvQFdH0jV25AJg73rnLGEe8cK6.pdf] So, clearly if there was an attempt behind the scenes to bully, it didn't work.

Helga, going into this conference, you had a role to play: You were able to bring to full consciousness the whole question of the Non-Aligned Movement, the anti-colonial movement. Why don't you give us a little sense of what you did?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I participated in a very interesting conference celebrating the 66 year commemoration of the Bandung-Belgrade-Havana conferences, and celebrating a revival of the Spirit of Bandung. This was a very interesting week-long conference: It started in Jakarta; it went to Bandung, it went to Surabaya, and then from there to Bali. I unfortunately only participated online, but nevertheless, it was really expressing the absolute desire of the developing countries to end colonialism, and that spirit was very, very strong.

Now, some people also expressed that they think the West is hopeless, that you have to have a unilateral agreement, just don't bother about the West any more. Now, I have argued many times that I don't think that is realistic, because if you do not integrate at least the United States and hopefully many European countries, at least the continental European countries, it will not work! First of all, I don't think the West would collapse as peacefully as the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991. And we can't have a bloc-building either: You can't have a Global South plus Russia and China, and a West, which decouples—I don't think that that will work. And I find it quite interesting, I just read an article by Andrey Kortunov from the Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC), who basically said the same thing. He thinks that to construct any kind of world order without the United States will not function, and unfortunately, that's what it is—or not “unfortunately.” [<https://www.rt.com/news/-566635-andrey-kortunov-american-attempts/>]

But we have to getting the United States, despite what Ray

McGovern calls the MICIMATT, Wall Street, the big banks, BlackRock, the whole conglomerate of economic-financial interests and the military-industrial complex conglomerate, that is one reality, but that is not the entire United States: We have farmers, we have people who are the real people and they have obviously had a voice in the recent period, in the campaign for Senate of Diane Sare in New York.

But I think just the last word on the G20, the Non-Aligned Movement, I think the momentum is in Asia. I was also able to give several interviews, Chinese TV, commenting on all these things. So my overall impression of all of that is, the Westerners, so-called, would be really advised to stop being so arrogant and just start to cooperate with the countries that clearly have the historic momentum. If they don't it will be at their own expense, and in the worst case, Europe will go to the sidelines of history and become a relic of one of these civilizations that didn't make it.

That's not what we should aim for, so I'm more for a revival of the spirit of Leibniz, that Europe and China should work together, and develop all the countries in between: So that's my view.

SCHLANGER: Things are not so good in Josep Borrell's "garden." The latest report from the European Central Bank shows that there is an extreme period of crisis coming with the economy. The idiocy of the Green partners in the German coalition government, Baerbock and Habeck, are pointing toward accelerated deindustrialization. What does it look like in Europe right now?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: We are going into a real hard fall and winter: The prices of food and energy are already skyrocketing. Fuest, who is the head of the Ifo economic institute in Munich just said that in the medium term this is risking Germany as an industrial location; the Mittelstand will be wiped out if the policies of these Green ideologues, these absolutely anti-

human, anti-growth people, [Foreign Minister] Baerbock and [Economic Minister] Habeck, if that is not quickly replaced, Germany will cease to be an industrial nation.

And the ECB just put out a report saying that they're between a rock and a hard place, between quantitative tightening, threatening collapses and bankruptcies; and quantitative easing, which threatens hyperinflation. There is no solution within that system. This is why we are saying, we absolutely need to have a new credit system, Glass-Steagall, national bank, going back to the principles as the Bretton Woods system was intended by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and unfortunately never implemented because when FDR died, Truman and Churchill who then finally designed the Bretton Woods. This is why many developing countries don't even like the word "Bretton Woods."

But as Roosevelt intended it, to overcome the poverty and increase the living standard of the entire world population, that has to be put on the agenda, but naturally, I don't think it will function with this present leadership of the EU, because von der Leyen and ECB President Lagarde, and these people, they are really the hard-core neoliberal—they're like the Honeckers of the neoliberal system. So, with them it will not function. We need some other motion.

SCHLANGER: Especially given the context of the war danger, as well as the hunger crisis that David Beasley talked about, maybe you want to say something more about that; but clearly, the question of a failing architecture, which as you say, is not going to fail peacefully, but could drag the world into war, does raise the question of what your husband, Lyndon LaRouche, dedicated the last 50 years of his life to, which is the creation of a new paradigm. And I think it'd be worthwhile just discussing finally how this would work to further the so-called "advanced sector": the bankruptcy reorganization, the credit system—this is something that's not even discussed. We just had an election in the United States, and *none* of this was discussed!

Maybe you want to say something about the lack of a “red wave” in the United States, in this context?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the expectation that the Republicans would take over with a sweeping victory did not come true. Then Trump’s candidates didn’t win in many places. Now the big talk is about Florida Governor DeSantis, who is really linked to the neoliberal Austrian school of economics.

Right now, I think the United States, it really shows that what my late husband had said about the party system, that it does not function—he actually called it the “potty system.” And, of course, George Washington at the end of his term, warned against the parties, saying they tend not to be in the interest of the nation, but in the lobby interests, the specialist groups. There is really no fundamental difference, because if you now look at what Bannon as an adviser to Trump is now doing in Mexico, lining up with the extreme rightwing forces of Latin American continent.

I think we need, really, a revival of the American tradition, and the only thing one could see in this recent election campaign was the fantastic campaign of Diane Sare, who, however, was completely defrauded of her vote! That should also be noted: There’s this big story, you can’t say there was vote fraud in 2020. Well, there was vote fraud for sure against Diane Sare. We have screen shots where she had at a certain point over 50,000 votes, and then a few hours later, the screen shot shows she had only 29,000 votes. She had collected more than 66,000 signatures to even *be* on the ballot! So they didn’t even give her a third of those votes, which is completely hilarious! She had all these groups that were supporting her.

In any case, what that signifies is that there is a huge divide between the population and the governments, and that is becoming very clear in Europe as well, where you have more and more large demonstrations: People taking to the streets

because they don't feel represented by the government, or the parties like the Free Democratic Party, which really showed its colors in the missile crisis. Who wants to be in the hands of people like this German MP Strack-Zimmermann? This is a Halloween kind of an idea.

What is really required is a completely different system, whereby the common good is again on the agenda, and more and more people from the so-called "normal people" have to take responsibility and qualify themselves to know what should be the economic policy, the foreign policy, the security policy, education. And that requires exactly what we are trying to do to create a movement of world citizens who basically say: We will not allow our fate to be ruined by those few billionaires who are controlling all the corporations; you know, BlackRock is just one example, Vanguard, these things are like vultures that are trying to suck the juice out of the economy, at the expense of the people. That has come to a breaking point, and we need, really, a mass movement of true state citizens. And one occasion where that will be discussed is this coming week at the next Schiller conference. So again, I invite you to participate.

SCHLANGER: Those people who want to know how there's no contradiction between being a patriot of your nation and a world citizen, should register for the conference. It's Nov. 22, and registration is available at the Schiller Institute website: https://schillerinstitute.-nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122

Helga we've run out of time, so thank you very much for joining us today, and we'll see you hopefully again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week.

CGTN udsender video-special med Helga Zepp-LaRouche om G20-topmødet og hidtil usete udfordringer

Kommer senere på dansk:

Nov. 14, 2022 (EIRNS)—An eight-minute video special by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, with a headline “German Expert: G20 Summit and Unprecedented Challenges” was broadcast today by CGTN with the following description:

“With a purpose of collective action and inclusive collaboration among major developed countries and emerging economies around the world, the 17th G20 Summit will take place from 15-16 November 2022 in Bali. What are the unprecedented challenges that world leaders will find answers for at this year’s assembly? Join Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and president of the Schiller Institute, to explore more!”

Se videoen her.

In the video (see below for the full text), Zepp-LaRouche asserts that the G20 summit occurs at a moment of unprecedented challenges to mankind—the proxy war in Ukraine, which could escalate to nuclear war; inflation which originates with QE decisions pumping trillions of dollars into the survival of an ailing system since 2008, now causing massive protests against inflation in Europe; the energy crisis, which has to do with Germany’s exit from nuclear and fossils energy sources as well as the impact of anti-Russian sanctions on gas supplies delivered to Europe and other parts of the world; the three years of pandemic; the threat that 1.7 billion humans will not have an adequate food supply and 2

billion have no access to clean water.

All these challenges threaten mankind as a whole, Zepp-LaRouche state. Therefore the question is whether the leaders who attend the G20, as the most important international forum for discussion of cooperation, will act constructively. Ten leaders of the G20 are from the West, the other ten are from the East and the Global South. Will the Bali Summit follow leaders with constructive proposals for a shared future of mankind like Xi Jinping today, or historic leaders, like President Sukarno at the Bandung Non-Aligned Movement summit in 1955 or José López Portillo's UN General Assembly address in 1982; or will they follow the destructive course of the Western geopoliticians?

What the world needs is a new security and development architecture that takes into account the interests of every nation to stop war; a new and just economic order to solve the world financial crisis; a doubling of food production to end starvation; and to build a modern health system in every country to forestall the threat of pandemics, Zepp-LaRouche concluded.

Her er afskriftet på engelsk:

{{Helga Zepp-LaRouche:}} This year, when the G20 meets in Bali, Indonesia, on November 15th and 16th, the world faces unprecedented challenges in human history. As President Xi Jinping recently emphasized, he called on all countries to uphold the common values of humanity, peace development, fairness, justice, democracy, and freedom, further mutual understanding, and form close bonds with other people. And he said, let us concentrate all our forces to face all kinds of global challenges.

The gremium [consultative body] which should be best suited to address and find solutions for those challenges is, or should be, the G20, the group of leading industrial and emerging

countries, which since September 2009, are the central forum for international economic cooperation. This was decided at the G20 summit in Pittsburgh, by the heads of government in response to the financial crisis of 2008.

This year, the G20 will meet in Bali, Indonesia, on November 15th and 16th, also in memory of the history Bandung Conference.

What are these “unprecedented challenges” these leaders should address and find answers for? To name only the most urgent ones:

First, the military conflict over Ukraine, which is not a war between Russia and Ukraine, but a proxy war between NATO and Russia, which has the potential to get out of control, and in the worst case, escalate into a global thermonuclear war.

Second, we see an explosion of inflation rates, for which the war in Ukraine is only one aspect. The sanctions against Russia have completely backfired: The economies of Europe and Germany are hit by a tremendous blowback. The prices of food are skyrocketing, energy prices are becoming unpayable, many energy-intensive firms are going bankrupt, such as bakeries; restaurants are giving up. More and more desperate people are taking to the streets, in France, in Belgium, in Holland. The farmers are radicalizing. In Italy, tens of thousands are demonstrating against the war danger.

In many German cities, people demonstrate to stop the sanctions, to reduce prices. More fundamentally, the policies of money printing by the central banks, the policy of so-called “quantitative easing” (QE), whereby they have pumped trillions of dollars and euros into the financial system, has created this inflation. One can see the clear correlation between the QE and prices going up.

Third, for the energy price crisis, there are different factors. Germany’s exit from nuclear energy, for which no

adequate replacement has been organized. Now, the exit is also from fossil fuels. Then, there has been a lack of investments in energy flux dense energy types. And even in France, which has a strong nuclear energy sector, they were pushed to put money into renewables, neglecting the maintenance of nuclear plants. Then, the sanctions against Russia as the main source for deliveries to Europe, which resulted in a new dependence on U.S. LNG, which makes energy much more expensive, and naturally, a price explosion as a result of the sabotage of the Nord Stream pipelines.

Fourth, then there is world food crisis. According to figures from the World Food Programme, 1.7 billion people are threatened with famine, {2 billion people have no clean water, which has a life-shortening effect, because diseases can spread easily.}

There is the COVID-19 pandemic and threat of other pandemics looming. After almost three years of the pandemic, if one compares the statistics of death by continent or country, one can see a correlation between the different responses by the governments and the death rates, and the lack of modern health systems in the majority of countries around the world.

So, our civilization indeed faces an unprecedented combination of challenges, of which the first one, the war danger, could threaten the very existence of mankind. But, also the other dangers, hyperinflation, energy shortage, world famine and pandemics, are such then one should assume that the governments would feel the urgent obligation to work together to solve them.

But will they?

As of now, ten participating countries belong to the camp of the West: Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, South Korea, and the EU.

Another ten countries are those who are working with the

countries of the Global South, who are really the most affected by all the calamities mentioned above: China, Brazil, Argentina, India, Russia, Indonesia, Türkiye, South Africa, Mexico, and Saudi Arabia.

So, the big question for the billions of people in the Global South is, can these leaders stop their geopolitical confrontations for the sake of the shared community of the future of mankind?

Look at what great leaders said at previous similar forums:

“It is a new departure in the history of the world that leaders of the Asian and African peoples can meet together in their own countries, to discuss and deliberate upon matters of common concern.” [Indonesian President Sukarno, Bandung, April 18, 1955]

How will the speeches of the leaders at the G20 summit measure up to what other great leaders said at other, less-challenging occasions? Such as the famous address by [Mexican] President López Portillo at the United Nations General Assembly in 1982: “We cannot fail. There is good reason to be alarmist. Not only the heritage of our civilization is at stake, but also the very survival of our children, of future generations, and of the human species.” [Mexican President José López Portillo, October 11, 1982; <https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1982/eirv09n39-19821012/eirv09n39-19821012.pdf>]

The fate of maybe billions of people will depend on what these leaders will do. Hopefully, all of them, or at least a powerful group of nations will agree on a joint program which will solve the existential challenges of humanity:

To stop the war, a new global security and development architecture, which takes into account the interests of every country on the planet.

To solve the financial crisis, agree on a new world economic order and a new credit system.

To stop the energy crisis, end the sanctions and cooperate on energy security.

To stop the world famine, double food production worldwide.

To stop the spread of pandemics, build a world health system, a modern health system in every single country in the world.

Let's hope that this moment of unprecedented challenges has founder leaders that have the greatness to save humanity!

“Underviseren, der blev fyret [af Folkeuniversitetet] for sit syn på Rusland”.

Interview med Jens Jørgen Nielsen m.fl. på Radio 24/syv

Lyt til programmet her på Radio 24/syvs hjemmeside.

“Beskrivelse af Radio 24/syv:

“Den kontroversielle historiker og Rusland-debattør Jens Jørgen Nielsen er blevet fyret som underviser af Folkeuniversitetets bestyrelse. Fyringen kommer, efter flere undervisere på Folkeuniversitetet har sagt op i protest mod Jens Jørgen Nielsen, og at kritikere har beskyldt ham for at være for “forstående” over for Putins styre i Rusland.

“Ifølge Jens Jørgen Nielsen er der tale om en fuldstændig uberettiget fyreseddel.

“Reporterne undersøger, hvad der er op og ned i sagen. For må man mene, hvad man vil i privaten, og kan man samtidig bedrive saglig undervisning?

“Gæster:

Jens Jørgen Nielsen, historiker og Rusland-debattør

Anders Lundt Hansen, middelalderhistoriker

Jakob Skovgaard-Petersen, formand for Folkeuniversitetet

Uffe Gardel, journalist

Vært: Alexander Wils Lorenzen”

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er uddannet i idé- og kommunikationshistorie, Moskva-korrespondent for dagbladet Politiken i slutningen af 1990'erne, forfatter til flere bøger om Rusland og Ukraine, leder af organisationen Russisk-Dansk Dialog og lektor i kommunikation og kulturforskelle ved Niels Brock Handelshøjskole i København.

Han er på Ukraines sortliste efter at have talt på Schiller Instituttets seminar i Danmark den 25. maj 2022 om en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur.

Her er et interview Schiller Instituttet lavede med Jens Jørgen Nielsen den 3. oktober 2022:

Interviewet omfatter:

- Truslen om atomkrig;
- Situationen er mere alvorlig end Cuba-krisen;
- Behovet for forhandlinger eventuelt med Tyrkiet eller Indien som mæglere;
- Den vestlige strategi om at fortsætte krigen, indtil Rusland er besejret, vil ikke fungere og indebærer risiko for atomkrig;
- Hvordan vi er kommet til dette punkt, startende med

USA's tidligere nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver (1977 til 1981) Zbigniew Brzezinskis plan om at bruge Ukraine til at splitte Rusland;

- North Stream-sabotagen blev efter al sandsynlighed ikke udført af Rusland.

Dona nobis pacem. Giv os fred. Sunget ved folketingskandidat Tom Gillesbergs valgfest 5. nov. 2022

København 7. november

Schiller Instituttet vil gerne gøre Dona Nobis Pacem til temasang for den voksende bevægelse imod faren for atomkrig og for fred i verden.

Videokonference med talerlisten: Stop faren for

atomkrig nu.

**Tirsdag den 22. november
eller senere**

Panel 1 ovenover.

Her er Panel 2: Link

Dato: Tirsdag den 22. november 2022

**Tid: Panel 1 (15:30– 18:30 dansk tid):
Stop uret til Dommedag – Det almene vel
af den ene menneskehed**

**Panel 2 (19:30 – 22:30 dansk tid): Fred
gennem udvikling**

Sted: Internet: schillerinstitute.com. og

Deputeretkammeret, Mexico City; Zoom (med simultantolkning på engelsk, spansk, tysk og fransk)

Tilmelding: Stop faren for atomkrig nu
https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/conference_20221122

Et tredje seminar for nuværende og tidligere valgte embedsmænd og andre politiske og sociale ledere på verdensplan vil blive afholdt den 22. november med den presserende opfordring "For verdensfred: Stop faren for atomkrig nu".

Beslutningen om at indkalde til dette tredje seminar blev

truffet af de ledende deltagere i det andet seminar for nuværende og tidligere valgte embedsmænd fra hele verden, som Schiller Instituttet tog initiativ til, og som mødtes den 27. oktober på en online Zoom-konference i et mødelokale i Mexicos kongres.

Det kommende arrangement den 22. november vil også finde sted i den mexicanske kongres med en stadig voksende liste af sponsorerende institutioner og tilhængere af erklæringen, der også tjener som invitation til denne række af seminarer (se nedenfor for teksten til erklæringen og den fulde liste over underskrivere).

På grund af den hastigt voksende støtte til dette initiativ fra hele verden, i takt med at faren for atomkrig eskalerer, vil det tredje seminar blive udvidet til at bestå af to paneler. Nærmere oplysninger vil blive offentliggjort snarest muligt.

Opdateret invitation på engelsk:

The long-awaited U.S. midterm election did *not* reduce the danger of global nuclear war – if anything, it increased that threat. First, because the life-and-death issues facing the United States and the world – the escalating danger of nuclear confrontation around the Ukraine theater, and the breakdown collapse of the Western financial and economic system that is driving that war danger – were scarcely even mentioned for discussion before the American and world public during that election cycle. And second, because the dynamic of economic depression is marching forward relentlessly: 1.8 billion human beings face the danger of starvation; 2 billion people lack clean water; most of Europe is being plunged into a cold and hungry winter; hyperinflation is galloping ahead, worsened by the incompetent “anti-inflationary” policies adopted by the U.S. Federal Reserve, the Bank of England, and other central banks and financial institutions of the West.

But that is only half the story. From Asia and the Non-Aligned movement more broadly, a new international security and development architecture is being forged. An epochal change is underway: Nations representing the large majority of mankind are saying that the era of blocs and geopolitics is over; that colonialism, underdevelopment and poverty will no longer be tolerated.

But if war is to be avoided, if we are to avoid sinking into two, decoupled geopolitical blocs set on a collision course, then the overriding interests of the One Humanity must be discovered, affirmed, and established as the basis for such a new architecture. National and regional interests cannot be partial and at war, one with the other, but must coincide with the interests of humanity as a whole. The threat of thermonuclear extinction has now forced that decision upon us: We shall either all prosper and develop, as we center our concerns on the benefit of the other; or we shall all perish through our own folly, and not survive to correct our mistakes.

Just how close we are to the edge of nuclear war was made dramatically clear in the events of Nov. 15-16, in which a rocket landed on Polish territory. Based on a rumor that Russia had fired the rocket, which turned out to be patently false, the world was within minutes of the activation of the equivalent of Article 5 of NATO. The entire incident, including the dangerously provocative role played by much of the Western media in fanning the flames, underscored how volatile the world situation is. Without a new international security architecture, it is only a matter of time until another such incident unleashes an actual war.

That is the subject, and the urgency, of the upcoming Nov. 22 "Third Seminar of Political and Social Leaders of the World: Stop the Danger of Nuclear War Now," which will gather thoughtful leaders from across the planet to deliberate on these issues. Please see the attached open letter from

Congressman Benjamín Robles Montoya and former Congresswoman María de los Ángeles Huerta of Mexico, urging current and former legislators from all nations to join that effort. You are also invited – you are urged – to attend and participate in that deliberation. The event will be conducted both on line and in a meeting room of the Mexican Congress, with simultaneous interpretation in four languages (English, Spanish, French and German), and it will follow the schedule we present below, along with a partial list of speakers and topics:

Talerlisten:

Panel 1 (15:30– 18:30 dansk tid): Stopping the Doomsday Clock–The Common Good of the One Humanity

- * Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Germany); founder, Schiller Institute
- * Benjamín Robles Montoya (Mexico); congressman:
- * Col. Richard Black (U.S.); former state senator for Virginia: “The Danger of Nuclear War After the U.S. Mid-Term Elections
- * Steven Starr (U.S.); retired director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, and a preeminent expert on nuclear war: “What Would Happen if a Nuclear War Started in the Black Sea?”
- * Argentina; former congressman: “The Necessary Conditions for the Development of the Third World”
- * Paulo Cannabrava Filho (Brazil); journalist, Editor of *Diálogos do Sul*: “Brazil and the Battle for an Expanded BRICS”
- * Alberto Quintanilla (Peru); former congressman: “The End of

Globalization and the Emergence of the BRICS”

* Antonio Ingroia (Italy); former anti-mafia judge in Sicily; candidate for Prime Minister

* Karl Krökel (Germany); small business leader, founder of “Craftsmen for Peace”

* Germany: religious leader

* France: elected official

Panel 2 (19:30 – 22:30 dansk tid): Peace Through Development

* Diane Sare (U.S.); 2024 candidate for U.S. Senate from New York state: “America’s Voice in the Emerging New Global Architecture of Peace Through Development”

* María de los Ángeles Huerta (Mexico); former congresswoman:

* Jorge Robledo (Colombia); former senator

* Donald Ramotar (Guyana); former President and former member of parliament

* George Koo (U.S.); retired international business advisor: “The Prospects for U.S. China Economic Cooperation”

* Juan Pari (Peru); former congressman: “The Energy Crisis and the Ukraine-Russia War”

* Dr. Rodolfo Ondarza (Mexico); former Representative, Mexico City Legislative Assembly: “Bacteriological Warfare and the Need for a Global Health System”

* Dr. Kirk Meighoo (Trinidad and Tobago); former senator

Erklæring:

Otte måneder inde i krigen mellem Rusland og Ukraine, i hvilken USA og NATO spiller en aktiv rolle, er der mange døde og sårede, omfattende ødelæggelser af alle former for ejendom og meget skadelige økonomiske og sociale konsekvenser i Europa og hele verden, hvilket forårsager chok, der forværrer de meget dybe problemer i verdensøkonomien med konsekvenser i form af en forværring af krisen og forøget arbejdsløshed, fattigdom og sult.

Det er kendt, at denne krig kan få langt alvorligere konsekvenser end dem, vi allerede lider under, herunder massive ødelæggelser og en krise af globale dimensioner, som aldrig tidligere er set, fordi krigen kan føre til en konfrontation med atomvåben mellem Rusland og USA og NATO.

Blandt de tiltagende stemmer, der opfordrer til en forstandig tilgang, fremhæver vi pave Frans' opfordring til en forhandlet, fredelig løsning.

De undertegnede politiske og sociale ledere, nuværende og tidligere lovgivere og andre folkevalgte fra forskellige lande opfordrer Rusland, Ukraine, USA og NATO til at nå frem til en aftale, der først og fremmest afviser den voksende løsagtige snak om eventuel anvendelse af atomvåben og bekræfter den grundlæggende forpligtelse i den såkaldte Reagan-Gorbatjov-formel fra 1985, at "en atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes". For at være varig skal en sådan aftale også etablere en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, der anerkender og respekterer de legitime sikkerhedsinteresser, som samtlige verdens nationer måtte have.

Vi anerkender og insisterer på, at Rusland i lighed med USA, NATO, Ukraine og alle andre lande har legitime sikkerhedsinteresser, som skal tages i betragtning og blive en af hjørnesteenene i den nye sikkerhedsarkitektur. En tilbagevenden til de vellykkede principper fra den Westfalske

Fred i 1648 – respekt for suverænitet, engagement i den andens, modpartens, bedste og eftergivelse af gæld, der forhindrer ægte økonomisk udvikling – er den slags arkitektur, vi efterstræber i dag.

Det almene gode for den fælles menneskehed er den obligatoriske forudsætning for det gode for hver enkelt nation. På den måde vil vi blandt alle verdens nationer kunne bidrage til at opbygge en organisation af borgere i en fælles international indsats, og på den måde etablere os som en drivkraft, der kan have indflydelse på den internationale politiske debat.

Vi opfordrer mennesker af god vilje i hele verden – uanset vores forskelligartede og naturlige forskelle – til at deltage i denne proces med overvejelser og søgen efter fredelige løsninger, herunder en grundig undersøgelse af en alternativ økonomisk politik med henblik på at erstatte spekulation, som har skabt så megen fattigdom og lidelse, med et system baseret på produktion og fremskridt, der kan tilgodese behovene hos en voksende verdensbefolkning.

Vi afviser alle forsøgene på at begrænse, intimidere eller forbyde en sådan overvejelserproces. Og vi opfordrer USA, NATO, Ukraine og Rusland til at bevæge sig i den retning, som vi præsenterer i denne respektfulde opfordring.

UNDESKRIVERE:

1) Donald Ramotar (Guyana); former President (2011-2015), former member of parliament (1992-2011, PPP)

2) Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Germany); founder, Schiller Institute

3) Jorge Robledo (Colombia); former Senator (2002-2022, Partido Dignidad)

4) María de los Ángeles Huerta (Mexico); former Congresswoman (2018-2021, Morena)

5) Dr. Kirk Meighoo (Trinidad & Tobago); former independent Senator (2004, United National Congress)

6) Dr. Rodolfo Ondarza (Mexico); former Representative, Mexico City Legislative Assembly (2015-2018, PT)

7) Diane Sare (U.S.); candidate for the U.S. Senate from New York (2022, independent/LaRouche)

ADDITIONAL SIGNERS:

Bolivia

8) Gen. Edwin de la Fuente Jeria; former Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of Bolivia (2012-2013)

Colombia

9) Jennifer Pedraza Sandoval; Congresswoman

10) Luís Eduardo Peláez; state representative, Antioquia

11) Leónidas Gómez Gómez; state representative, Santander

12) Jorge Gómez Gallego; former Congressman

13) Diógenes Orjuela García; former Secretary General, CUT trade union confederation

14) Manuel Sarmiento Arguello; city councilman, Bogotá

Czech Republic

15) Vincenzo Romanello (Czech Republic/Italy); Ph.D., Senior Nuclear Researcher and Project Manager, National Radiation Protection Institute (SURO)

Denmark

Tom Gillesberg, formand, Schiller Instituttet,

Folketingskandidat udenfor partierne i Københavns Storkreds

Dominican Republic

16) Ramón Emilio Concepción; former presidential precandidate (2020)

Italy

17) Sergio Tancredi; former member of the Sicilian Parliament (2017-2022)

18) Antonio Ingroia; former anti-mafia judge in Sicily; candidate for Prime Minister (2013)

19) Alessia Ruggeri; trade unionist, Comitato per la Repubblica

Mexico

20) Benjamín Robles Montoya; Congressman (2018-); former Senator (2012-2018)

21) Elpidio Tovar de la Cruz; former Congressman (2003-2006)

22) Claudia Yáñez Centeno; former Congresswoman (2014-2017)

23) Alberto Vizcarra Osuna; former Sonora state representative (1988-1991)

24) Dr. Sergio Pablo Mariscal Alvarado; former Mayor, Ciudad Obregón (2018-2021); engineering professor, Sonora Technological Institute

25) Emeterio Ochoa Bazúa; former Sonora state representative (2015-2021)

26) Antonio Valdez Villanueva; former Sonora state representative (2009-2012); Under- secretary General of the Mexican Labor Confederation (CTM) in Sonora.

Netherlands

27) Dr. A. J. (Guus) Berkhout; Professor-Emeritus Geophysics, Technical Univ. of Delft; President of CLINTEL

United States

28) Richard Black; former Virginia state Senator (2012-2020), former member Virginia House of Delegates (1998-2006)

29) Graham Fuller; former U.S. diplomat, CIA official, and Islamic scholar

30) Dr. George Koo; International business advisor, retired

31) Dr. Mohammad A. Toor; Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Pakistani American Congress

32) Bradley Blankenship; Journalist

33) Bob Van Hee; Commissioner, Redwood County, Minnesota

Venezuela

34) Román Rojas Cabot; former Venezuelan ambassador to the European Community, Brussels

35) Emil Guevara Muñoz; former member of the Latin American Parliament (2006-2011)

Yemen

36) Dr. Fouad al Ghaffari; Advisor to the Prime Minister for BRICS Countries Affairs; President of Yemeni ALBRICS Youth Parliament