

**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
nytårshilsen**

Zepp-LaRouches

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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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 hjørnestenene 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.

UNDERSKRIVERE:

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

Videokonference – Noösfærens fysiske økonomi: Genoplivning af Vladimir Vernadskijs arv. Lørdag den 12. november kl. 16 eller senere

Panel 2: kl. 20 eller senere

Den 1. november, 2022 (EIRNS) – Schiller Instituttet er vært for en konference om Noösfærens fysiske økonomi: Genoplivning af Vladimir Vernadskijs arv, den 12. november fra kl. 10.00 til 17.00 dansk tid.

I denne tidsalder med omfattende politisk tumult, med uenighed om den positive rolle, som menneskelig teknologisk udvikling udgør, og den voksende fare for militær konflikt mellem atomare magter, hvad enten den måtte skyldes planlægning eller fejlregning, er det nødvendigt at undersøge og studere den store sovjetiske, russisk-ukrainske videnskabsmand Vladimir Vernadskijs (1863-1945) revolutionære idéer. Dette gælder især Vernadskijs begreb om noösfæren, den fysisk-økonomiske sfære, hvorigennem den menneskelige videnskabelige tænkning udgør den dominerende kraft i vort univers.

I en tid med opfordringer til at opdele verden i ideologiske grupper kræver begrebet noösfære et nyt paradigme, som bringer menneskeheden tættere sammen og ikke længere fra hinanden.

Det centrale i noösfæren er at opretholde et grundlæggende engagement i videnskabens fremskridt, dvs. at realisere de grundlæggende gennembrud i den videnskabelige tænkning, som, når de tillempes den produktive proces, øger menneskets indflydelse i biosfæren. Mens Vernadskijs primære

videnskabelige bidrag var hans opdagelse af "levende materies" kraftfulde funktion med hensyn til at omdanne og forbedre selve naturen af det underliggende inaktive univers gennem "atomernes migration", indså han også, at mennesket gennem udviklingen af sin videnskabelige tænkning udøvede en lignende effekt på at omdanne og forbedre biosfærens virke.

Mod slutningen af Vernadskijs liv, da Anden Verdenskrig nærmede sig sin afslutning, insisterede han på, at det var presserende for landene at forene deres kræfter og arbejde sammen for at realisere menneskehedens fælles mål, et engagement, som han delte med Sovjetunionens allierede i krigen, den amerikanske Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Dette symposium har til formål at genoplive denne fremtrædende videnskabsmands navn, idéer, arv og mission. Vi har samlet kendte videnskabsmænd fra hele verden for at diskutere de grundlæggende videnskabelige fremskridt, der er opnået eller snart vil blive gennemført inden for deres respektive aktivitetsområder, hvoraf mange også var Vernadskijs forskningsområder. Om eftermiddagen vil vi drøfte nogle af de fysiske ingeniørprojekter, der pågår i forskellige dele af verden, med henblik på at forbedre menneskehedens vilkår – at udvikle noösfæren.

- Det første panel, der finder sted fra kl. 10 til 13, har titlen: "Vernadskijs revolution inden for videnskab og tænkning".
- Det andet panel, der finder sted fra kl. 14.00 til 17.00, omhandler "Fysisk økonomi: Udvikling af noösfæren".

Vladimir Vernadskij skabte, ved at udvikle begrebet noösfæren, i det væsentlige en unik tilgang til fysisk økonomi, som påfaldende ligner LaRouches metode for fysisk økonomi, der anvender kemi og graderne af fysisk output og input i produktionen som fornødne indikatorer, snarere end den uspecifikke monetaristiske tilgang. Udviklingen og opdagelsen

af nye ressourcer og nye metoder til at udnytte og fordele ressourcerne for effektivt at øge en økonomis produktive ydelse udgør en hjørnesteen i denne tilgang. Vandforvaltning og udvikling af energi- og transportkorridorer er ligeledes af afgørende betydning. Talerne i dette panel vil drøfte effektive forslag på disse områder og diskutere nye opdagelser om selve vandets natur og dets forhold til biosfæren og noöfæren samt de bredere spørgsmål om klimaet i forbindelse med solsystemet og galaksen.

Et websted og yderligere oplysninger vil snart blive offentliggjort.

Folketingskandidat Gillesberg sætter risikoen for atomkrig på dagsordenen ved valget den 1. november i Danmark

Denne artikel blve bragt den 30. oktober 2022 i EIR Daily Alert, Washington, D.C.:

KØBENHAVN, 29. oktober 2022 (EIRNS) – Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, er på stemmesedlen til Folketinget den 1. november i København og fører kampagne for at skifte fra at sende våben til Ukraine til at tilskynde til fredsforhandlinger og nedtrappe den atomare trussel. Hans kampagne føres i forbindelse med Schiller Instituttets Venners valgplatform, der opfordrer til et nyt paradigme i internationale relationer, nemlig fred gennem udvikling.

Gillesberg har med stor gennemslagskraft siden 2005 stillet op til samtlige folketingsvalg undtagen ét på denne platform, i opposition til de herskende politiske fraktioner, som har bevirket, at Danmark er blevet en loyal deltager i NATO's krige i Irak, Afghanistan og Libyen. Siden 2015 har danske soldater trænet ukrainske styrker, og Danmark har sendt våben til Ukraine.

I denne sammenhæng har Gillesbergs kandidatur, på trods af krigshøgenes bestræbelser på at mørklægge hans kampagne, haft en væsentlig indflydelse, især gennem en kampagneaktion, hvor der blev sat 500 opsigtsvækkende plakater op i København med sloganet: "Stop NATO's krige: SAMARBEJDE – Fred gennem udvikling". Plakaten fremviser flag fra nationer, der arbejder sammen – Danmark, Ukraine, Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA – samt et billede af et byggeprojekt i Afrika.

På skandaløs vis blev mindst 140 plakater fjernet af ukendte politiske vandaler, og politiet er ved at undersøge sagen. Som reaktion på skandalen interviewede det nationale radioprogram, Den Uafhængige Radio, Gillesberg den 26. oktober og spurgte kandidaten, hvem der egentlig ville have plakaterne fjernet? Gillesberg gjorde det klart, at han ikke er offeret for hærværket, men at det danske demokrati er. Hans kampagne udfordrer de fortællinger, der anvendes til kontrol af den offentlige mening, til understøttelse af krigsførelse og til at påtvinge hårde vilkår på energiområdet og hyperinflation.

Tre dage før valget har ingen andre nationale medier foretaget et interview med Gillesberg, men hans kampagne har succes med at alarmere om krigsfare, og hvad vi bør gøre. Han stiller alle de presserende spørgsmål, f.eks. hvorfor er der ingen, der stiller spørgsmålstegn ved, hvem der saboterede Nord Stream-rørledningerne nær den danske ø Bornholm? {Cui bono?}

Hans kampagne har sat tusindvis af eksemplarer af hans erklæring i omløb, hvor han spørger: "Tør du stille kritiske spørgsmål? Eller holder du mund og mister både velfærd og

risikerer atomkrig?” Han stiller spørgsmål, der skal provokere folk til at tænke, f.eks.: “Er det Ruslands skyld, at der er energi- og inflationskrise? [og er Rusland eneansvarlig for krigen i Ukraine?]”

Hans erklæring indeholder også løsninger. Sammenfattende er hans tre hovedpunkter: Stop NATO's krige; samarbejd med Rusland, Kina og resten af verden; stop røverisk finans- og spekulation og opbyg verdensøkonomien med “Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love”. Denne tilgang kræver en Glass/Steagall-regulering af bankvæsenet, målrettet kredit til infrastruktur og projekter med videnskabelige drivkræfter.

Erklæringen har nået vigtige dele af København via massiv omdeling. Tidligere på måneden cirkulerede den inde i Folketinget på den årlige københavnske kulturnat og nåede ud til folk i alle 14 partier og 20 kandidater. Den 26. oktober blev erklæringen udsendt på Københavns Universitet på et studentermøde for kandidater fra otte partier. Forsøget på at begrænse diskussionen mislykkedes, da to kandidater reagerede på en journalist fra EIR News, der bad kandidaterne om at forholde sig til, hvorledes Ukraine-krigen burde bringes til ophør? Journalisten udtalte, at Gillesberg redegør for faren for eskalation af en atomar brand, og hvordan vi er nødt til at aktiveres for at stoppe den [ved at skifte fra at sende våben til Ukraine til at presse på for fredsforhandlinger].

Det, der gør Gillesbergs advarsel endnu stærkere, er, at han er kendt for sine tidligere kampagner for at få Danmark til at ændre kurs i den udenrigs- og økonomiske politik. Tom Gillesberg og hans plakater er en særlig institution i dansk politik siden hans første kampagne i 2005, hvor han med plakatsloganet: “Når boblen brister... Nyt Bretton Woods” advarede mod derivater og hyperinflation, som det er sket. Der har været signaturplakater/politiske slogans til hver valgkamp siden. I 2015 var det: “Win-Win med BRIKS – ikke sammenbrud og krig”. Nu er Tom Gillesberg en afgørende stemme på den europæiske scene.

Kandidat Tom Gillesbergs video orientering dagen inden valget

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 25. oktober 2022: Har vi stadigvæk demokrati i Danmark?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg, som er Folketingskandidat udenfor partierne i Københavns Storkreds.

**Københavns Universitets
valgmode:
Spørgsmål rejst om Tom**

Gillesbergs kampagne for at forhindre, at krigen i Ukraine bliver til atomkrig

København den 25. oktober. Kandidater fra otte partier deltog i Københavns Universitets valgmøde med 400 studerende. Tom Gillesbergs valgkampagne delte valgpjecer ud mens de studerende ankom.

KU's prorektor, Kristian Cedervall Lautau, som var ordstyrer begyndte mødet med at sige, at når man er politiker, skal man svare på fire spørgsmål. Det første er, hvordan man kan reducere faren for atomkrig, men det skal vi ikke tale om i dag. Der var tre andre emner. Det sidste var, hvordan skal vi håndtere den grønne omstilling i lyset af energikrisen og krigen i Ukraine? En af de to spørgsmål til politikerne fra salen om emnet var fra Executive Intelligence Review:

Jeg synes ikke vi skal hoppe over, hvordan vi afslutter krigen i Ukraine. Der er en kandidat udenfor partierne, Tom Gillesberg, som siger, at det vigtigste spørgsmål er, hvordan vi forhindrer, at krigen i Ukraine bliver til atomkrig, og at vi skal skifte fra, at det vigtigste er at sende våben til Ukraine til, at det vigtigste er at presse på for fredsforhandlinger, og at etablere en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur. Hvad mener I om det?

Det blev besvaret af Palle Dragsted fra Enhedslisten og Ida Auken fra Socialdemokratiet.

Link til lydfil:

Københavns Universitets valgmøde:

Spørgsmål rejst om Tom Gillesbergs kampagne for at forhindre, at krigen i Ukraine bliver til atomkrig

Støtterne af Tom Gillesbergs folketingskampagne tager kampagnen direkte ind i Folketinget

KØBENHAVN, 15. oktober 2022 (EIRNS) – En gruppe på tre personer tog Gillesberg-kampagnen direkte ind i Folketinget i forbindelse med Københavns Kulturnat. Inden de gik indenfor, uddelte de den første kampagnefolder til folk i den lange kø, som ventede på at komme ind i Folketinget, og den gik som varmt brød. På folderens forside er kampagneplakaten “Stop NATO’s krige: Samarbejde: Fred gennem udvikling” og Gillesbergs udtalelse: “Tør du stille kritiske spørgsmål, eller holder du mund og mister både velfærd og risikerer atomkrig?”

Indenfor gik delegationen rundt til repræsentationslokalerne hos alle de 13 opstillede politiske partier i Danmark med budskabet: “Det vigtigste spørgsmål i valget er at forhindre, at krigen i Ukraine bliver en atomkrig”, overrakte dem Gillesbergs valgfolder og førte diskussioner af længere eller kortere varighed. Delegationen talte med tre partiledere,

herunder en tidligere statsminister, og yderligere 17 kandidater, hvoraf de fleste havde været fungerende folketingsmedlemmer.

Delegationen understregede, at i lyset af de sidste par ugers eskalering og drøftelserne om anvendelsen af atomvåben, må vi omstille os fra at levere våben for at fortsætte krigen så længe som muligt for at svække Rusland, til at insistere på at indlede forhandlinger for at afslutte krigen så hurtigt som muligt. I næsten alle tilfælde tog kandidaterne disse briefinger meget alvorligt, idet de erkendte, at faren er stor. Folketingskandidaterne blev straks draget ind i de mest alvorlige diskussioner. Det var det vigtigste, som blev gennemført.

Hvad angår svarene, var der et par stykker, som umiddelbart udtrykte: " I har ret. De fleste var uenige om, hvad man skulle gøre ved det. Nogle sagde f.eks.: "Man kan ikke forhandle med Putin, det russiske folk er nødsaget til at vælte ham". Et par stykker erklærede, at de registrerede det, vi nævnte, men at det ikke var tidspunktet til at afgøre sagen. Alle lovede at gennemgå Gillesberg-materialet.

I går fremhævede TV2's hjemmeside udtalelsen imod våbenleverancer fremsat af formanden for De Frie Grønne, det eneste parti, der afviser at sende våben til Ukraine, i forbindelse med dækningen af deres interview med ham. Overskriften er: "Sikander Siddique ønsker at hjælpe Ukraine på alle tænkelige måder, men tvivler på, at flere våben er vejen til fred". Sikander Siddique udtalte: "Vi ønsker at hjælpe Ukraine med humanitær hjælp, og vi bør gøre alt, hvad vi kan, for at presse Vladimir Putin til at komme til forhandlingsbordet. Men flere våben vil ikke skabe fred". Han opfordrede til international nedrustning. Han var blandt de partiledere, som delegationen talte med.

Kampagnen fortsætter.

Webinar: Menneskerettigheder, udvikling og Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet

Den 13. okt. 2022 Bælte og Vej Instituttet i Sverige (BRIX) organiserede et internationalt webinar på internationalt topniveau om sammenhængen mellem menneskerettigheder og økonomisk udvikling og Bælte og Vej Initiativets rolle i forbindelse med fremme af menneskerettigheder og udvikling på verdensplan.

Sammenhængen mellem kinesiske og vestlige synspunkter på dette spørgsmål blev drøftet af diplomater og eksperter fra Kina, Europa og Asien og blev diskuteret indgående i denne første session af webinarret.

Talere på den første session var:

1. H.E. Cui Aimin, ambassadør for Folkerepublikken Kina i Sverige
2. Dmitry Mironchik, ambassadør fra Republikken Belarus til Sverige
3. Erik Solheim, tidligere direktør for FN's miljøprogram, Norge.
4. Ambassadør Sven Hirdman, svensk tidligere diplomat.
5. Dr. Hassan Daud, administrerende direktør for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Board of Investment, Pakistan.
6. Henry Tillman, formand for China Investment Research

Talere på den anden session var:

1. Shakeel A. Ramay, CEO Asian Institute for Eco-Civilization R&D, Pakistan
2. Stephen Brawer, formand for Bælte og Vej Instituttet i

Sverige

3. Dr. Glenn Diesen, professor ved Vestfold Universitet i Norge

4. Hussein Askary, næstformand for Bælte- og Vej- Institutet i Sverige

Link til anden session her:

Besøg hjemmesiden: www.brixsweden.org

Kontakt os: infobrixsweden.org

Den tavse march mod et atomart ragnarok er afbrudt

Den 13. okt. 2022 (EIRNS) – Som i en sommerstorm er den ubarmhjertige, undertrykkende spænding af en tavs march mod atomkrig blevet afbrudt. To ungdomsledere fra LaRouche-bevægelsen nægtede at flirte med atomkrig, og insisterede på at den demokratiske kongreskvinde Alexandra Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) fra NYC skulle indse den skræmmende virkelighed af hendes handlinger. Videoen af Kynan Thistlethwaite og José Vega, der konfronterede hende på et borgermøde i New York City angående hendes moralske fallit, hendes omfavnelser af krigspartiet, er eksploderet i offentligheden. I løbet af de første 24 timer var der 5,5 millioner visninger, og videoen er blevet spredt på Fox News, RT, {New York Post} og et væld af andre steder.

Link til videoen her:
<https://twitter.com/i/status/1580364662419312641>

Forhenværende kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard, som netop havde forladt Det Demokratiske Parti og kritiseret det for at have

omdannet sig til krigspartiet, optrådte i Fox' Jesse Waters show og opfordrede alle til at være "opmærksomme på, hvad disse to unge mænd ytrede... En af grundene til at jeg forlod Det Demokratiske Parti i dag er, at det har udviklet sig til krigshøgenes parti. Vi står bogstaveligt talt på randen af en atomkatastrofe. Man hører disse unge mænd erklære, at "alt andet er ligegyldigt, hvis vi alle bliver tilintetgjort i en atomkrig". "Tucker Carlson fulgte det op i Fox' næste udsendelse med gentagne henvisninger til interventionen mod AOC og sagde om Thistlethwaite og Vega, at "de er ægte progressive" – i modsætning til den bedrageriske og "neokonservative" AOC.

Det berygtede ukrainske "Center for Countering Disinformation" – hvis sortliste forsøgte at lukke Schiller Instituttets platforme – havde blot to dage tidligere ladet deres mareridt komme frem: At 50 % af republikanerne i USA nu var af den overbevisning, at USA havde sendt for mange våben af sted til Ukraine og var gået for vidt. Selv om det kun var en slags forvildet opfattelse fra CCD's side, er det et udtryk for de ikke-lineære processer, der er i bevægelse i USA og i verden. Som man siger, hvis selv Greta Thunberg, det grønne ikon, indrømmede, at de tyske atomkraftværker bør holdes åbne, kan foråret så være langt væk?

I denne tone, den asiatisk-centrerede organisation, Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), blev oprettet i Astana, Kasakhstan, efter 31 års virke som en lejlighedsvis diskussionsgruppe. Indien, Kina og Rusland står i spidsen for en liste af 28 lande med Asien som centrum...

En klar trompet har lydt. En ny generation af LaRouche-aktivister mødes på lørdag, sponsoreret af Schiller Instituttet. Der bliver ikke gjort ophold midt i forløbet. (https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/october_15_2022_conference_inperson)

Folketingskandidat Tom Gillesberg: Tør du stille kritiske spørgsmål? Eller holder du mund og mister både velfærd og risikerer atomkrig?

København den 8. oktober, 2022

Folketingskandidat Tom Gillesberg stiller op udenfor partierne i Københavns storkreds.

Er det Ruslands skyld, at Europa befinder sig midt i en energikrise, der truer familier med at måtte flytte fra hus og hjem?

Er det Ruslands skyld, at vi har en buldrende inflation, der ikke er set højere i 40 år, og som gør at det er svært for mange at få husholdningsbudgettet til at hænge sammen?

Er det udelukkende Ruslands skyld, at der er krig i Ukraine, som truer med at udvikle sig til en atomkrig?

Er det tilladt, at stille den slags spørgsmål, eller bliver man stemplet som landsforræder eller konspirationsfanatiker, hvis man forsøger at tænke selv i stedet for blot at gentage efterretningsapparatets, mediernes og etablisementets fortælling om, at det er Ruslands og Putin skyld det hele?

Skaber det fred og økonomisk sikkerhed, hvis vi bruger 20 milliarder eller mere om året her i Danmark på at mobilisere

for at føre krig imod Rusland?

Kan velfærdsstaten så overhovedet overleve?

Kunne det tænkes, at de kriser vi står med, ikke skyldes Rusland, Kina eller andre lignende fjendebilleder, men er resultatet af Vestens egen politik og beslutninger gennem mange år?

Er det så måske muligt at løse alle disse problemer, hvis vi finder ud af, hvad vi har gjort galt, og lægger politikken om, i stedet for at finde en sydebuk vi kan gøre ansvarlig for det hele?

Er der egentlig nogen, der har gjort dette, og som er kommet frem til den nye politik, som vi må iværksætte, der vil gøre det muligt, at vi kan leve gode spændende liv, uden at det sker på bekostning af andre lande eller befolkninger?

Svaret på det sidste spørgsmål er heldigvis »Ja«. Det er præcis, hvad jeg har forsøgt at gøre, når jeg gennem årene siden 2005 har stillet op til valg. Lige siden jeg i 2005 stillede op med en valgplakat, der advarede »Når boblen brister... Nyt Bretton Woods«, med en boble der var påskrevet Derivater, Boligpriser og Inflation.

Eller da jeg i 2007 skrev »Efter finanskrakket: Magnettog over Kattegat«, i 2011 advarede om »Glass/Steagall eller kaos!

Bankopdeling ikke hyperinflation«, i 2015 foreslog »Win-Win med BRIKS – ikke kollaps og krig«, i 2017 mente »Inden nyt finanskrak: København skal med i Den Nye Silkevej« og i 2019 opfordrede til »Helium-3 fra Månen til ubegrænset fusionsenergi på Jorden, samarbejde – ikke krig – med Rusland, Kina og USA«, for blot at nævne nogle.

I 40 år har jeg som aktivist i LaRouche-bevægelsen og aktiv i Schiller Instituttet brugt det meste af min tid på at beskæftige mig med disse store Spørgsmål, og sammen med mine

kolleger sørge for at finde ud af, hvad der egentlig sker i Verden, og hvad vi skal gøre ved det, hvis vi alle skal komme godt i mål. Det er ikke alt sammen enkelt og ligetil; der er meget, som man selv må undersøge, fordi det ikke er en del af den officielle fortælling. Men hvis man er indstillet på at tænke selv – og mange gange tænke ud af boksen – så er der altid løsninger. Hvis valget står mellem pest og kolera, så gør man klogt i at vælge noget helt tredje.

Hvis du selv har stillet nogle af de overstående spørgsmål, og er interesseret i, hvad jeg ville svare på dem, så følger her korte svar, som du kan få uddybet ved at læse på www.sive.dk og www.schillerinstitut.dk, eller ved at studere de mere dybtgående skrifter fra Lyndon LaRouche, der har været min politiske inspirationskilde.

Er det Ruslands skyld, at Europa befinder sig midt i en energikrise, der truer familier med at måtte flytte fra hus og hjem?

Den nuværende energikrise begyndte ikke den 24. februar 2022, da russiske tanks rykkede ind over Ukraines grænser. Den var allerede i gang lang tid før, som en konsekvens af EU's grønne omstilling, der har betydet, at en stor del af energiforsyningen fra kernekraft, kul og olie er blevet taget ud af drift og kun delvist erstattet af dyre og upålidelige energikilder som sol og vind (de leverer kun strøm når solen skinner, eller vinden blæser). Den billige russiske gas har så reddet situationen, men da EU derefter under pres fra USA lavede sanktioner imod russisk olie og gas, så brasede det skrøbelige korthus sammen.

Med en mangedobling af prisen på gas blev elektriciteten også mange gange så dyr. På kort sigt kunne en genoptagelse af import af olie og gas fra Rusland hjælpe på problemet (de, der sprængte Nord Stream i luften for at undgå dette, mislykkedes med at ødelægge et af de fire rør og de andre kan nok repareres), men den egentlige løsning er derudover atomkraft

på kortere sigt og fusionsenergi på den længere bane. Uden billig og rigelig elektricitet kan man ikke have et moderne velfærdssamfund.

Er det Ruslands skyld at vi har en buldrende inflation, der ikke er set højere i 40 år, og som gør, at det er svært for mange at få husholdningsbudgettet til at hænge sammen?

Allerede inden den 24. februar 2022 var inflationen løbet løbsk i USA og resten af den vestlige verden, og det kan blive værre endnu. De seneste årtiers omlægning af Vestens økonomi fra industrisamfund til forbrugersamfund, en neddrogning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og en styring af økonomien fra finansverdenen til gavn for finansiel spekulation gjorde, at situationen allerede var uholdbar i 2007-2008, da finanssystemet brød sammen og resulterede i en dyb finanskrisen. I Vesten valgte man at »løse« problemet gennem at sænke renten ned under nul, lade staterne overtage en stor del af den spekulative gæld, og pumpe enorme mængder gratis likviditet ind i finansmarkederne i form af »kvantitative lempelser«.

Nu, hvor denne politik langt om længe har sat sig i økonomierne, som en hastigt stigende inflation med stigende priser til følge, har man ikke andre modtræk inden for det nuværende system end at lade befolkningerne og velfærdssamfundet spænde livremmen ind. EU's forbud imod at købe billig russisk energi gør selvfølgelig ikke tingene bedre. Vi er nødt til at have et paradigmeskifte i den økonomiske politik, der har det almene vel som sit udgangspunkt og sætter menneskene først i stedet for finansverdenen. Det kan man kickstarte med gennemførelsen af LaRouches fire økonomiske love.

Er det udelukkende Ruslands skyld, at der er krig i Ukraine, som truer med at udvikle sig til en atomkrig?

Krigen i Ukraine begyndte ikke med »en uprovokeret russisk

aggression« den 24. februar 2022. Efter en langvarig forløber i form af den vedvarende udvidelse af NATO, efter at man garanterede Gorbatsjov, i forbindelse med den russiske accept af den tyske genforening i 1990, at man ikke ville flytte NATO's grænser så meget som en tomme imod øst, iværksatte USA et statskup i Ukraine i 2014, hvor man afsatte den folkevalgte præsident Janukovitsj og bragte væbnede grupper med stærke nazistiske rødder til magten. USA's viceudenrigsminister, Victoria Nuland, pralede med, at USA havde brugt fem milliarder dollars i støtte til NGO'er for at skabe dette skifte (læs det foretræde jeg havde sammen med Schiller Instituttet for Folketingets Udenrigsudvalg 18.marts 2014 på <https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=668>).

Da de to delstater Donetsk og Lughansk i det østlige Ukraine nægtede at acceptere dette og krævede udvidet lokalt selvstyre, begyndte otte års krig imod dem fra centralregeringen i Kiev. I løbet af de otte år blev USA og NATO en stadig større leverandør af våben og træning til Ukraines militær, og alle løfter om en fredelig løsning på konflikten (som f.eks. Minsk-aftalen) blev svigtet. Samtidig iværksatte Kiev en stadig mere kraftig afrussificering af Ukraine, hvor det sprog og den kultur, som flertallet af ukrainerne havde som deres indtil 2014, blev lagt for had og systematisk undertrykt. Da Rusland som en sidste udvej i december 2021 foreslog to traktater til USA og NATO, der bl.a. skulle forhindre, at Ukraine blev medlem af NATO, talte man for døve øren. Da Rusland kunne konstatere, at Ukraine i begyndelsen af 2022 uden indgreb fra Vesten forberedte en fornyet militær offensiv, så lod man de russiske tanks rulle ind over Ukraines grænser. Håbede Rusland på at deres militære operation kunne afløses af en hurtig politisk forhandlingsløsning og en fredsaftale?

Fredsforhandlingerne stoppede brat, da Storbritannien og USA forbød Ukraine at fortsætte dialogen med Rusland og i stedet lovede Ukraine, at man ville yde nærmest ubegrænset våbenhjælp

til kampen mod Rusland, hvis de blev ved med at kæmpe. Det er USA, Storbritannien og NATO, der har forhindret enhver form for fredsaftale indtil nu. Deres officielle politik er at lade soldater og civile dø, mens Ukraine forarmes, så krigen kan gøre maksimal skade på Rusland. Den dybe involvering fra NATO's side, i form af levering af våben, træning af ukrainske soldater i forskellige NATO-lande og aktiv involvering i planlægningen og udførelsen af militære operationer, gør at krigen allerede er en de facto krig mellem NATO og Rusland.

Det gør, at faren for det næste skridt på eskalationstrappen, brugen af atomvåben, som åbent diskuteres, er en reel mulighed. Faren for atomkrig er større end på noget tidspunkt siden Cuba-missilkrisen i 1962. Bliver bare et enkelt atomvåben først anvendt, er det næsten uundgåeligt, at hele det globale atomvåbenarsenal bliver affyret med ubeskriveligt frygtelige konsekvenser for menneskeheden. Derfor skal vi finde en fælles sikkerhedsløsning sammen med Rusland.

Er det tilladt at stille den slags spørgsmål, eller bliver man stemplet som landsforræder eller konspirationsfanatiker, hvis man forsøger at tænke selv i stedet for blot at gentage efterretningsapparatets, mediernes og etablisementets fortælling om, at det er Ruslands og Putins skyld det hele?

Det har det ikke været indtil nu. Man har haft travlt med at udskamme og isolere alle, der måtte rejse tvivl om den officielle fortælling. Vesten har samtidigt accepteret, at Ukraine udstiller og truer, hvad de kalder »informationsterrorister«, gennem sit Center for bekæmpelse af desinformation (Center for Countering Disinformation), der opererer i samarbejde med det amerikanske udenrigsministerium, det amerikanske forsvarsministerium, NATO og EU. På en offentliggjort liste over »personer, der støtter den russiske fortælling«, finder man øverst Schiller Instituttets internationale formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og andre med forbindelse til Schiller Instituttet (deriblandt tre fra Danmark), der har imødegået den officielle fortælling om, at

vi ukritisk skal levere våben og penge til Ukraine, så Ukraine kan fortsætte krigen imod Rusland, og fordi de arbejder for fred og en ny inkluderende sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle verdens nationer.

Ved et samråd for Folketingets Udenrigsudvalg den 19. august i år nægtede Danmarks udenrigsminister Jeppe Kofod at tage afstand fra denne ukrainske sortlistning, og har undladt at kræve af Ukraine, der modtager store mængder våben og penge fra Danmark, at denne sortlistning af personer, på grund af deres fremsatte meninger, skal ophøre. Derefter modtog Kofod få dage senere ved et besøg i Kiev en ukrainsk fortjenstmedalje.

Hvad er løsningen?

USA, Storbritannien og dets allierede må ophøre med at betragte Rusland, Kina og andre dele af verden som en trussel, fordi de nægter at indordne sig under en unipolær verdensorden, hvor USA og Storbritannien fastlægger reglerne efter eget forgodtbefindende og til egen fordel, uden tanke på de andre landes interesser. Vi må øjeblikkeligt stoppe støtten til krig imod Rusland i Ukraine, imod Kina i Taiwan og lignende vanvidsprojekter. I stedet bør vi i fællesskab etablere en international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, der tilgodeser alle landes sikkerhed og udvikling. Gennem samarbejde om projekter til fælles økonomisk fordel, som f.eks. den eksport af billig russisk gas til Vesteuropa, der begyndte under Den kolde Krig, og som har været et afgørende bidrag til den økonomiske velstand i EU, men som også var grundlag for samarbejde og fælles interesser, indtil USA, Storbritannien og NATO fik sat konfrontation og krig på dagsordenen i stedet.

På samme måde er Kinas Bælte- og Vej-Initiativ, der bygger infrastruktur og skaber økonomisk udvikling verden rundt, noget som vi alle bør deltage i til fælles fordel. Schiller Instituttet har brugt de seneste fire årtier på at finde ud

af, hvordan vi kan erstatte den nuværende kollapsende vestlige finansorden med et nyt paradigme, der med videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt gør det muligt for alle nationer og mennesker at realisere deres fulde potentiale. Læs mere om alt dette på www.sive.dk og www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Kontakt mig for at vide mere, og hvis du ønsker at hjælpe til.
53 57 00 51; info@sive.dk

Se Toms otte nye valgvideoer her: www.sive.dk

Video interview med Jens Jørgen Nielsen overfor truslen om atomkrig og opfordring til forhandlinger mellem Rusland og Ukraine

Den 3. okt. 2022 (EIRNS) – Der blev i dag foretaget et 42 minutters videointerview af Schiller Instituttet i Danmark med Jens Jørgen Nielsen.

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.

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.

Schiller Instituttet deltager i et DIIS seminar om atomkrig og nedrustning

KØBENHAVN, 27. september – Meget passende afholdt Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS) i dag et arrangement med titlen "Atomkrig og fremtidsudsigterne for atomnedrustning", og to organisatorer fra Schiller Instituttet deltog. Seminaret var hybridt, både med folk i lokalet og live via internettet.

Her er et link.

En folder med dagens ledende artikel af LaRouche-bevægelsens formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche: "Wake up or you may not be here next week", blev uddelt.

Det meste af seminaret og diskussionen handlede om udsigterne for atomnedrustning, men der var også henvisninger til den farlige situation mellem NATO-Ukraine og Rusland, hvor der er en åben diskussion om mulig anvendelse af atomvåben.

Under den første del af seminaret talte en britisk ekspert i nedrustning, hovedsagelig om nedrustning, men med hensyn til den aktuelle situation beskyldte han udelukkende den russiske part for at true med at gøre brug af atomvåben.

I begyndelsen af spørgerundens anden del spurgte ordstyreren, DIIS-forsker Rens van Munster, om Putins trussel om at bruge atomvåben, hvis den territoriale integritet trues, hvilket nu er blevet farligere efter folkeafstemningerne, og efter at USA har meddelt, at det vil medføre katastrofale konsekvenser. Er dette retorik, eller bringer det os tættere på en atomkrig?

Under den næste spørgerunde kunne en organisator fra Schiller Instituttet give en orientering om de vigtigste punkter i Helgas advarsel (ved 2 timer og 10 minutter): at den nuværende krise er værre end Cuba-krisen; at det er som to hurtige atomtog, der er på vej mod sammenstød, og at de kan kolliderede allerede i denne uge efter folkeafstemningen i det østlige Ukraine; at der også har været trusler om atomangreb og forebyggende atomangreb fra NATO's side; at russerne har den opfattelse, at Vesten er ude på at splitte Rusland; og at Helga har opfordret folk i Vesten til at tale åbent om faren og om behovet for forhandlinger af en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur. Hun rundede af med at spørge de fire paneldeltagere, hvad der kan gøres for at bringe os tilbage fra afgrunden?

Tom Sauer, en forsker i nedrustning fra Belgien svarede, at spørgsmål om nedrustning er langsigtede anliggender, men som

denne kvinde påpegede, med henvisning til organisatoren, har vi i denne uge et atomart problem i Ukraine. I Ukraine har vi en atomvåbenstat, der angriber en ikke-atomvåbenstat. Vil Putin bruge atomvåben? Det ved jeg ikke. Folk troede ikke på Putin, da han i 2008 advarede om, at hvis Ukraine ville tilslutte sig NATO, ville Rusland indtage Krim og det østlige Ukraine, eller før februar, at han ville bruge troppeopbygningen ved grænsen til at angribe, og jeg ved ikke, om han vil bruge atomvåben nu, men det er meget faretruende.

Den vigtigste udtalelse under hele arrangementet kom fra John Kierulf, pensioneret dansk diplomat fra Udenrigsministeriet i Danmark. I sine indledende bemærkninger fortalte han, at USA har en politik for et såkaldt atomart overrumplingsangreb [first strike]. Det er kun Kina, som ikke har det. Mod slutningen af seminaret opfordrede ordstyreren ham til at uddybe dette. Han citerede fra Daniel Ellsbergs bog, "The Doomsday Machine": Confessions of a Nuclear War Planner:

"Ligesom de bomber, der ødelagde Hiroshima og Nagasaki, ville ethvert fremtidigt angreb med et enkelt taktisk atomvåben i nærheden af et tætbeholdt område, dræbe titusinder til hundredtusinder af ikke-kampdeltagere, ligesom dengang. Derfor er nærmest en hvilken som helst trussel om første brug af et atomvåben en terrortrussel. Enhver nation, der fremsætter sådanne trusler, er en terrornation. Det omfatter USA og alle dets allierede [det omfatter os, tilføjede han], herunder Israel, sammen med Rusland, Pakistan og Nordkorea."

Kierulf tilføjede, at hvis den handling, som man vil udføre, er ulovlig, så er truslen også ulovlig. Vi har ikke brug for dem, da nutidens konventionelle våben kan udslette ethvert militært mål. Atomvåben er selvmord eller altødelæggende våben. Afskrækkelse har fejlet ved mange lejligheder.

Han sluttede med at citere fra en tale, som præsident Reagan holdt i 1984, som var rettet til den amerikanske kongres, om hvorfor atomvåben bør afskaffes:

“En atomkrig kan ikke vindes, og må aldrig udkæmpes. Atomvåben forårsager ubeskrivelige lidelser og drab på uskyldige civile. De er ulovlige i henhold til den humanitære folkeret og er en forbrydelse mod menneskeheden. De er ubrugelige som afskrækkelse. De koster milliarder af dollars og giver ingen sikkerhed. Tværtimod vil enhver brug af atomvåben ødelægge vores civilisation og natur. Det vil sige alt menneskeliv og alle levende arter.”

Rand Corporation og den amerikanske hær indledte Ukraine-operation i 2019 – Moon of Alabama, Caitlin Johnstone, Jimmy Dore m.fl.

Den 22. september 2019 (EIRNS) – Kritikere af det militærindustrielle kompleks har bemærket, at den igangværende konflikt i Ukraine, som kommer tættere og tættere på en nuklear konfrontation, ser ud til at have været en del af en planlægning, fremlagt i et 354-siders Rand Corporation-dokument, “Extending Russia: Competing from Advantageous Ground”, som den amerikanske hær har indgået kontrakt med, og som blev offentliggjort i 2019.

Moon of Alabama dækkede det, og podcaster Jimmy Dore blev tilskyndet af den australske blogger Caitlin Johnstone til at producere en kort udsendelse om dokumentet i går. Dore afslørede simpelthen, hvordan Ukraines militære operation, som er koordineret og betalt af den amerikanske regering og andre

NATO- og EU-institutioner, følger de anbefalinger, der gives i "Extending Russia", i hovedtræk med ringere resultater end forventet.

Det ser ud til, at Rand nu er blevet lidt flov over hele sagen og ønsker at flytte skylden fra dem, der har skrevet teksten, til dem, som har læst den. De har indsat en erklæring på deres hjemmesides introduktionsside, hvor der er anført: "Redaktørens bemærkning, september 2022: Vi opfordrer dig til at udforske denne rapport og den ledsagende forskningsrapport. Eftersom russiske enheder og personer, der sympatiserer med Putins beslutning om at invadere Ukraine, har misfortolket denne forskning i de seneste uger, tilskynder vi dig ligeledes til at udforske denne nyttige ressource om Ruslands tilgang til propaganda med 'brandslukning af løgn' og vores forskning om begrebet 'sandhedsforfald', som er et fænomen, der til dels skyldes spredningen af desinformation."

Dores indledende citat er Rands forklaring om, at de søgte efter "muligheder, der afslører omkostninger, som kunne skabe ubalance og overbelaste Rusland." Man tilføjede, at resultatet ville være "ideelt set større byrder end dem, der ville blive tilføjet USA for at forfølge disse muligheder", og "Indførelse af mere indgribende handels- og finansielle sanktioner ville ... sandsynligvis nedbryde den russiske økonomi, især hvis sanktionerne er omfattende og multilaterale. Således vil deres effektivitet afhænge af andre landes vilje til at deltage i en sådan proces. Men sanktioner er forbundet med omkostninger og, afhængigt af deres strenghed, betydelige risici." Rand tog fejl i deres prognose af den skade, som Rusland blev forvoldt.

Rand fortsatte med at rådgive om, hvordan man skulle overveje "dødbringende støtte til Ukraine", som kunne "fremprovokere en meget bredere konflikt, hvor Rusland på grund af sin geografiske nærhed ville have betydelige fordele."

Dore fortsatte i yderligere ti minutter med at belyse Rand-anbefalingerne, med advarsler angående deres gennemførlighed.

De overvejelser, som blev behandlet, omfattede positionering af bombefly, jagerfly inden for rækkevidde af Rusland og taktiske atomvåben i Europa og Asien”, for at “lokke Rusland ud i et dyrt våbenkapløb ved at bryde ud af ordningen om atomvåbenkontrol”.

Kort sagt var Rand-rapporten tæt pakket med råd om at forsøge en række udstationeringer, hvoraf mange kunne udløse russiske kontraindsatser eller modangreb med en umådelig destruktiv kapacitet. Adskillige af de muligheder, der blev undersøgt, minder meget om det der rent faktisk er sket, og som kulminerede i præsident Putins trussel om at gengælde kraftige eller nukleare trusler på lignende vis.

Dore's

udsendelse: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oVjPh-8JMJQ>.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21. september 2022: Krig eller fred? Økonomisk kollaps eller udvikling? LaRouche og Tom Gillesberg har løsningerne

Med Tom Gillesberg, formand og folketingskandidat udenfor partierne i Københavns storkreds.

Rapport fra Panel 3: “Præsentation af ‘LaRouche- biblioteket’: LaRouche i dialog med verdens nationer”

Den 11. september 2022 (EIRNS) – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, en af de stiftende direktører for LaRouche Legacy Foundation (LLF), indledte mødet i panelet ved at præsentere en oversigt over LaRouches samlede værker og gav udtryk for, hvor stolt og glad hun var for at kunne annoncere åbningen af det digitale bibliotek med LaRouches værker, der spænder fra tusindvis af artikler, bøger og videoer til hundredvis af møder og præsentationer.

Hun berettede, hvorledes hun og Lyn besøgte over 40 lande gennem adskillige årtier; mødtes med mange stats- og regeringschefer angående en række forskellige emner, såvel som med et publikum, der repræsenterede fiskere, videnskabsmænd, landmænd, musikere og mange andre samfundslag.

Hun understregede desuden, at det som oligarkerne frygtede mest ved LaRouche ikke udelukkende var dybden og bredden af hans vidensniveau, men at han også var i stand til at vække fornuftens kreative kræfter hos medmennesker.

Dernæst var der en 82 minutter lang video med uddrag af præsentationer, som LaRouche havde gennemført for flere nationer – Peru (25. februar 2000), Polen (24. maj 2001), Indien (1. december 2003), et seminar om Kina (22. oktober 1997), Rusland (26. april 1996), Brasilien (12. juni 2002) og De forenede arabiske Emirater (2. juni 2002). De enkelte præsentationer indledtes med et universelt princip eller et

strategisk overblik, og behandlede derefter de økonomiske og kulturelle problemer i den nation, som han italesatte i en global kontekst, idet han altid indarbejdede dybereliggende begreber, såsom "agapē", der understreger det menneskelige sinds kreative kræfter til at udvikle løsninger på de kriser, som civilisationen står over for.

John Sigerson, der er medlem af LLF's rådgivende udvalg, foretog en grundig rundvisning i det nye digitale LaRouche-bibliotek [<https://larouchelibrary.org/>] i dets indledende udgave. Han delte sit eget skærbillede og understregede, at selv med de hundredvis af emner, der allerede er i systemet, repræsenterer det endnu kun en beskedent del af det, der mangler at blive gennemgået, bearbejdet og uploadet. Der er adskillige værktøjer og filtre, hvormed man kan foretage en meget finmasket søgning efter bestemte emner. Dokumenterne, videoerne og andre elementer er organiseret kronologisk, og han opfordrede læserne til at studere LaRouche på samme måde, som den store dirigent Wilhelm Furtwängler dirigerede musikken – "mellem ordene". Alle emner er tilgængelige og kan frit downloades til personlig brug.

Afslutningsvis meddelte Gretchen Small, formand for LLF, at bind II af LaRouches {Collected Works} snart vil være klar til udgivelse. Dette bind vil fokusere på LaRouches kulturelle bidrag. Hun understregede, at kultur – musik, poesi og kunst – ikke blot er "underholdning", men at studiet af klassisk kultur faktisk er afgørende for videnskabelige gennembrud.