

Schiller Instituttets diplomatiske seminar i København: Stop drabene, genopbyg Gaza og regionen med 'Oase-planen'

af Michelle Rasmussen og Marcia Merry Baker

9. maj – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark afholdt den 8. maj et seminar i København for det diplomatiske samfund og andre gæster med temaet "Stopdrabene og begynd at genopbygge Gaza og regionen med Oase-planen: LaRouche-løsningen for fred gennem udvikling." Fire ambassadører og mange andre diplomater kom personligt fra tolv ambassader, som repræsenterede Sydvestasien og Nordafrika, nationer andre steder i Asien og Afrika samt Vesteuropa.

Publikum var intenst engageret i løbet af de tre timer, hvor de hørte de spændende præsentationer og deltog i dialogen, hvis fokus både var at bidrage til en øjeblikkelig afslutning på død og ødelæggelse i Gaza og at skitsere en udviklingsvej.

Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, var ordstyrer og fremhævede Schiller Instituttets aktuelle indsats i mange lande for at fremme dialogen om begrebet "fred gennem udvikling" i Palæstina, Israel og globalt for at bidrage til en ny økonomisk og sikkerhedsmæssig verdensarkitektur.

Den 13. april afholdt Schiller Instituttet internationalt en daglang online-konference, som nu er tilgængelig i videoarkiv, med titlen "[Oase]-planen: LaRouche-løsningen for fred gennem udvikling mellem Israel og Palæstina og for hele Sydvestasien." Siden februar har en 14-minutters

video cirkuleret om "Oase-planen".

Kort fortalt går konceptet ud på, at udvikling af infrastruktur til at levere pålideligt vand, strøm, transport, sundhedspleje, boliger og andre basale ting til støtte for moderne agroindustriel aktivitet er grundlaget for sikkerhed af gensidig interesse. I Trans-Jordan indebærer det opførelse af nye vandledninger og nuklear afsaltning, nye højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer, der forbinder Afrika, Asien og Europa, rigelig elektricitet og meget mere.

I 1975 præsenterede statsmanden og økonomen Lyndon LaRouche (1922-2019) denne tilgang som "Oase-planen" for Sydvestasien, da han besøgte regionen, og samme år udsendte han også sit forslag til finansiering af "Den Internationale Udviklingsbank".

Schiller Instituttets invitation til hele det diplomatiske samfund i København opfordrede til diskussion af et nyt paradigme i denne ånd:

"Død, ødelæggelse og sult er blevet brugt som krigsvåben; økonomisk udvikling skal bruges som et fredsvåben: til at forvandle sværd til plovskær. Vi må alle handle nu for at stoppe drabene og starte genopbygningen.

Schiller Instituttets seminar i København vil være et vigtigt bidrag til dialogen om, hvordan vi kan bringe fred og velstand til denne lange lidende del af verden og indlede et nyt paradigme for internationale relationer."

Et videoarkiv på engelsk fra arrangementet den 8. maj i København er tilgængeligt her.

Talere: Fred gennem udvikling

De tre hovedpræsentationer begyndte med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, via videolink fra Tyskland. Hun er grundlægger og leder af Schiller Instituttet og har i årtier samarbejdet med sin mand, Lyndon LaRouche (1922-2019), om udviklingsdiplomati.

Den anden var H.E. Ambassadør Prof. Dr. Manuel Hassassian, Den

Palæstinensiske Myndigheds ambassadør i Danmark. Disse to fortsatte i dialog deres udvekslinger, der blev indledt på den tidligere internationale Schiller Institut-konference den 13. april, herunder om det presserendespørgsmål om, hvorvidt "politiske" forskelle skal løses, før "økonomisk" udvikling kan gennemføres.

Den tredje taler var Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, som er medforfatter til Schiller Instituttets bog fra 2017: *Extending the New Silk Road to Southwest Asia and Africa*, og har lavet den arabiske oversættelse af EIR-bogen: *The New Silk Road Becomes the WorldLand-Bridge*.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche begyndte sin præsentation med titlen: "Oase-planen: Fred kan kun opnås gennem udvikling" med de forfærdelige nyheder om starten på det israelske angreb på Rafah. Hun gav en global strategisk analyse af faren for regional og global krigsførelse og beskrev truslen om endog atomkrig fra optrapningen i Sydvestasien og som en udløber af NATO-Ukraine-Rusland-konflikten.

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede diplomaterne til at samarbejde om at fremme "Oase-planen" som en løftestang for at nå frem til et nyt paradigme og en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, den eneste vej ud af den eksistentielle krise, som verden gennemgår. Hun beskrev sine ti principper for en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som hun udsendte til international diskussion i 2022.

Stop drabene, begynd genopbygningen

H.E. Amb. Prof. Dr. Hassassian talte om temaet "Stop drabene og start genopbygningen". Han holdt en meget skarp tale om den igangværende tragedie for det palæstinensiske folk, konfliktens historie og hvad der er nødvendigt for at stoppe folkedrabet. Ambassadøren opfordrede de 12 lande, der var repræsenteret på seminaret, og det internationale samfund til at handle for at stoppe drabene, og han understregede behovet

for en politisk løsning baseret på palæstinensisk suverænitet og understøttet af økonomisk udvikling. Diskussionen omfattede spørgsmålet om en to-statsløsning for Israel og Palæstina og, hvordan man kan sætte Oase-planen på den internationale dagsorden.

Ambassadør Hassassian taler ud fra lang erfaring og engagement. Han er tidligere ambassadør i Storbritannien og Ungarn. Han var vicepræsident for Bethlehem University på Vestbredden og professor ved University of Maryland, hvor han udviklede et kursus i konfliktløsning mellem Israel og Palæstina. Han var PLO's chefrådgiver i spørgsmålet om Jerusalems status. Han har en kandidatgrad i internationale relationer fra University of Toledo, Ohio, og en ph.d. i statskundskab fra University of Cincinnati, Ohio. Se hans interview den 15. marts 2024 med Schiller Institutet.

LaRouches Oase-plan

Hussein Askary præsenterede konkrete områder af den økonomiske geografi og udviklingsprincipperne i Oase-planens tilgang under emnet "Det umulige er selvpålagt: Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling er den eneste vej frem i Vestasien." Han udfordrede især aksiomerne bag nulvækstbevægelsen og dens politiske udtryk. Han forklarede, at udviklingsprincipper er baseret på den virkelighed, at menneskehedens kreativitet forvandler naturen.

Askary brugte eksempler fra sin nylige rejse til Xinjiang for at vise den kinesiske udviklingspolitik for at gøre ørkenen grøn. I diskussionsperioderne kom der mange forskellige spørgsmål op, bl.a. om der er for mange mennesker i verden, og hvad man skal gøre ved terrorisme i Vestafrika, hvor han understregede behovet for økonomisk udvikling som en modgift.

At fremme en global Oase-plan

I løbet af diskussionsperioden besvarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche et spørgsmål, der kom op ved at appellere til det Globale Syd om at lade deres stemmer blive hørt.

Et konkret forslag blandt debattørerne er, at Oase-planen skal være på dagsordenen på nogle af de symposier om sikkerhed, der hvert år afholdes af fonde og nationer. Palæstinensiske stemmer kunne formelt anmode om dette. H.E. Ambassadør Prof. Dr. Hassassian tilføjede at få diskussionen i gang på universiteterne og understregede vigtigheden af Oase-planen som en katalysator for økonomisk udvikling og Schiller Instituttets og LaRouche-bevægelsens arbejde med at fremme den.

Den generelle reaktion på selve seminaret fra diplomaterne var, at de var taknemmelige for idéerne, som er meget forskellige fra det, der rutinemæssigt præsenteres. Som en asiatisk diplomat sagde: "Jeg er helt overvældet. Det vil tage mig dage at tænke over alle de nye ideer, der blev præsenteret."

Den umiddelbare mulighed for at udtale sig på en formel internationalplatform kommer kun to dage efter mødet i København, hvor FN's Generalforsamling den 10. maj har spørgsmålet om en palæstinensisk stat på dagsordenen til debat og formodentlig afstemning.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche rapporterede til Den Internationale Fredskoalition: "Det var et ekstremt vigtigt opfølgingsmøde på diplomat- og ambassadør niveau, og ud af dette møde kom en fuldstændig forpligtelse til at fortsætte organiseringen, løfte den op på et højere niveau ved at forsøge at få en stor international konference med deltagelse af stater om behovet for alvor at sætte Oase-planen, udviklingsplanen for hele regionen Sydvestasien, på dagsordenen."

**POLITISK ORIENTERING med
formand Tom Gillesberg den 3.
april 2024:**

**Vestens “regelbaserede
verdensorden” afsløret:
Folke drab og brud på
international lov**

**Schiller Instituttets video-
interview med Palæstinas
Ambassadør til Danmark
H.E. Prof. Dr. Manuel
Hassassian den 13. marts 2024**

Interviewet af Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller
Instituttet i Danmark, den 13. marts 2024.

H.E. Ambassadør Prof. Dr. Manuel Hassassian har haft en anset
karriere inden for den akademiske og diplomatiske sfære. Hans
akademiske ekspertise er inden for internationale relationer
og konfliktløsning. Han er uddannet i Jerusalem, på American
University i Beirut, og har opnået sin MA i internationale
relationer og PhD i statskundskab på Toledo og Cincinnati

universiteter i Ohio i USA. Han var professor og til sidst Executive Vice President på Bethlehem University på Vestbredden i Palæstina. Han underviste i konfliktløsning mellem Israel og Palæstina sammen med den israelske professor Edward Kaufman på universitetet i Maryland i 26 år.

Han var også PLO's førende rådgiver i spørgsmålet om Jerusalems status.

H.E. Ambassadør Prof. Dr. Manuel Hassassian blev derefter Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyres ambassadør i Storbritannien i 13 år, Ungarn i et år og senest Danmark i de sidste fire år.

Ambassadørens artikler i Palestine-Israel Journal: <https://www.pij.org/author/326> Mere omfattende CV: <http://passia.org/personalities/351>

Interviewet dækker mange områder, herunder især det påtrængende behov for at stoppe det nuværende folkemord i Gaza og volden og undertrykkelsen på Vestbredden, og fordømmer de vestlige politiske leders manglende støtte til at stoppe krigen; behovet for anerkendelse i FN og internationalt af en uafhængig palæstinensisk stat, og hvad det vil kræve i Israel at nå dertil; hans støtte til LaRouche-organisationens video "Oase-planen: LaRouches løsning på Mellemøsten" og ideen om fred gennem økonomisk udvikling for Israel og Palæstina; om hans kursus i israelsk-palæstinensisk konfliktløsning på University of Maryland; og hans varme lovprisning af Schiller Instituttet.

Se den 14 min. lange video: The Oasis Plan – LaRouche's Solution for the Middle East fra LaRouche Organization:

Engelsk: <https://youtu.be/hjffHIiXPmE>

Arabiske undertekster: https://youtu.be/551_XoiKUHA

Tilmeld dig Schiller Instituttets gratis online-konference lørdag den 13. april 2024 kl. 11 EDT; 17 dansk tid: Oase-planen: LaRouches løsning for fred gennem udvikling mellem Israel og Palæstina og for hele

Sydvestasien: <https://schillerinstitute.nationbuild...>

Kontakt: Palæstinensisk Mission i Danmark: +45 33 93 22 39; www.infopalestine.dk; info@infopalestine.dk

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark: +45 53 57 00 51; si@schillerinstitut.dk

Schiller Instituttets hjemmesider:

Engelsk: www.schillerinstitute.com

Dansk: www.schillerinstitut.dk

Arabisk: <https://t.me/larouchearabic>

NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR- FEBRUAR 2024:

Danmark har pligt til at forhindre Israels folkedrab

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 4. januar 2024 med formand Tom

Gillesberg:

Danmark skal ikke være vasal til USA men en fri nation, som samarbejder med BRIKS+ og andre nationer

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, your 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 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 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.

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

Danmark?

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

Folketingskandidat Tom Gillesberg: mærkesager

Stop NATO's krige:

Verden er ikke blevet et bedre sted, fordi Danmark har deltaget i NATO's mange krige. Det er ikke kun dyrt for os, men endnu dyrere for de lande, som Afghanistan og Irak, der bliver efterladt i ruiner. Nu er man i gang med det samme i Ukraine, hvor ukrainere fortsætter med at dø, fordi vi synes de skal skade Rusland mest muligt. I stedet for at sende våben til Ukraine skal vi støtte fredsforhandlinger, hvor man fjerner enhver militær tilstedeværelse fra NATO og sikrer fred og samarbejde mellem Ukraine og Rusland. Vi skal også have en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsorden, der gælder for alle nationer.

Fred gennem udvikling – Samarbejde med Kina og Rusland og resten af verden:

Vi skal skabe fred gennem samarbejde med Rusland, Kina og resten af verden om at løse de meget store udfordringer, som vi har. Det gælder bl.a. den globale finansielle og økonomiske nedsmeltning på grund af finansiell spekulation, hvor vi har tilladt private finansielle interesser at tage styringen, i stedet for at sætte befolkningernes ve og vel først. Vi skal øge velstanden gennem opbygningen af moderne infrastrukturforbindelser og udviklingskorridorer (inkl.

højhastighedstog og magnettog) og ved at gøre videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt tilgængeligt for alle.

Stop finansspekulation og red økonomien med LaRouches fire love:

Den nuværende finansielle og økonomiske krise, som jeg og Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om i mange år, kan løses ved hjælp af LaRouches fire økonomiske love: 1) En Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, 2) Kreditskabelse til nationalt vigtige projekter gennem Nationalbanken, 3) Store infrastrukturprojekter som Kattegatbro og et dansk magnettoget, 4) Rumfart og fusionsenergi.

Andre mærkesager: Danske infrastrukturprojekter; Atomkraft og fusionsenergi, Ja tak!; For en ny klassisk kultur-renæssance; Lær den amerikanske økonom og statsmand Lyndon LaRouche (1922-2019) at kende.

Kontakt mig for at vide mere, og hvis du ønsker at hjælpe til:

53 57 00 51; info@sive.dk

Se Toms 10 nye valgvideoer og mere på www.sive.dk

Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg stiller op til valg udenfor partierne i

Københavns storkreds

Her er Toms 2 min. valgvideo.

Se de otte andre kampagne 2022 videoer og skriftlige materiale på www.sive.dk



EIR artikel: Dansk udenrigsminister udspurgt i Folketinget om Ukraines sortliste. af Michelle Rasmussen

Følgende artikel blev bragt i Executive Intelligence Review vol. 49, nr. 35 den 9. september 2022.

Her kan man abonnere på EIR tidsskrift.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

English translation: Excerpts

from the Danish parliament's Ukraine list consultation with Foreign Minister Jeppe Kofod

Consultation in the Danish parliament on August 19, 2022
Danish Foreign Minister Jeppe Kofod About the Ukraine
Blacklist, Which Includes Three Experts in Denmark

(The video, in Danish, and the full transcript, in Danish, may
be seen here.)

Translated Excerpts in English

Member of Parliament Marie Krarup (independent): My reason for raising the question is that I think it is a serious matter, because this Centre to Counter Disinformation – the centre that has made the list of 72 foreigners outside Ukraine – belongs to the Security Council of Ukraine, and the same day that this list was published, the leader, Andrei Shapovalov, said that the people who are spreading disinformation are “information terrorists,” and they must be held accountable as “war criminals.” Zelensky’s adviser Mikhail Podolok has elaborated these views, in interviews and an article in which he calls on other governments to limit the influence of these people and for them to be subjected to what he called “military cleansing”.

I am therefore, of course, interested to hear whether the Foreign Minister has taken the initiative to carry out a “military cleansing” of Associate Professor Jens Jørgen Nielsen, peace researcher, Jan Øberg, and Professor in International Politics at Aalborg University Li Xing?

Or has the Foreign Minister made approaches to Ukraine to have these persons removed from the list? Or does the Foreign Minister still believe that we are supporting freedom of expression and democracy by supporting Ukraine? Thank you.

Minister for Foreign Affairs Jeppe Kofod (Social Democrat):
Yes, thank you for that. And thank you to Mrs. Marie Krarup for convening the consultation today.

Putin's war of aggression in Ukraine means that we in Denmark and in Europe can no longer take our freedom and our security for granted. Disinformation, lies and propaganda are an integral part of Russian warfare and attempts to undermine the unity of the West. And as a world community, we must therefore continually consider how to respond, with respect for freedom of expression, and our fundamental democratic rights.

The Centre for Combating Disinformation, under Ukraine's National Security and Defence Council, has published a list of speakers who "promote narratives consistent with Russian propaganda." However, the list, which includes four [sic: three] people linked to Denmark, is no longer available on the website.

In addition to the consultation today, the list has attracted considerable coverage in the Danish press, where it was received with astonishment and concern. There are concerns about the criteria for inclusion on the list, and about the use of such a list to silence voices in the debate with whom one disagrees.

I have therefore also asked the Danish embassy in Kiev to contact the Ukrainian authorities to seek clarification of the activities of the Centre for Combating Disinformation.

In this context, we from the Danish side will support the fight against disinformation, which is an essential element in Russia's warfare against Ukraine.

At the same time, we will underline the Danish position, as is well known, that the fight against disinformation should contribute to strengthening, not undermining, democracy, research and freedom of expression.

When I have a response from the Ukrainian authorities, I will be happy to return to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. And until then, I would like to take the opportunity to make the government's policy absolutely clear:

We must stand firm that research and freedom of expression are important democratic values for the Danish government, there should be no doubt about that.

Next, I would argue that Ukraine is threatened in its very existence. Putin has set out to destroy an entire country, a democracy, in fact, deny Ukraine's legitimacy at all.

I think most people can understand that the fundamental principles may well come under pressure in such a situation....

[Foreign Minister Jeppe Kofod continued his initial remarks by outlining Denmark's position on the need to support Ukraine in the war with Russia.]

Marie Krarup: Thank you for the answer. So that basically means that what the foreign minister has done, is to ask the Danish embassy in Kiev to get in touch with the Ukrainian authorities to seek clarification on the activities of the Center for Fighting Russian Disinformation in Ukraine...

That means that contact has been made with the Danish Embassy in Kiev to do something which they always ought to do. I have worked in an embassy myself, and I know how things work there. If there is something going on, in relation to Denmark, then it is obvious that it is the embassy's obligation to immediately get a clarification of what is going on.

That is what the Foreign Minister has done, about a month after three law-abiding Danish researchers were put on a list in which they were called "information terrorists" and they are indirectly threatened with being brought before a war crimes tribunal.

These are researchers who use the quite ordinary Danish freedom of expression to say quite ordinary and banal things, such as one of them has said, "Western sanctions against Russia are not working." Then you are added to a list where you are indirectly threatened as a war criminal. And so, the Foreign Minister, in the month that has passed since the three Danish nationals were put on this nasty list, the Danish Foreign Minister has asked the Danish Embassy in Kiev to do its duty?

I think that is a very poor response to the quite unbelievably gross situation that three Danish researchers are being prevented from carrying out perfectly legal research activities because they now have to live with threats hanging

over their heads.

Has the Foreign Minister contacted the police and asked them to ensure that the three researchers' safety is guaranteed?

Jeppe Kofod: I'm afraid I have to, unfortunately, correct Mrs. Marie Krarup. The Danish Embassy HAS contacted the Ukrainian authorities, so it is not the case that I have asked the Embassy to contact them. They have contacted them. And we are awaiting the reply from the Ukrainian authorities. And in that context, the contact that the Danish Embassy has made, the Danish Embassy has also expressed concern about the list, which, by the way, has been taken down, as I understand it. And then, just in relation to the CCD, according to what I have been told, it is the acting leader of this center who is quoted as putting forward the idea that the information space could be protected from disinformation by means of a new law which would allow the prosecution of disseminators of disinformation as war criminals – that is what I think Marie Krarup has referred to. It is said to have been put forward at a round table discussion, with the support of the U.S. Department of State, organised by the National Security Service Academy, the Civilian Research and Development Foundation of the U.S., the International Academy of Information, and the coordination platform the National Security Cluster. We were not present at this roundtable. But there is nothing immediately indicating that the statement is about individuals on the list we are discussing today.

As mentioned, and I would like to stress this, I have asked the Danish Embassy to investigate the statement further, and get an explanation from the Ukrainian authorities about how they will ensure, and I hope that Mrs. Marie Krarup agrees with me, concern for freedom of expression, freedom of research and democracy with such a law.

Once the Ukrainian authorities have given their statement, I will ensure that this committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is informed. And I think it is important that we hear the Ukrainian authorities' explanation. Also in a situation where there is a lot of misinformation out there...

.....

Excerpt 2:

Marie Krarup: How can the Foreign Minister accept that three law-abiding Danish scientists were put on a list to scare people and make them stop. How can the Foreign Minister accept that?

And, by the way, I must dispute the fact that these answers from the head of the CCD and President Zelensky's adviser, Mr. Podolok, were not referencing this list. There is a very clear statement that there IS reference to this list, calling on governments to carry out what has been called 'military lustration,' which I think should be translated as 'cleansing', or to impose sanctions on them. So, will the Foreign Minister follow the call of President Zelensky's adviser to put these three perfectly law-abiding scientists: a professor at Aalborg University, a lecturer elsewhere, and a peace researcher, will the Foreign Minister follow the call of President Zelensky's adviser to make sure that these three people can no longer speak freely?...

Excerpt 3:

Jeppe Kofod: ... So I think it's really a slightly skewed debate. There should be a lot more focus on what Russia is up to at the moment. With cyber attacks, disinformation, misinformation, as an attempt to destroy our way of life. I

hope that Mrs Marie Krarup will also be concerned about that.

Marie Krarup: Thank you. I would be very happy to organise a new meeting to talk about combating Russian disinformation, because of course we must counter any kind of lies, of course we must counter any kind of restrictions on freedom of expression – that is absolutely clear, I will do that at any time!

Now, what we are dealing with here is three Danes, perfectly law-abiding debaters, who have been put on a list as an indirect threat to their security. It is an attempt to silence them. Because they make perfectly legal and almost boring statements, such as that the Western sanctions against Russia are not working. Should it be a criminal act to say that? It is true that the list is not available right now. Thank goodness.

That might suggest that Ukraine's government has figured out that making such a nasty list is shooting itself in the foot. Because it is obviously not an expression of freedom of speech and democracy to put people in the stocks and start behaving like the neighbouring country. Because what is the point of us restricting freedom of expression in Denmark and restricting freedom of expression in Ukraine, and thereby coming to resemble Russia, where freedom of expression is restricted to such an extent. Are we going to turn our countries into tyrannies?

No, we must not! We must fight it! But the list exists! There are clever people who had it printed out as soon as it was

available. And here it is. And I'd gladly pass it on. There are many ordinary sensible scientists listed here who are in no way breaking the law with their research. Highly recognized and respected professors, for example, John Mearsheimer, who has been very active in this debate and, of course, has said nothing at all illegal. Has not incited hatred, or violence, or anything, whatsoever. Perfectly legal speech. And that's what this is all about. We can have many other consultations, about everything else, but right now it's a consultation about what to do to ensure the freedom of expression of Danish debaters in Denmark?

And what has the Foreign Minister done to investigate what is going on? Does the Foreign Minister think that it is supporting democracy and freedom of expression, to support a government that is asking us to sanction Danish researchers in Denmark? And to be interested in what my opinions or feelings are in other contexts – is just not within the subject of this consultation. I think that something terrible is happening in Ukraine, absolutely terrible, and I want this war to stop. I think it's a crime that Russia has invaded, that's just not what it's about right now. Right now, it is about the fact that the Ukrainian government, which the Danish government supports, is calling for the Danish government to sanction Danish researchers and restrict their freedom of expression.

And I have not received any answer from the Foreign Minister, except something about perhaps the embassy being asked to do its job, or is the embassy just doing it by itself? There is simply no public statement to the effect that we cannot vouch for this. It may be that the next arms shipment will be delayed because we do not think it is OK for a professor of international politics at Aalborg University – he is being criminalised for saying that Western sanctions are not working

against Russia. I have not heard the Foreign Minister express any criticism; I would very much like to hear the Foreign Minister do so here. Is it OK for Ukraine to encourage us to sanction perfectly law-abiding researchers in Denmark?

Excerpt 4:

Jeppe Kofod: Now Russia has started a war of conquest, illegal war of conquest in the country, and there we have to respond again, and defend the Ukrainians. And therefore, there can not be, in any way, as Mrs. Marie Krarup spoke about, talk about our arms donations. The arms donations that we are giving to Ukrainians, for their defense fight, we will continue to do that, and we are working very hard for others to contribute as well, so that we can ensure Ukrainians that they can live without Russian invasion.

They must win, the Ukrainians, and the fact that they must be able to win requires us to continue with our arms supplies, which we certainly intend to do, irrespective of what Mrs. Marie Krarup mentions here.

Christian Juhl (Unity Party): I have put my name on the list. I would like to hear from the minister. We are friends of Ukraine, we support them in this terrible situation. And I think in my time, since February 24, I have spent thousands of hours defending Ukraine, but also spent, about ten minutes, or fifteen minutes looking at the allegations that have been made that Ukraine, in the harsh situation, is actually also at risk of violating some of the basic rules that we think belong in a democratic society. It is also our duty as politicians and ministers to try to see the nuances of the situation. Even if it is serious. So that the foundation stone of the democracy which is to be developed further after the war and after the Russians have withdrawn their troops, must develop. We will have at least as great a task to help with that, in my opinion. Reconstruction, development of the country, etc.

I would like to ask two questions there. When we are friends with Ukraine, it is also important that we are honest friends. Real friends are honest friends, right?

That means that if we find something incomprehensible, we tell each other. Just as I think the ministers who have visited from Ukraine have done to us. They have been very clear when we were foot-dragging, and cut through: This is not what we are talking about, we don't need friendly words, we need weapons, they say, for example in the meetings. These are honest friends who say such things to their partners. Does the minister think that there can be arguments for restricting freedom of speech in an extreme situation, like the one Ukraine is in at the moment, and it would be legal, in the minister's opinion, for Ukraine to say, we cannot afford to have freedom of speech here?

Or, for example, it has been debated in the media lately that they are preparing an anti-union law in Ukraine, there are a number of European trade unions and individuals who have protested violently against that because, what does that have to do with the war? Because that is a fundamental principle that we also support. So a question: can there be a situation where you have to give up freedom of expression in such an extreme situation as Ukraine is in, during the occupation. In the minister's opinion?

That's the one. The other one is: can the minister confirm that we are indeed, monitoring the laws of war on both sides? And that we actually believe that everybody should abide by the laws of war, including occupied countries. Because that forms the basis for things not escalating into a completely crazy situation. Or is this also a place where we have to say that it is only one side that has to respect the laws of war.

I only ask because I think it is important that we have some

universal approaches to some of these things.

The last question is a Danish question. I would like to know whether the Minister believes that the three researchers have used blatant propaganda and disinformation, or that the Minister suspects that the three have done so? It is a little because we might as well play it over on the Danish court straight away. If they haven't done it, then we should defend them, in my opinion. If they have done it, then we need to have it on the table. And then we must know, where does this conflict with Danish law.

[op cut begin]

Marie Krarup: Thank you. It's not strange to abolish freedom of speech in a country that's at war. And I have the impression that that's pretty much what they've done in Ukraine. What is strange is that we say that we are defending democracy when we support a country that is asking us to abolish freedom of expression in our own country.

THAT is where I think the problem is. To be handed a list with three Danes on it and be asked by the head of the Center [for Combating Disinformation] and Zelensky's adviser to sanction them. And when the minister claims that there is nothing to suggest that this is what happened, then I must refer to the statements that the head of the Center, Shapovalov, made, on July 14, about people who spread disinformation, they are information terrorists, and they must face a war crimes tribunal. And something similar was written by the same person in Ukraine's Pravda on 2 August.

And Zelensky's adviser, Podolok, said on August 5 about the people on the list that they are calling for them to be sanctioned by other governments, their influence to be limited, and then they are to be subjected to this 'military purge', which I don't quite know what that means.

So that's what is a call for us, in our country, to put

restrictions on perfectly legal Danish researchers' freedom of expression. THAT's what I'm asking the minister to address. I am surprised that the Minister has not somehow said to Ukraine, because, as was said earlier, if you are friends, then you are, of course, honest friends. And if we are to help Ukraine become a democracy, as I certainly think we should, then freedom of speech is part of that.

And it may well be that they cannot have it now, in the current war situation, I actually understand that, in their own country, but the fact that they are calling for us, in Denmark, to abolish freedom of expression, in certain areas, is not good. We should therefore say to Ukraine that you have to stop that. You have to take our people off the list. We will not sanction our researchers. We do not think that it is Russian disinformation or an illegal statement to say that "Western sanctions against Russia are not working," as a professor of international politics from Aalborg University has said.

Does the minister think that's an illegal statement? Or that it is spreading Russian propaganda to say that Western sanctions against Russia do not work?

[op cut end]

Excerpt 5:

Jeppe Kofod: 1. Ukraine has not asked us to abolish freedom of expression in Denmark, as has been claimed, I want to make that clear.

2. There is no request from the Ukrainian government to us, about the researchers about whom Mrs. Marie Krarup addresses us.

3. We have not received any list.

I really think we should be careful that such debates do not get out of proportion, when we consider what it is a task we

face, in terms of disinformation, misinformation. You can pick your battles as you like.

Excerpt 6:

Marie Krarup: So the Foreign Minister might deny that the list exists? It was published, it was taken down, thank God, shortly after, for example, Jyllands-Posten wrote an editorial about it. So Jyllands-Posten also lives in an alternative reality where they believe that list exists?

It does exist. And there were statements from the head of the center, and from Zelensky's advisor, Podoljak. I know that the Foreign Ministry has received documentation about that, with the translation of those documents. Where the head of the center, and Zelensky's adviser, calls on the governments, where the foreign – these are 72 people living outside Ukraine – where they are called on to take action against them. This is not an official request. That is absolutely correct, I fully agree. But it is a public request. And the Foreign Minister is apparently totally indifferent about that.

Documentation has been sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I know, because I myself received it on the same occasion.

So the question is: will the Foreign Minister follow these calls to restrict the freedom of expression of Danish researchers? I think that would be wrong. I also think it would be appropriate to say to Ukraine that we will not do that and call on them to distance themselves from the list. It is very good that it is no longer available on the website; it is still visible on their Facebook page. With photos of the people they don't like. Who they want sanctioned. So, in that way, it still exists.

I hope it's not the case that if Russia approaches Denmark,

unofficially or officially, and asks to restrict the freedom of expression of some Danish researchers, that they say “never mind”. Or just look out of the window.

Then I wish that they would officially distance themselves from it. Because it is just wrong.

And now that we are talking about a country which we support, and which we support because we say that it is a democracy, I just think it seems odd that no statement is being made. Jyllands-Posten could at least write an editorial about it and denounce it. And I think that the government should do the same. And then guide the Ukrainians in a friendly, honest way and say: this is a bad idea. You should not do that. We will not follow your calls to sanction Danish researchers in Denmark, no matter how terrible the situation you are in. Because they are in a completely terrible situation. It is so appalling. No matter how terrible the situation you are in, we will not destroy our own democracy, our own freedom of expression.

An honest friend of Ukraine should have said that to Ukraine. And you should also do it for the sake of the researchers, who obviously don't find it nice to have this kind of indirect threat.

So, after this consultation, I assume that the Foreign Minister now, after getting some more information, and hopefully getting a deeper understanding of what this is about, will take action on this, and address the Ukrainian government and say something about that freedom of expression in Denmark must not be destroyed, because there is a terrible situation in Ukraine, and if Ukraine wants to be a democracy, in the long term, then it has to respect freedom of expression.

Will the Foreign Minister do that?

Excerpt 7:

Jeppe Kofod: [About that Marie Krarup alleged that I] denied that there is a list, I have not. I have simply said that we have not received it. We have not received a list, from the Ukrainian Government, sent to the Danish Government of any individuals. I mentioned that it was a list that apparently has been taken down from the website, and I also believe that there are organizations, including the Schiller Institute, that have sent this material, probably to Marie Krarup, and also to me.

Excerpt 8:

Jeppe Kofod: And then once we've heard about this list, the work of this Center for Combating Disinformation, we'll come back, to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Then we can take the debate further there, if it is still relevant. (00:58:35:00)

Marie Krarup: I would like to, if it's possible. But I'm glad the minister doesn't deny it. Actually, that's not what it was about. What I find embarrassing is that the minister has not taken action to defend the freedom of expression of Danish researchers. Thank you for giving me the floor.

Christian Juhl – [Thanks the minister and Marie Krarup.] We would like, in the Foreign Affairs Committee, to receive a written briefing, when it is available, with the facts about it, and then we can consider an extension of the consultation. Thanks to all.

The video, in Danish, and the full transcript in Danish may be seen here.

Jyllands-Posten editorial, August 11, 2022 at 6:30pm. Jyllands-Posten is one of the three major Danish daily newspapers. Here are some excerpts.

FOR SUBSCRIBERS

Title: Ukraine and free speech

Kicker: It is worrying when Ukraine blacklists researchers and others who have a different view of the conflict from the unequivocally pro-Ukrainian one.

Beginning: "If not before, then certainly since February 24 this year, the Ukrainian people and their President, Volodymyr Zelensky, could not have any doubt that a united West and the EU are fully behind them....

[In speeches, Zelensky] "skillfully appealed to unity and emphasized what we know, that Ukraine's struggle for freedom is ours too. It has helped to underline and convince, even more, that Ukraine naturally belongs in Europe, and eventually in the European Union – one day on the other side of the war.

"But to get there, there are conditions to be met. Among them is the fundamental acceptance of free speech. Even before the war, there were stories that freedom of expression, particularly for the media, did not always enjoy favorable conditions in Ukraine, and it is obvious that this is even worse in a war like the present one. But that is why it is still necessary for the country, and especially its President, to show that it accepts free speech and the right to disagree.

"The Centre for Countering Disinformation sounds like something out of George Orwell's '1984', but it is a center under Ukraine's National Security Council. The center presumably has a central function during the war, but it has also recently been used to blacklist 72 international politicians, thinkers and researchers, including four Danes [really three Danes and one Swede- mr]: Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen, peace and conflict researcher Jan Øberg, chairman of the Schiller Institute in Sweden Ulf Sandmark and Aalborg University professor Li Xing.

"What the four Danes have in common is that they took part in a seminar at the end of May on alternatives to the current

security policy structure in the world in order to reduce tensions and the division of countries into, for example, members and non-members of NATO. Li Xing, among others, opposes Russia's attack on Ukraine, but he has also questioned the long-term impact of the sanctions policy based on his research. Both – the theme of the seminar and the questioning of Western sanctions policy – are of course perfectly legitimate in a free and open society.

“It is therefore worrying when Ukraine blacklists researchers and others who have a different view of the conflict. For it can hardly be seen as anything other than an attempt to silence them and label any angle other than the pro-Ukrainian one as pro-Russian, and thus on the wrong side of history.

“Ukraine's fight for freedom in the face of its opposite, Putin's barbaric unfreedom, is heroic and deserves all our support. But in rejecting free speech, free research and free debate, it is precisely Ukraine and its President who are in danger of moving to the wrong side, far from the ideals that they will hopefully pursue on the other side of the war, to emphasize that they are part of us, as we now see their struggle as ours.” End of the editorial.

It should be noted that Jyllands-Posten led an international campaign for free speech after they printed derogatory cartoons of the prophet Mohammed in 2005. Now, they have something much better to defend.

pictures: Marie Krarup: screen grab
Jeppe Kofod: Michelle Rasmussen

Udenrigsminister Jeppe Kofod skal i samråd om Ukraine- listen

fredag den 19. august kl.
13-14.

Tilmeldingsinformation.

Opdatering: Fra Folketingets hjemmeside:

Samrådet er åbent for alle, men tilmelding er nødvendig, også for pressen. Der er et begrænset antal pladser, som tildeles efter i først-til-mølle-princippet. Tilmelding skal ske senest kl. 11.00, dagen inden samrådet bliver afholdt.

Tilmelding på e-mail

Samrådet finder sted i vær. 2-133.

Gæster udefra bør beregne ekstra tid til registrering i Besøgsindgangen på grund af sikkerhedstjek.

Samrådet tv-optages og vil blive vist direkte her på hjemmesiden. Optagelsen vil efterfølgende kunne (gen)ses her på siden og under "TV fra Folketinget". Desuden vises samrådet forskudt på Folketingets tv-kanal.

For regler for fotografering og optagelse af film og lyd under åbne samråd, se linket her. [✖](#)

Aug. 5, 2022 (EIRNS)–COPENHAGEN, Aug. 5 (EIRNS) – Den 1. august anmodede formanden for Folketingets Udenrigsudvalget Bertel Haarder (Venstre) den danske udenrigsminister Jeppe Kofod om et samråd om Ukraine-listen på vejen af udvalgsmedlem Marie Krarup (uafhængig). Ethvert folketingsmedlem har ret til at kræve, at enhver minister mundtligt besvarer skriftlige spørgsmål, der tidligere er stillet. På Folketingets

hjemmeside annonceres anmodningen om samråd og de to spørgsmål.

På Folketingets hjemmeside:

**Samrådssp. om den ukrainske liste over udlændinge, som "fremmer" den russiske fortælling mv., til udenrigsministeren
Samrådsspørgsmål U**

Vil ministeren forholde sig til den ukrainske liste over udlændinge, som "fremmer" den russiske fortælling, herunder bedes ministeren svare på, om listen efter regeringens opfattelse er udtryk for respekt for ytringsfrihed, demokrati og andre værdier, som ministeren mener, Danmark bør fremme i verden?

Mener ministeren, at Danmark fortsat kan begrunde sin støtte til Ukraine med våben og penge med, at Danmark således er med til at støtte demokratiske værdier uden for Danmark? Der henvises til "Ukraine offentliggør liste over udlændinge, som fremmer "russisk fortælling" om krigen i Ukraine, tre danskere figurerer på listen", bragt på www.mreast.dk den 29. juli 2022.

Af: Marie Krarup (UFG)

Til: udenrigsminister Jeppe Kofod ()

Dato: 01-08-2022

Status: Ikke besvaret

Emne: udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitik

Link: <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20211/almdel/URU/samspm/U/index.htm>

Billede: Michelle Rasmussen

Jyllands-Posten leder imod Ukraines sortliste: Ukraine risikerer at bevæge sig over på den forkerte side, når det handler om det frie ord

Jyllands-Postens leder den 11. august kl. 18.30:

Link: JP mener: Ukraine risikerer at bevæge sig over på den forkerte side, når det handler om det frie ord

- 11/08/2022 KL. 18:30
- FOR ABONNENTER

Ukraine og det frie ord

Det er bekymrende, når Ukraine sortlister forskere og andre, der har et andet syn på konflikten end den entydigt proukrainske.

Dækning af lederen i Officielt EU-Website/ Europa-Kommissionen/Repræsentationen i Danmark:

https://denmark.representation.ec.europa.eu/news/eu-i-dagens-avis-fredag-den-12-august-2022-2022-08-12_da

Udvidelse: Ukraine og det frie ord

Jyllands-Posten skriver blandt andet i sin leder: "Om ikke før så i hvert fald efter den 24. februar i år har den ukrainske befolkning og landets præsident, Volodymyr Zelenskyj, ikke

kunnet været i tvivl om, at et samlet Vesten og EU bakker landet fuldt op. [...] Og den tidligere skuespiller Zelenskyj har ud over at være en autentisk og stærk leder af sit land også – i sin grønne army-T-shirt – afsløret sig som en blændende kommunikator og fortolker af mediesamfundet. [...] Det har været med til i endnu højere grad at understrege og overbevise om, at Ukraine naturligvis hører til i Europa og med tiden i EU – en dag på den anden side af krigen. Men for at nå dertil er der betingelser, der skal opfyldes. Blandt dem er den grundlæggende accept af det frie ord. Allerede inden krigen var der historier om, at ytringsfriheden for især medierne ikke altid havde gunstige vilkår i Ukraine, og at det under en krig som nu er endnu værre, er indlysende. [...] Center for Modvirkning af Desinformation lyder som noget fra George Orwells "1984", men det er et center under Ukraines Nationale Sikkerhedsråd. Centeret har formentlig en central funktion under krigen, men det er for nylig også blevet brugt til at sortliste 72 internationale politikere, tænkere og forskere, heriblandt fire danskere: Rusland-eksperten Jens Jørgen Nielsen, freds- og konfliktforskeren Jan Øberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Sverige Ulf Sandmark og professor på Aalborg Universitet Li Xing. Fælles for de fire danskere er, at de i slutningen af maj deltog i et seminar om alternativer til den aktuelle sikkerhedspolitiske struktur i verden for at mindske spændinger og opdelingen af lande i f.eks. medlemmer og ikkemedlemmer af Nato. Bl.a. Li Xing er imod Ruslands angreb på Ukraine, men han har også baseret på sin forskning sat spørgsmålstegn ved sanktionspolitikens virkning på lang sigt. [...] Derfor er det bekymrende, når Ukraine sortlister forskere og andre, der har et andet syn på konflikten."

Kilde: Jyllands-Posten, s. 28

DR's hjemmeside: Aalborg-professor er på sort liste hos de ukrainske myndigheder

Her er linket: Aalborg-professor [Li Xing] er på sort liste hos de ukrainske myndigheder

NYHEDSORIENTERING MAJ-JUNI 2022:

Dansk-svensk videokonference d. 25. maj 2022:

For en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle nationer,

ikke en styrkelse af geopolitiske blokke.

NEJ til at afskaffe forsvarsforbeholdet

NEJ til Sverige og Finland i NATO

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Afghanistan: Den humanitær krise, og hvad der skal gøres.

Interview med H.E. Ahmed Farooq, Pakistans ambassadør til Danmark

May 31, 2022 interview with H.E. Ambassador Ahmed Farooq, Ambassador of Pakistan to Kingdom of Denmark.

Contact: www.pakistanembassy.dk

Interviewed by Tom Gillesberg, chairman, Schiller Institute in Denmark, and Executive Intelligence Review's Copenhagen bureau chief.

Contact the Schiller Institute in Denmark: si@schillerinstitut.dk ; +45 53 57 00, Danish: www.schillerinstitut.dk

English: www.schillerinstitute.com

This transcript appears in the June 10, 2022 issue of Executive Intelligence Review. Subscribe to Executive Intelligence Review (larouchepub.com)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

På engelsk:

SUBSCRIBE TO EIR

*This transcript appears in the June 10, 2022 issue of **Executive Intelligence Review**.*

[Print version of this transcript]

INTERVIEW: Ambassador Ahmad Farooq

Twenty-Two Million People in Afghanistan Continue To Face a Dire Humanitarian Emergency

The following is the edited transcript of the interview with His Excellency Ambassador Ahmad Farooq, Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Kingdom of Denmark, conducted by Tom Gillesberg, May 31, 2022 at the Pakistani Embassy in Denmark. The video of the interview is available [here](#).

Tom Gillesberg: I'm Tom Gillesberg, Chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, and also with *Executive Intelligence Review*. I'm here at the Pakistani Embassy in Denmark with His Excellency Ambassador Ahmad Farooq, the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Kingdom of Denmark since April 2020. Before that, the Ambassador held several posts in connection with the United Nations: Counsellor/Alternate to the Rome-based UN Agencies; Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the UN; member of Pakistan's Security Council team; Director General dealing with counter terrorism at the UN and other multilateral forums; and Director, dealing with the UN General Assembly, UN Security Council, Counter Terrorism, UN Peacekeeping and other political and peace and

security issues.

Your Excellency Ambassador Farooq, I'm very glad you agreed to give us an interview. You gave a speech to the Schiller Institute in Denmark's Afghanistan seminar in October 2021, "Afghanistan, What Now? Peace Through Economic Development," where you especially described the dire situation in Afghanistan at the time, and how the Afghanistan war had affected Pakistan. Since then, the people of Afghanistan have suffered through seven months of winter conditions, and the humanitarian situation is much worse, probably the worst in the whole world. Could you please describe the humanitarian emergency for the people of Afghanistan right now?

[View full size](#)



Michelle Rasmussen

H.E. Ahmad Farooq, Ambassador of Pakistan to Denmark.

Ambassador Ahmad Farooq: Thank you very much, Tom. I would first of all like to thank you and the Schiller Institute for coming to the Pakistan Embassy in order to discuss this important issue that is being faced by the people of Afghanistan and the region. The Schiller Institute, I must say, has been doing a very good job, in highlighting what is happening in Afghanistan, so I would like to begin by thanking you for that.

You have very rightly said that Afghanistan has been going through a very difficult situation, and when we met at the

Schiller Institute in October, things were not as bad. But we could see which way the situation could go, if the international community did nothing to help the people of Afghanistan.

Unfortunately, what we had foreseen at that time did play out in the following period. What we now know—and these are statistics [that] have come out from the United Nations—is that over 22 million people in Afghanistan continue to face a dire humanitarian emergency. Over 1 million Afghan children are malnourished and at the risk of dying. The winter period, in particular, has been very hard on the people of Afghanistan, because of the food shortages and because Afghanistan had been facing a prolonged drought even before things happened in August of last year. That, combined with the economic situation that Afghanistan faced after the withdrawal of the international forces in particular, has helped to further compound the humanitarian crisis being faced by the people of Afghanistan.

So, it continues to be a very difficult situation there. The region itself, obviously, has suffered from this conflict for over four decades, and we continue to do so. There is a lot of concern in Pakistan, as it is a very sad and difficult situation that we see which the people of Afghanistan are currently facing.

[View full size](#)



Ibn Sina (Avicenna), 980–1037, the great doctor, philosopher, and political advisor.

Gillesberg: Obviously, much too little humanitarian aid has reached Afghanistan. The Schiller Institute has been pleading for emergency action. We also did that very much in the seminar together with you, to alleviate the sufferings of the Afghan people. And our founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche has proposed Operation Ibn Sina, named after the great doctor and philosopher and political adviser from the region, born in 980, also known in the West as Avicenna. Operation Ibn Sina is a call for mobilizing emergency humanitarian aid and building a modern health system as a focus for sparking the long-term development of Afghanistan's infrastructure and economy. What do you think of this? And what must be done to prevent even more millions of people from starving and many dying?

Ambassador Farooq: I think—and it is the position of the government of Pakistan in this regard—that the international

community needs to come together and address the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan, and that there is need for engagement with the authorities in Afghanistan. There is a need for coordinated provision of humanitarian assistance for the people of Afghanistan.

So far, what we are seeing is that there is a sporadic effort, and obviously, many Western countries that were present previously in Afghanistan, no longer have any presence there. Then, we also had a significant presence of the United Nations which mostly is not there anymore. Then, there is this issue of how to deal with the authorities in Afghanistan, and what we generally see is an effort to try to bypass them when dealing with the people of Afghanistan.

Now, Afghanistan is a large country in terms of size, area, and also in terms of the size of its population; it's over 40 million people. The way we see it, it is not possible for a good, coordinated humanitarian effort to reach the most vulnerable people in the country when you are trying to bypass the authorities. This is something we have been calling upon the international community—that everybody needs to come together and look at what the humanitarian needs are in Afghanistan. The other issues, the political issues, obviously, those also have to be dealt with, but the priority has to be on how we can prevent further suffering in Afghanistan.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, we have been trying to facilitate, for example, the UN humanitarian effort. Most of it in the past was also being routed through Pakistan, and we have an arrangement with the UN on how they can again direct their humanitarian actions through Pakistan. So that is happening.

But again, I think the principal obstacle is this issue—that the policies which the Western countries have come up with, is that whatever they do there, they have to bypass the

authorities. And that, in itself, is preventing a more sustained and coordinated effort to help the people there.

So when you mention about the initiative which Helga Zepp-LaRouche has launched, it is a very good idea. It's something that should have a lot of traction, particularly for Muslim countries, because obviously Ibn Sina comes from our part of the world, and could provide a sort of rallying point for Islamic countries to help the people of Afghanistan. So, anything that can be done should be done. We are of the view that it is our obligation to help those poor people there.

Gillesberg: Could you say more about what the government of Pakistan is concretely proposing, and what they are doing in relation to Afghanistan?

Ambassador Farooq: Well, being the most immediate neighbor of Afghanistan, and a country which has suffered throughout the last four decades, both in terms of the humanitarian angle—we have been hosting over 4 million refugees at any given point in time, and over 3 million still continue to live in Pakistan, we have faced the security dimension of the instability in Afghanistan, especially over the last 20 years, so we have a deep interest in having a stable Afghanistan as our neighbor.

[View full size](#)



UNICEF/Omid Fazel

Refugee camp in Afghanistan, May 18, 2020.

Right after the events of August 2021, we coordinated with the international community, first in the evacuation of the international staff, diplomats, Afghan nationals that the international community wanted to evacuate from there. We have been trying to coordinate efforts among the neighboring countries of Afghanistan. So, Pakistan hosted a conference in September of the six neighboring countries; then another conference was held in Tehran, Iran, in October, and we participated in that. We then hosted the meeting of the Troika-Plus: This is a grouping of China, Russia, the United States, and Pakistan, so we hosted that, and on the sidelines of that meeting, there was also a meeting of this grouping with the Taliban delegation. Then we hosted the emergency meeting of the Islamic countries' Foreign Ministers in December, which was focused, specifically, on the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan.

So our effort has been to promote engagement with Afghanistan, bring the international community together, so that we, specifically, deal first with the humanitarian situation.

Bilaterally as well, Pakistan has contributed, despite our economic difficulties, about \$30 million in terms of humanitarian assistance. We have been facing the challenge of COVID, and despite that, we have tried to keep cross-border movement of people, as well as trade of goods and services open, so that the people of Afghanistan do not suffer more than they have to. And we recently also allowed a shipment of wheat from India: This is a sensitive issue in Pakistan, but for the benefit of the Afghan people, we allowed an overland shipment of Indian wheat from India to Afghanistan.

So, we continue to engage with the international community in terms of what we can do to help Afghanistan.

Gillesberg: Pakistan also organized the conference in Islamabad of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) about Afghanistan, on March 22-23 this year. What was the result of that meeting?

Ambassador Farooq: Yes, as I mentioned in my previous response, actually the emergency session on Afghanistan was held in December. And there were two important outcomes of that conference: First was that a special humanitarian trust fund was created for Afghanistan; and then the Organization for Islamic Cooperation also appointed a special representative to deal with the humanitarian situation. These were the two key decisions that were taken at the December meeting. In March, we had a regular session of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the OIC, which basically operationalized those two decisions. So now that trust fund is operational, and countries have started to contribute money to that, which would then be channeled to Afghanistan through the Islamic Development Bank. So the OIC has its own set of organizations that can deal with these humanitarian issues, and we feel very happy that we were able to coordinate, and to have this work done for Afghanistan.

Gillesberg: What is your message to people in the U.S. and in

Europe, regarding Afghanistan, and what should happen?

Ambassador Farooq: Our consistent message to our European and other Western partners is that we have to come together: It's our obligation to help the people of Afghanistan, and it is important to continue to our engagement even with the authorities of Afghanistan. We do understand that there are sensitivities with regard to issues relating to political inclusion, as well as human rights, especially the rights of women and girls. But we believe that in order to make progress on these issues as well, we have to continue our engagement. Pakistan has been, as I mentioned, part of several initiatives in terms of trying to bring countries together on Afghanistan, and we have consistently joined the international community in expressing the same concerns that they have, in terms of human rights, in terms of political inclusion, and especially the rights of women and girls. So we share those concerns, but we believe if we are to make progress, we have to continue our engagement with the country.

[View full size](#)



OIC

The Organization of Islamic Cooperation Foreign Ministers' Meeting on March 22-23 in Islamabad, Pakistan operationalized a special humanitarian trust fund for Afghanistan, and appointed a special representative to deal with humanitarian aid.

Then, the most important aspect, I think, that has to be

addressed is the economic meltdown which has happened in Afghanistan, because without a functioning economy, you cannot deal with the humanitarian situation. The world cannot be expected to just keep pumping in money in terms of providing food and medical assistance: The country eventually has to stand on its own two feet. And for that, we have to ensure that the banking system of the country is functional, and we have to look at this issue of the sanctions that exist against the Taliban authorities, because when you have that kind of a situation, it is not possible for a country to do business internationally. So these, I think, are some of our key messages to our international partners, for how we bring about stability in Afghanistan, and take them out of the current sad situation.

Gillesberg: This also includes, of course, that part of these sanctions has been to freeze all the accounts of the national government of Afghanistan, so they do not have Afghanistan's money to spend on dealing with the situation in Afghanistan; but it's also a big factor that Afghanistan has been cut off from the whole SWIFT system, which means that Afghans living abroad are not able to send money back home.

Ambassador Farooq: Exactly. So this is what I'm trying to say, that the international connectivity of Afghanistan with the banking system—the banking system of Afghanistan, it is clear, has collapsed. There is an issue of liquidity, which the United Nations is trying to address, and we appreciate that. More needs to be done. When you mention about freezing of Afghan assets, again, they have the money to take care of their people for some time, but because of the sanctions, they don't have access to it. And lately, we were also disappointed with the decision that part of that money has been sequestered to pay, to compensate the victims of, for example, the 9/11 attack. So this again, is an unfortunate decision, because that money was the money of the people of Afghanistan: They need it. They are starving to death. So that consideration

should have been given.

Gillesberg: Well, now, on top of all the calamities, you can say, in that situation, you also have a war between Russia and Ukraine, with the U.S. and NATO actively engaged in many ways, and which also directly affects the situation with these enormously rising food prices, and all of the other things involved. Now, could cooperation to help the people of Afghanistan maybe be a way for the great powers to begin to cooperate to solve their problems?

Ambassador Farooq: Well, it has been most unfortunate for the world as a whole that we have this conflict in the heart of Europe in the 21st century, which was unthinkable until a few months back, and unfortunately, it has diverted the focus of the international community from grave humanitarian situations like Afghanistan, like Yemen, also some situations in Africa, and the entire focus is now on this war: So this is most unfortunate.

Frankly, sitting in Europe, and looking at the positions which the opposing sides have taken on this conflict, I really don't see a possibility of some kind of a compromise—I mean, cooperation on Afghanistan that could help solve this conflict. It has to be the other way around. There has to be peace in Ukraine, which would be for the betterment, I think, of the entire international community. And Pakistan was among the first countries that raised these concerns, that this conflict would have serious consequences for the global economy, and especially for the developing countries that are dependent on import of food items, grain, import of petroleum products.

And it is playing out: You have seen what has happened in Sri Lanka. Pakistan itself is facing very serious economic issues on the external front, because we also import wheat, we also import most of our petroleum products, so it has put a serious strain on our economy. I'm sure there are many other countries

that are facing these difficulties. So what we urge all the players that are involved in this conflict is, that we have to find a peaceful solution through dialogue, through diplomacy, because conflicts and wars don't provide any solution. That has been our consistent perspective in respect of Afghanistan, and we say that, also, in the case of Ukraine.

Gillesberg: Well, most people and most politicians normally say, "first we have to create peace, and once we create peace we can begin to collaborate." The Schiller Institute has always insisted that it's the other way around, that you create peace through development: That if nations engage with each other, in really taking care of their common interests by having economic development, then you also have the opportunity for long-term peace.

The Schiller Institute is right now circulating a petition that was released a few days before the outbreak of the Russia-Ukraine war, entitled, "Convoke an International Conference To Establish a New Security and Development Architecture for All Nations," modeled on the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which, after 30 years of war in Europe, which really was over 100 years of war in Europe, the conflicting parts then agreed that peace could only come about by taking into account the interests of every country. Also, the regional economic development programs are essential for increasing global security. Do you have any comments on this proposal?

Ambassador Farooq: I think it's a good proposal. But if you look at it from a historical perspective, didn't this happen at the end of the Second World War when we created the United Nations, and the United Nations Charter has all those elements—respect for territorial integrity, non-use of threat or force; solving disputes through peaceful means—all this was there, and then the whole global architecture was created, the financial and economic architecture that was meant to promote peace and development. And the European Union, itself, is the

best example that once countries start to cooperate economically, then the chance of having a war is reduced significantly. We are seeing this in the Southeast Asian region, where we have ASEAN. So it is correct.

But at the same time, we still see, that there are forces, or it's perhaps when a certain generation which has gone through these difficult times is phased out, and there is a new generation, they forget about how destructive wars are, and you see the start of another war happening. There has to be a consistent effort by humanity that wars don't provide any solutions, and we have to look at cooperation between the countries, and through that find peace.

So, this petition you have launched, it's very timely, but now we have a war here, and we have to find a peaceful solution to it, because conflicts, as I said, are no answers to any differences between countries.

Gillesberg: Well, Mr. Ambassador, it's been very interesting talking to you about these matters, and much more could be brought into the discussion, but is there anything else, at the end of the interview, you would like to say to the viewers?

Ambassador Farooq: Well, it's been an interesting time for me, serving as Pakistan's ambassador to a member of the European Union. And I believe that it is important to develop a better understanding of each other, in order to have peace, stability, and global prosperity. The world is facing huge challenges: COVID was just one example, but the bigger challenge and threat that the entire globe is facing is climate change. And what we are seeing is, for example, that the situation in Ukraine tends to dilute your focus from the bigger challenges that we all are collectively facing. So there is a need for bringing the world together to address those challenges in which everybody has a stake.

One of the key things for us which has come out of this conflict in Ukraine, is that we didn't want to take any further sides in great power conflicts, because we believe that developing countries have to focus on the betterment of their people, and we have to look at what bigger challenges we are facing in the future.

Gillesberg: Also, when you have a conflict, where the obvious unsaid question is, when will this escalate into thermonuclear war, if the dynamic is not changed, it's difficult to see how you can be a "winner" by simply choosing sides.

Ambassador Farooq: Exactly.

Gillesberg: Then it might be better to change the dynamic.

Ambassador Farooq: That is correct.

Gillesberg: Well, Your Excellency, thank you very much for the interview. And let's talk again later, when, hopefully, some of these issues are getting a more interesting development, which gives more opportunity for actually solving the problems.

Ambassador Farooq: Thank you Tom. It's always a pleasure to interact with the Schiller Institute.



Hvorfor Danmark bør afstå fra et intensiveret geopolitisk militært engagement, af næstformand Michelle Rasmussen:

Fra videokonferencen den 25. maj 2022.

Jeg vil lige bruge et par minutter på at tale om den danske situation, idet jeg afløser Tom Gillesberg, der er formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark.

Schiller Institutet i Danmark siger helt klart, at folk skal stemme NEJ ved folkeafstemningen, som skal afholdes den 1. juni. Folkeafstemningen drejer sig om en situation, hvor fem partier i den danske regering i forbindelse med Ukraine-krigen stemte for at få en folkeafstemning, som en del af et nationalt forsvarskompromis, herunder Socialistisk Folkeparti, som i første omgang havde sørget for fravalgene. Det var tilbage i 1992, hvor den danske befolkning først havde stemt NEJ til Maastricht-traktaten. Derefter kom forhandlingerne, der førte til Edinburgh-aftalen, frem til fire undtagelsesbestemmelser. Derefter stemte befolkningen JA til at acceptere Maastricht-traktaten.

En af undtagelserne var, at Danmark ikke ville deltage i de fælles europæiske EU-militære aktiviteter. Vi mener, at befolkningen skal stemme NEJ. Det ville være en måde, ikke blot at forhindre Danmark i at øge sine militære aktiviteter med EU, men også at sætte en stopper for en militariseringsproces, der især siden 2001 har været i gang. Personligt er jeg amerikansk statsborger, og for nylig er jeg også blevet dansk statsborger. Og jeg vil sige, at Danmark,

mit nye hjemland, i stedet for bare at følge med i USA's politik, mit oprindelsesland, at Danmark i stedet burde arbejde for at ændre USA's politik.

Lyndon LaRouche opfordrede for mange år siden til en fire-magts-aftale. Hvis USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og Rusland samarbejder om at etablere et nyt retfærdigt økonomisk verdenssystem, et nyt kreditsystem, kunne dette har været grundlaget for konfliktløsning gennem økonomisk udviklingssamarbejde. Som Li Xing sagde, er det bedste alternativ til krig at få iværksat et økonomisk samarbejde. [Dermed kunne den nuværende konflikt have været undgået.]

Siden 2001 har Danmark deltaget i alle de krige, som USA, tilskyndet af briterne, har indledt, fra Afghanistan under statsminister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, og det var især under statsminister Anders Fogh Rasmussen, som senere blev NATO's generalsekretær, at militariseringen blev optrappet. Danmark deltog i krigene i Irak, og så havde vi Libyen. Vi var med i de andre krige, der kom bagefter.

Nu er Danmark i forhandlinger med USA om etablering af en bilateral forsvarsaftale, som formentlig vil omfatte permanent udstationering af amerikanske tropper på dansk jord, hvilket vil sige, at udenlandske tropper for første gang i fredstid vil blive permanent udstationeret her.

Der var et spørgsmål til de fem partier, der kom med dette nationale forsvarskompromis, fra en journalist til de to højrepartier, Det Konservative Folkeparti og Venstre, om, hvad de ville sige, hvis USA ville bede om at forhandle om opstilling af atomvåben i Danmark. Og deres svar var: "Jamen, det må vi da tale om." Det er også en total kursændring i forhold til den tidligere danske politik.

Den anden ting er, at det ikke er nok at stemme NEJ ved folkeafstemningen. Det vil ikke løse problemerne. Men det vil være en måde at dæmme op for denne trinvis militarisering.

For det, Schiller Instituttet siger, er, at nøglen til en mere fredelig verden ikke er at øge militariseringen, men at etablere en ny arkitektur for sikkerhed og økonomisk udvikling, hvor man kan undgå krigsudbrud. Som Jan Øberg påpegede, kan man have konflikter, men hvordan sikrer vi, at de ikke fører til krig? Hvordan kan vi løse disse konflikter på en fredelig måde?

Det er her, at idéen om fremgangsmåden med den Westfalske Fred dukker op. Jeg vil snarest stille et spørgsmål til Helga for at få mere at vide om det.

Danmark har også haft en anden tradition. Et af vores slogans her har været, at i stedet for krigsførelse skal vi bygge broer. Der er en dansk tradition for økonomisk udvikling, partnerskab med lande om vandudvikling, om brobygning og om energiudvikling. Det er det, vi skal fremhæve.

In English:

I will just take a few minutes to speak about the Danish situation, standing in for Tom Gillesburg, the chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark.

The Schiller Institute in Denmark is definitely saying that people should vote NO in the referendum, which is to be held on June 1st. The referendum concerns a situation where after the Ukraine war, five parties in the Danish government voted to have a referendum as part of a National Defense Compromise, including the Socialist People's Party, which had organized the opt-outs in the beginning. Back in 1992, where the Danish population had first voted NO to the Maastricht Treaty. Then, the negotiations that led to the Edinburgh agreement came up with four opt-outs. Then, the population voted YES to accept the Maastricht Treaty.

One of the opt-outs was that Denmark would not participate in the joint European EU military activities. We think that people should vote NO. This would be a way, not only to prevent Denmark from increasing its military activity with the

EU, but would also put a stop to a process of militarization that has been going on, especially since 2001. Personally, I'm an American citizen, and recently, I also became a Danish citizen. And I would say that Denmark, my adopted country, ought to, instead of just following along with the policies of the United States, my native country, that Denmark should, instead, work to change the policies of the United States.

Lyndon LaRouch, many years ago, called for a four power agreement. If the United States, Russia, China and India would cooperate to establish a new just world economic system, a new credit system, this could be the basis of conflict resolution through economic development cooperation. As the Li Xing was saying, the best alternative to war is to get economic cooperation going.

Since 2001, Denmark has participated in every war that the United States, goaded on by the British, have launched, from Afghanistan under Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, and it the militarization was especially escalated under Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen, who later became the NATO's general secretary. Denmark participated in the the wars in Iraq, and then we had Libya. We had the other wars that came after that.

And now Denmark is in negotiations with the United States for setting up a bilateral defense treaty, which will probably include permanent stationing of United States troops on Danish soil, which would be that foreign troops would be permanently stationed here for the first time in peacetime.

There was a question to the five parties that came up with this National Defense Compromise from a reporter to the two right parties, the the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party (Venstre), about what they would they say if the United States would ask for negotiating about stationing of nuclear weapons in Denmark. And their answer was, "Well, we'll have to talk about it." This is also a total reversal of the previous Danish policy.

The other thing is that it's not enough to vote NO in the referendum. That will not solve the problems. But it will be a way of of stemming the tide of this step by step by step militarization.

Because, what the Schiller Institute is saying, is that the key to a more peaceful world is not increasing the militarization, but it is establishing a new security and economic development architecture, where you can avoid the outbreak of war. As Jan was saying, you can have conflicts, but how do we make sure that it doesn't lead to war? How can we solve these conflicts in a peaceful way?

And that is where the idea of the Peace of Westphalia approach comes in. I will soon ask a question to Helga to explain more about that.

And Denmark has also had a different tradition. One of our slogans here has been, instead of war fighting, bridge building. There is aa Danish tradition for economic development, partnership with countries about water development, about building bridges, about energy development. And this is what we need to be emphasizing.

So, I would like to introduce, then, the question period, by asking the question to Helga. This is from Sarah on YouTube, who would like to ask Helga "What is a foreseeable path to reaching a position to propose the peace of Westphalia? Is war the only way? How much can transparency work towards reaching this goal?" To sum it up. What is the idea of the Peace of Westphalia? How can these principles of peace building be used today? And how can we actually implement this?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

The answer will come soon.

Hvorfor Sverige og Finland ikke bør tilslutte sig NATO.

Why Sweden and Finland Should Not Join NATO:

Speech by Ulf Sandmark, chairman, Schiller Institute in Sweden, May 25, 2022

Præsentation på Schiller Instituttets seminar "Vi har brug for en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, ikke for en styrkelse af de geopolitiske blokke" den 25. maj 2022.

På vegne af Schiller Instituttet i Sverige, som er medvært for dette seminar, vil jeg gerne byde alle velkommen og især takke de talere, der er kommet før mig, for deres fremragende præsentationer.

Jeg vil forsøge at besvare spørgsmålet: "Hvorfor bør Sverige og Finland ikke tilslutte sig Nato?"

Faktisk var ansøgningerne om at blive medlem af Nato unødvendige, uforsvarlige og vanvittige. De var unødvendige ansøgninger, fordi der ikke var nogen trussel mod Sverige eller Finland. Rusland havde travlt på andre fronter, og der var ingen hensigt om at angribe vores lande.

De var uforsvarlige, fordi de øger truslerne mod Rusland i strid med OSCE-traktaten, især princippet om inklusiv sikkerhed, som betyder, at man ikke må øge sin egen sikkerhed

på bekostning af andres sikkerhed i henhold til traktaten, og det er faktisk også i overensstemmelse med FN-traktaten. Det var også uforsvarligt, fordi vi nu har etableret en konfrontations linje i Nordeuropa. Under Den kolde Krig var der tidligere en meget stærk konfrontationslinje på kontinentet med store hære, der stod over for hinanden i Tyskland m.m.. Nu vil vi få den samme konfrontationslinje i Nord, hvilket gør det til et ustabil område. Hele Østersøen vil blive blokeret med en amerikansk politik kaldet 2A/AD, "Area Denial"-politikken, som nu diskuteres i det svenske Krigsvidenskabelige Akademi.

Ansøgningerne var vanvittige, for det vi har nu er en absolut, enorm nuklear provokation, muligvis en omvendt Cuba-krise med Sverige og Finland placeret så tæt på Rusland og især deres baser for atomubåde i Arktis. Allerede nu er det tilladt for B-52 strategiske bombefly at flyve ind i svensk luftrum i henhold til værtslands-aftalen med Nato. Jeg vil gerne dele dette billede fra den 18. februar der viser en amerikansk B-52 Stratofortress fra Bomber Task Force, som eskorteres af svenske kampfly over Sverige. Ved denne lejlighed var der ikke kun én B-52, men to. Hver af dem kan bære 12 Tomahawk-missiler, der kan have atomare sprænghoveder. Det betyder, at disse B-52, der flyver fra Storbritannien ind i svensk luftrum, fra svensk territorium på få minutter kan tilintetgøre 24 russiske byer. Det var en enorm provokation. Det var faktisk på samme tidspunkt, som den ukrainske hær øgede beskydningen af Donbass med tredive gange.

Som Jan Öberg havde mistanke om, var det et planlagt angreb for at få Sverige ind i Nato. Det var som et bagholdsangreb. Den svenske tidligere forsvarsminister Sven Tolgfors har i en bog (2016) skrevet, at man kunne forvente, at en sikkerhedskrise ville kunne ændre den svenske Nato-politik. I en sikkerhedskrise skal vi være forberedt på at gøre det rigtig hurtigt.

Vi kan også se, hvordan det er kommet i stand. Bare få uger

med frygt og hysteri ændrede Finland og Sverige sig. Dette pludselige skift er stadig et chok for især den svenske befolkning. Det, der var sandt for to måneder siden, er nu forkert. For to måneder siden sagde statsminister Magdalena Andersson: "Et svensk Nato-medlemskab ville destabilisere regionen". Nu skulle svenskerne omprogrammeres af presset fra massemedierne.

Som svenskerne har for vane, at være "de bedste i klassen", der mestrer den type "gruppetænkning", som Jan Öberg ligeledes nævnte. Nu forventes det, at Sverige vil være "den bedste i klassen" til krig mod Rusland og Kina. Vi befinder os i en enorm identitetskrise blandt svenskerne og især blandt de socialdemokratiske vælgere.

Tyrkiets modstand mod at tillade medlemskab for de nye ansøgere er et eksempel på den manglende suverænitet i Nato. USA skal nu "løse" problemet. Hvor er den så højt besungne frihed og suverænitet, som Nato skal forsvare, blevet af? Svenskerne er chokerede over at se, hvordan Tyrkiet behandles nu, hvor USA formodes at lægge pres på deres beslutning.

Faktisk forsvarer Tyrkiet nu den svenske og finske suverænitet mere end vores regeringer. Forhåbentlig vil flere NATO-medlemslande tilslutte sig Tyrkiet. Det vil i det mindste give os mere tid her til at stoppe dette vanvid. Ved at blokere vores Nato-ansøgning forsvarer Tyrkiet hele Nato og verden mod en omfattende atomvåbenkrise. Tyrkiet er faktisk den voksne person i rummet ved at organisere fredsforhandlingerne mellem Rusland og Ukraine, hvilket Sverige og Finland burde have koncentreret deres diplomatiske indsats om i stedet for at tilslutte sig Nato!

Men Sverige og Finland bør tage sine skæbner i egne hænder. Vi skal genetablere vores tidligere fælles mission for fred og økonomisk udvikling. Vi bør deltage i etableringen af en ny arkitektur for sikkerhed og udvikling for alle nationer, som erstatter geopolitik og storfinansens plyndring af vores

nationer. Nato har kørt os over. Sammen med andre nationer i verden kan vi nu gøre Nato forældet og begrave det.

Det første skridt for Sverige og Finland bør være at slå sig sammen med Italiens premierminister, Mario Draghi, som netop har fremsat et fredsforslag for Ukraine. Denne form for internationalt samarbejde kunne også få Tyrkiet til at presse på for at få fred i stedet for krig.

For det andet er vi nødt til at inddrage den økonomiske dimension, fordi det kan være afgørende for hele Sveriges og Finlands beslutning om ikke at blive medlem af Nato. Hele Europa er nødt til at imødegå sanktionernes økonomiske chok. Det er en neoliberal chokterapi på steroider, der kaster befolkningerne direkte ud i elendighed. Sanktionerne er [ikke til for at hjælpe Ukraine, men er] en ondsindet plyndring for at frigøre de finansielle gældsbobler på ryggen af befolkningen, industrien og middelklassen, hvilket gør millioner af mennesker i Vesten fattige og medfører massiv sult i udviklingslandene.

Faktisk vil den udplyndring i krigstiden, som de vil foretage ved at aflaste den finansielle boble, være meget større end den udplyndring, som det militærindustrielle kompleks foretager, og lige så uproduktiv.

Det vi har, er de fire love, som Lyndon LaRouche har foreslået for at standse denne chokterapi. Vi bør stoppe centralbankernes pengetrykning for at redde det svigtende finanssystem. Vi bør indføre en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling for at kunne nægte at betale for spekulationsboblerne. Med en adskillelse af banker vil vi være i stand til at genetablere banker som banker for produktiv kredit. Derefter kan vi oprette en nationalbank for udvikling, der udsteder produktive kreditter.

Helga har allerede peget på denne politik. Jeg vil gerne fremhæve den igen, fordi den kunne være det absolutte centrum

for modstanden mod krigspolitikken og Nato-ansøgningerne. Det, vi har brug for nu, er forordninger til at håndtere nødsituationer med hensyn til fødevarer, energi og elektricitet. Vi plejede at have et reguleret elektricitetssystem her i Sverige med en meget billig og sikker strømforsyning. Det kan vi vende tilbage til. Vi kan vende tilbage til regler for fødevareforsyningen, for landbruget og industrien, der er forbundet med fødevareproduktionen, og for energien, faktisk for hele økonomien.

Det vigtige er princippet om, at mennesket kommer først, at beskytte produktionen og boligerne. I denne krise vil mange mennesker miste deres job, fordi virksomheder vil gå konkurs. Mange mennesker vil miste deres hus, fordi de vil få problemer med at betale deres renter i en galopperende inflation. Det, vi har brug for, er en fastfrysning af huslejer og gældsbetalinger. Det er nødvendigt for at beskytte befolkningen og produktionen. Vi er nødt til at investere i den mest avancerede teknologi med høj energitæthed for at øge produktiviteten. Dette er at bekæmpe inflationen på den rigtige måde.

Vi har nu en situation i Sverige, hvor halvdelen af den svenske befolkning er vred over det svenske etablisementets og regeringens forræderi. Der afholdes et valg den 11. september. Der bør ske store forandringer her, som må og kan blokere for Nato-medlemskabet og modstå krigsfremstødet mod Rusland og Kina!

Vi har denne mulighed nu for at udnytte den opstandelse i befolkningen, der skyldes den økonomiske krise, til at stoppe ansøgningen om Nato-medlemskab. Så dette er vores store chance nu.

Vi bør stræbe efter at arbejde for dette, og Sverige og Finland bør stræbe efter ikke at være bedst i Nato-klassen for krig og økonomisk plyndring, men bedst i klassen for fred og

udvikling!

Tak! Det var det, jeg ønskede at sige.

English:

Presentation to the seminar "We Need a New Security & Development Architecture, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs". (<https://youtu.be/G5Xkq-xfFgQ?t=8779>)

Thank you,

On behalf of the Schiller Institute in Sweden, being the co-host of this seminar, I would like to welcome everyone and especially thank the speakers ahead of me for their excellent presentations.

I will try to answer the question: "Why Sweden and Finland should not join Nato?"

Actually, the applications to join Nato were unnecessary, reckless and insane. They were applications unnecessary because there was no threat to Sweden or Finland. Russia was busy on other fronts and there was no intention to attack our countries.

They were reckless because they are increasing the threats to Russia in violation of OSCE treaty, especially the principle of inclusive security which means that you are not allowed to increase your security at the cost of other's security according to the treaty, actually this is also according to the UN treaty. It was also reckless, because we now have established a line of confrontation in the North of Europe. There used to be in the Cold War a very strong confrontation line on the Continent with big armies standing against each other in Germany and so on. Now we will have the same confrontation line in the North making it an area of instability. The whole Baltic Sea will be blocked with an American policy called 2A/AD, the "Area Denial"-policy, which

is now discussed in the Swedish Royal Academy of War Sciences.

The applications were insane because what we have now is an absolute, immense nuclear provocation possibly a Cuban missile crisis in reverse with Sweden and Finland positioned so close to Russia and especially their bases for the nuclear submarines in the Arctic. Already now B-52 strategic bombers are allowed into Swedish airspace according to the Host Nation Agreement with Nato. I would like to share this picture from February 18th

showing U.S. a B-52 Stratofortress from the Bomber Task Force being escorted by Swedish fighter planes over Sweden. On this occasion there was not only one B-52, but two. Each one of them can carry 12 Tomahawk missiles that could have nuclear war heads. It means, that these B-52 flying from Great Britain into Swedish airspace could, from Swedish territory within minutes, extinguish 24 Russian cities. It was a huge provocation. It was actually the same time, as the increase of the shelling by thirty times in Donbass by the Ukrainian army.

As Jan Öberg suspected, it was a planned attack to bring Sweden into Nato. It was like an ambush. The Swedish former Minister of Defense, Sven Tolgfors, has written in a book (2016) that a security crisis could be expected to shift the Swedish Nato policy. In a security crisis we must be prepared to make it really swift.

We can also see how it came about. Just in few weeks out fear and hysteria Finland and Sweden shifted. This sudden shift is still a shock to especially the Swedish people. What was true two months ago, is now false. Two months ago, Prime Minister Magdalena Andersson said: "A Swedish Nato membership would destabilize the region". Now the Swedes are supposed to be reprogrammed by the mass media pressure.

As the habit of the Swedes are to be "the best in the class"

as master the type of "Group think", which Jan Öberg also mentioned. Now it is expected that Sweden will be "the best in the class" for war against Russia and China. We are in a huge identity crisis among Swedes and especially among the social democratic voters.

Turkey's opposition to allow membership to the new applicants, sets an example of the lack of sovereignty in Nato. The US is now supposed to "fix" the problem. Where is the so much heralded freedom and sovereignty, which Nato is supposed to defend? The Swedes are shocked to see the treatment of Turkey now, when the US is supposed to put pressure on their decision.

Actually, Turkey is now defending the Swedish and Finnish sovereignty more than our governments. Hopefully, more Nato member nations will join Turkey. It will at least give us more time here to stop this insanity. By blocking our Nato-application, Turkey is defending all of Nato and the world against a huge nuclear weapons crisis. Turkey is actually the grown up in the room, in its organizing the peace negotiations between Russia and Ukraine, something Sweden and Finland should have concentrated its diplomatic efforts on, instead of joining Nato!

However, Sweden and Finland should take our destiny in our own hands. We must reestablish our former common mission for peace and economic development. We should take part in the establishing a new architecture for security and development for all nations, replacing geopolitics and the robbery by high finance against our nations. Nato has run us over. Together with other nations in the world, now we can make Nato obsolete and bury it.

The first step for Sweden and Finland should be to team up with Italy's Prime Minister, Mario Draghi, who has just put forward a peace proposal for Ukraine. This kind of international cooperation could also pull in Turkey to put

pressure for peace instead of war.

Secondly, we need to bring in the economic dimension because this could decide the whole process of Sweden and Finland not to join Nato. All of Europe need to counter the sanction economic shock wave. It is a neoliberal shock therapy on steroids, throwing the peoples directly into misery. The sanctions are [not there to help Ukraine but are] an evil looting to unload the financial debt bubbles on to the back of the population, industry, middle class making millions in the West poor, bringing massive starvation to developing nations.

Actually, the war-time looting they will do, by unloading the financial bubble, will be much bigger than the looting being done by the Military Industrial Complex, and as unproductive.

What we have, are the Four laws proposed by Lyndon LaRouche to halt this shock therapy. We should stop the Central Bank money printing for bailing out the failing financial system. We should implement a Glass Steagall bank separation to be able to refuse paying the speculation bubbles. With bank separation we will be able to reestablish banks as banks for productive credit. Then we can establish a National bank for development, issuing productive credit.

Helga pointed already to this policy. I want to point to it again because this could be the absolute center of the resistance to the war policy and the Nato applications. What we need now are regulations to address emergencies of food, energy, electricity. We used to have a regulated electricity system here in Sweden with a very low cost and secure power supply. We can go back to that. We can go back to regulations for the supply of food, for farming and the industry hat is connected to the food production and for the energy, actually for the whole economy.

What is important is the people first principle, to protect production, protect housing. In this crisis many people will

lose their jobs because businesses will go out of business. Many people will lose their houses because they will have difficulties to pay their interest in a run-away inflation. What we need, are the freezing of rents and debt payments. This is necessary to protect the people and the production. We need to invest in the most advanced technology with high energy density to increase productivity. This is to fight inflation the real way.

We have a situation now in Sweden where half the Swedish population are angry over the betrayal by their establishment and government. There is an election coming on September 11. There should be huge changes here that can and must block the Nato membership and resist the war drive against Russia and China!

We have this opportunity now to use the uproar in the population because of the economic crisis, to stop the Nato membership application. So this is our big chance now.

We should strive to work for this and Sweden and Finland should strive for not being best in the Nato class for war and financial looting, but the best in class for peace and development!

Thank you! That is what I wanted to say.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen:
Baggrunden for krigen mellem

Ukraine-NATO og Rusland. Background of the war between Ukraine-NATO and Russia. Speech at the Schiller Institute's seminar May 25, 2022.

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.

Mange tak for invitationen. Jeg synes, at denne konference er meget aktuel og yderst relevant, for jeg har levet i mange år – man kan se på farven på mit hår – og man kan være sikker på, at jeg har levet i flere årtier. Jeg kan ikke huske, at vi i alle disse år efter Anden Verdenskrig har befundet os i en situation, som den vi befinder os i nu. Jeg var en lille dreng under Cuba-krisen i 1962 og vidste ikke særlig meget om den, men erindrer, at mine forældre og alle voksne var meget nervøse over situationen. Men alligevel vil jeg sige, at jeg nogle gange ser tilbage på denne tid under Den kolde Krig, og finder at tingene var meget bedre på dette tidspunkt. Jeg havde aldrig troet, at det skulle komme til dette punkt. Nogle gange vågner jeg op om morgenen og håber, at alting var et mareridt, men er bange for, at det ikke er tilfældet. Er bange for at være i live, og sover ikke, drømmer ikke; det er virkeligheden lige nu. Jeg vil blot sige om Cuba-krisen, at Khrusjtjov og Kennedy fandt et fælles sprog, som man siger på russisk [sætning på russisk 57:01], og de kom godt ud af det sammen, og de fandt en løsning ret hurtigt. De respekterede på en eller anden måde hinanden. Tænk på Nixon og Brezhnev; deres forhold var – selvfølgelig var de modstandere, konkurrenter –

selvfølgelig var de det, men de havde en vis respekt for hinanden. Det samme gælder for Reagan og Gorbatsjov osv. Så derfor mener jeg, at tiden lige nu er forfærdelig, fordi vi ikke har denne respekt. Hvis man ser på, hvordan de beskriver Putin i alle medierne, og det har de gjort i de 15, næsten 20 år, så er det som nedgørelse, åbent had, foragt og den slags ting. Jeg synes, det er et meget dårligt varsel, det er et meget dårligt tegn på, at vi går nogle meget besværlige tider i møde.

Jeg vil gerne tale lidt om to spørgsmål, som meget sjældent bliver stillet, og som meget sjældent bliver besvaret. Det første spørgsmål, som jeg vil tale lidt mere udførligt om, er: "Hvordan er vi endt der? Hvordan er det sket, at vi nu, 30 år efter Sovjetunionens opløsning, er endt i denne situation, hvor vi faktisk er tættere end nogensinde før på menneskehedens udslettelse?" Jeg synes, det er et meget grundlæggende spørgsmål. Det andet spørgsmål er naturligvis: "Hvad gør vi? Hvordan skal vi komme ud af dette? Hvordan kommer vi til forhandlingsbordet for at forhandle om fredsbetingelser og den slags forhold?" Og måske et tredje spørgsmål er naturligvis: "Hvordan opbygger vi en ny verden? Det er ikke lige nu, for nu handler det om, hvordan vi forhindrer en atomkrig?"

Jeg vil behandle disse to spørgsmål. Hvordan nåede vi dertil? Jeg tror, Jan Øberg vil tale lidt mere om, hvad vi skal gøre, eller måske snarere, hvad vi ikke skal gøre. Jeg har været med i næsten 30 år, faktisk også i denne årrække hvor jeg arbejdede i Rusland, jeg arbejdede på nogle ambassader i de tidligere sovjetrepublikker, og begyndte at lære det russiske sprog allerede før det. For det andet blev jeg gift med en russer for 30 år siden, i 1992. Vi havde håb om en ny verden, vi havde lige forladt Den kolde Krig, og vi havde håb om, at vi skulle leve i en fredelig verden. Og her er vi så, 30 år senere. Men der er noget håb; vi er ikke blevet skilt, vi har ikke planer om at blive skilt, så der er lidt håb, vil jeg mene.

Tilbage til det, der er sket. I 1991, da Sovjetunionen blev opløst, og Warszawa-pagten blev opløst, rejste jeg meget i

Rusland. Jeg var meget i Rusland, og jeg havde russiske venner. De var alle entusiastiske, de var alle optimistiske. "Nu går vi ind i en ny verden. Nu har vi en harmonisk verden præget af harmoni og fred og udvikling og den slags ting." De sagde, at de udtrykkeligt ønskede at være en del af Vesten; de ønskede at dele vores værdier og den slags ting. Hvis man har dette billede i begyndelsen af 1990'erne, var det meget svært at leve i Rusland, fordi alt brød sammen, og der var kaos. Men de ønskede at være en del af Vesten. Så det interessante spørgsmål er, hvad skete der egentlig? Hvorfor gik det ikke sådan? Der er flere trædesten i dette, vil jeg sige, for allerede i begyndelsen af 1990'erne kom Bill Clinton til magten i USA. Han støttede først en plan om, at de østeuropæiske lande skulle blive en del af NATO og lade Rusland stå udenfor. På den måde vil jeg påstå, at han afviste Gorbatsjovs forslag om at opbygge et europæisk hus. Der var faktisk en plan om at opbygge et europæisk hus, men det var et europæisk hus baseret på militæret, og Rusland stod udenfor. På dette tidspunkt advarede mange folk i FN, selv i Europa, om, at det ikke ville fungere; det ville helt sikkert ikke fungere, for selv de liberale i Rusland, og mange af disse pro-vestlige liberale sagde: "Det er en meget dårlig idé".

Men det fungerede på denne måde, fordi Clinton insisterede ihærdigt på dette. Det startede på dette tidspunkt. Så havde de, jeg ved ikke, om det var uheld, måske var det med vilje, at de godkendte Polen, Ungarn og Tjekkiet, samtidig med at man begyndte at bombe i Serbien. Serbien er en meget tæt historisk allieret for Rusland.

Så på dette tidspunkt var jeg journalist. Jeg talte med en masse mennesker. Jeg talte med Sakharovs enke, Jelena Bonner; jeg talte med alle de liberale – hvem talte jeg ikke med på dette tidspunkt? Og alle var meget skarpt imod dette. På dette tidspunkt, jeg tror, hvis man skal sætte et årstal, var det 1999, et år hvor splittelsen faktisk begyndte; måske begyndte den lidt tidligere, men på dette tidspunkt var den åbenlys. Så kom Putin ind i billedet; han skabte ikke denne situation. Mange mennesker tror, at russerne var liberale, og at den onde Putin kom til. Nej! Det er den anden vej rundt. Faktisk fulgte Putin det russiske folks dagsorden, og endda ikke kun det, for

sjovt nok var Putin meget ivrig efter at komme med i NATO. Det er meget interessant at tale om dette i dag. Han ønskede, at Rusland skulle tilslutte sig NATO, det sagde han i hvert fald i et interview med BBC i 2000, da han først blev præsident.

Men selv i Afghanistan støttede Putin Vesten. Han hjalp Vesten i Afghanistan. Han gjorde alt for at opnå venskab. Han holdt en tale i Forbundsdagen i Berlin, og han gjorde alt, hvad han kunne. Men han fandt ud af, at det var forgæves, fordi Rusland var dømt til at blive udelukket fra denne nye sikkerhedsarkitektur, fordi den europæiske sikkerhed bestod af NATO uden Rusland.

Jeg tror, at alt begyndte at forværres fra dette tidspunkt. Man kunne foretage nogle tiltag. Jeg vil blot nævne nogle få. Man kan sige, at der i 2008 var et NATO-topmøde i Bukarest i Rumænien. På dette tidspunkt var George W. Bush præsident, og han inviterede Georgien og Ukraine til at blive en del af NATO. Frankrig og Tyskland var ikke så begejstrede for dette, så de afviste det faktisk. Men det blev holdt på dagsordenen, at disse to lande fik en invitation. Putin var til stede på denne konference, og han var meget, meget vred. Men der skete ikke rigtig noget. Man kan sige, at løsningen på NATO-topmødet var den værst tænkelige løsning, fordi man for det første fik ukrainerne og georgierne til at tro, at de ville få opbakning fra NATO, hvis de angreb Rusland, eller som Saakashvili i Georgien gjorde i 2008. For det andet øgede den russernes mistanke, og det løste ikke noget. Ud fra det blev det endnu værre. I Ukraine havde man selv på dette tidspunkt en meget russofobisk regering. I Ukraine er der ca. 50 % russisktalende personer, som ikke ønskede at tilslutte sig Rusland, men at have venskabelige forbindelser med Rusland og i det mindste være neutrale som en stat. Mange mennesker i de vestlige dele af Ukraine mente noget andet, nemlig at de skulle tilslutte sig NATO og EU. Så det er på mange måder et splittet land.

I det mindste blev Ukraine på dette tidspunkt i 2008 inviteret [til at blive medlem af NATO]. Det er interessant nok, at 17 % af den ukrainske befolkning ønskede at tilslutte sig NATO, mens 66 % ikke ønskede at tilslutte sig NATO. Jeg synes, at det er meget interessante tal, for det siger alt om, hvordan

USA havde en dagsorden om at trække Ukraine ud af den russiske sfære, og de skjulte det ikke engang. Zbigniew Brzezinski, som var national sikkerhedsrådgiver, skrev en bog om "det store skakbræt" {Grand Chessboard}: han skrev åbent, ja, vi ønsker at rive Ukraine ud af Ruslands område. Så hvor meget stabilitet kan man opbygge der? Og tingene blev endnu værre.

Interessant nok blev Viktor Janukovitj fra Regionernes Parti i 2010 valgt til præsident, og i 2012 havde hans parti og nogle andre partier flertal. De gik ind for, at Ukraine fortsat skulle være et neutralt land, og for det andet gik de ind for et tæt samarbejde med Rusland med hensyn til gasleverancer og leje af flådebasen i Sevastopol og på Krim osv. Derefter havde de en diskussion – Helga har allerede nævnt det – om associeringsaftalen med EU. Janukovitj læste den meget omhyggeligt og fandt ud af, at den ikke var særlig velgørende for Ukraine, og han afviste at underskrive den.

Så kom Maidan og alle den slags ting, og i februar 2014 var der faktisk, hvad jeg ville kalde et kup. Efter min mening kan man ikke kalde det andet end et kup. Det var ikke i parlamentet. Der var ikke nok stemmer i parlamentet, og det var et militærkup, intet mindre end det, vil jeg påstå.

Derefter kom ødelæggelsen af Ukraine, for i den østlige del havde de stemt i byer som Lugansk, hvor næsten 90 % havde stemt på Regionernes Parti, i Donetsk var det 85 %, og det samme på Krim, 85 % havde stemt på dette parti, som netop var blevet smidt ud af regeringen. Så de reagerede naturligvis på dette. Og på Krim skete der en løsrivelse fra Ukraine, og de blev i sidste ende en del af Rusland.

Herefter startede krigen: Den ukrainske hær begyndte at angribe de republikker, der havde erklæret sig uafhængige. For man kan sige ud fra et juridisk synspunkt, at hvis man kan lave et kup i Kiev, kan man også lave et kup i Donetsk. I Donetsk og Lugansk havde de i det mindste folkeafstemninger. De valgte nye regeringspartier i disse to republikker. Så, sanktionsregimet begyndte allerede der, og der skete en endnu kraftigere forværring af forholdet mellem NATO og Rusland, meget voldsommere. På dette tidspunkt var der faktisk en reel

krig i gang i Donbass, den østlige del af Donbass, som er en region i Ukraine.

Mange mennesker i Danmark, – jeg diskuterede på nuværende tidspunkt disse ting med mine danske landsmænd, og jeg sagde: "Måske ved du, at 14.000 mennesker er blevet dræbt i denne krig?" "Hvad? Nej, det er russisk propaganda." Jamen, det er det bestemt ikke, for det er en vurdering fra OSCE, Organisationen for Sikkerhed og Samarbejde i Europa, som jeg vil mene nok er den eneste kilde, vi har til den slags tal. Mindst nogle tusinde af disse 14.000 er civile mennesker, og blandt disse er der mange børn. Men russerne kan også se, at vi ikke græder over disse børn, og vi hejser ikke russiske flag for disse børn i vores lande i Vesten. Så mange russere har en tendens til at tænke "OK, så hvis vi ønsker at sikre de russisk talendes sikkerhed, bør det være Rusland, for EU er slet ikke interesseret." Den ukrainske regering er bestemt ikke interesseret i at beskytte menneskerettighederne for de mennesker, der ønskede at bevare deres sprog eller have nogle normale forbindelser med Rusland.

Dette er altså noget, der foregår i Rusland og i det mindste i en del af det opdeltede land, Ukraine. I februar 2015 var der en meget interessant konference i Minsk, og Lukashenko var vært. Der blev indgået en aftale mellem Frankrig, Tyskland, Rusland og Ukraine og også disse to republikker. De underskrev en aftale, ifølge hvilken Ukraine skulle have direkte forhandlinger med lederne af de to republikker – Donetsk og Lugansk – med disse to republikker. Ideen var, at Ukraine skulle ændre sin forfatning for at tillade autonome enheder i Ukraine. Tanken var, at Donetsk og Lugansk skulle være autonome enheder i Ukraine, der skulle bestemme, hvilket sprog der skulle være, og som også skulle bestemme, om de skulle have vetoret i spørgsmål om militærpolitik og lignende forhold. Jeg tror faktisk, at det var det bedste, man kunne opnå, og jeg vil gerne rose Merkel, fordi hun indgik denne aftale uden USA's umiddelbare støtte. Hun gjorde det på egen hånd; hun tog Hollande fra Frankrig med sig og indgik denne aftale, som var det bedste, man kunne opnå på det tidspunkt.

Men meget hurtigt blev det klart, at den ukrainske præsident

Petro Porosjenko ikke var herre i eget hus, som vi siger, fordi han ønskede at få det igennem i parlamentet. Hvad skete der? Nogle af disse højrefløjsgrupper, som Helga også omtalte, eksploderede. Medlemmer af parlamentet, tre mennesker blev dræbt på dette tidspunkt. De truede Porosjenko, og sagde at hvis han overhovedet ville fortsætte med at gennemføre disse bestemmelser i Minsk II-aftalen, ville han blive dræbt i en kælder. Han ønskede ikke at blive myrdet i en kælder, så han stoppede det. Senere, Zelenskij, gjaldt det samme for ham. Han sagde, da han stillede op til præsidentvalget, at han ønskede at skabe fred. Han ønskede også at opfylde Minsk II-aftalerne, og hvad skete der? Han blev også truet, og der skete ikke noget. Både Porosjenko og senere Zelenskij sagde, at vi ikke vil opfylde denne aftale. Det er klar tale, kan man kalde det.

Men på dette tidspunkt sagde Tyskland og Frankrig ikke noget. Man kunne have forestillet sig, at de ville have sagt til den ukrainske regering: "Vær nu venlige, I har underskrevet en aftale. Vi forventer, at I vil opfylde aftalens bestemmelser." Så meget mere, så denne Minsk II blev en del af FN's politik. Sikkerhedsrådet har vedtaget den som officiel FN-politik, men den ukrainske regering var ligeglad med den, og intet vestligt land ville nogensinde nævne, at de skulle opfylde denne aftale.

Nu kan jeg se, at jeg er ved at løbe tør for tid. Jeg vil blot sige, at hvis man går lidt længere frem, kom Zelenskij til magten – 70 % af den ukrainske befolkning støttede ham. Hvorfor? Fordi han sagde, at han var for fred; han ville gerne have en aftale med Rusland; han vil løse deres problemer med forhandlinger i Donbass, med Lugansk og Donetsk. Men han blev også truet, og han veg tilbage fra denne politik. I stedet inviterede han endnu mere [militær støtte fra USA] fra 2017-18, det var under Donald Trump. Ukraine blev bevæbnet mere og mere, og de begyndte at have fælles militærøvelser. De installerede også militær teknik i den østlige del, og også i Ukraine. Så man kan sige, at selv om Ukraine ikke var en del af NATO, så var NATO selvfølgelig i Ukraine. Jeg vil gå endnu længere og sige, at der sidste år, i 2021, var flere interessante ting. For et år siden, eller endnu tidligere, det var i marts sidste år, hævdede Zelenskij, at han var nødt til

at erklære krig. Han sagde, at han gerne ville tage Krim og Donbass tilbage med militæret og støttet af NATO, ikke med NATO-soldater, men med NATO-udstyr, NATO-træning og lignende ting.

I 2021 var der en flådeøvelse i Sortehavet med deltagelse af 32 lande. Yderligere kan man sige, at i februar 2022, den 16. februar, hvis man ser på OSCE's vurdering af, hvad der skete, hvor de tæller hvor mange eksplosioner, hvor mange skyderier, hvor mange drab, hvor mange dette og hint – det er deres job at gøre dette. De udtalte, at der fra den 16. februar var en stigning på næsten 30 gange flere eksplosioner. Hvad betyder det? Det betyder, at den ukrainske hær på dette tidspunkt allerede havde startet en krig! 110.000 ukrainske soldater var klar i Donbass og klar til at gå ind i Donbass. Desuden havde de som sagt hævdet, at de gerne ville indtage Krim.

Så nu er vi nået frem til den 24. februar. Putin var nødt til at forholde sig til situationen. Jeg billiger ikke Putins beslutning. Jeg er ikke sikker på, at det er rigtigt; jeg siger ikke, at det er rigtigt. Men han stod i en meget, meget vanskelig situation. Så denne situation kom ikke bare ud af det blå, ud af ingenting: Der er naturligvis en sammenhæng, der er en historie forud for dette. Hvis vi gerne vil løse problemet, bør vi finde måder at finde fredelige løsninger på. Jeg mener, at vi bør begynde her. Vi bør starte med "Hvorfor er vi endt her?" Vi er også nødt til på en eller anden måde at undersøge "Hvorfor endte vi her?" Måske har vi begået nogle fejltagelser, måske har vi gjort nogle ting her i vores del af verden. Måske har vi gjort noget, der kunne få Putin til at tro, at vi havde onde hensigter. For meget ofte siger vi, at NATO er en defensiv organisation, som ikke kunne drømme om at forstyrre noget som helst. Men hvis man ser på, hvad der sker i Ukraine i det sidste år, i hvert fald fra marts 2021 til februar 2022, hvis man ser på, hvad der skete der, hvis man sidder i Rusland og ser på, hvad der sker der, er det meget, meget tydeligt, at der er intentioner om at tage det tilbage.

Dette er en rød linje for Rusland. Det har de sagt. Der er ingen tvivl om, at Rusland har en rød linje, og på en eller anden måde er man nødt til at agere på den. Jeg siger ikke, at

det er det rigtige at gøre, men at sige at Putin er en galning, at han bare er blevet skør eller noget, det synes jeg ikke er relevant. Jeg siger ikke, at han har truffet den rigtige beslutning, men han er ikke gal. Han ser faktisk på verden fra en anden vinkel.

English: Jens Jørgen Nielsen, degrees in the history of ideas and communication, a Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s, author of several books about Russia and Ukraine, 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.

English:

Thank you very much for the invitation. I think this conference is both very timely and very relevant, because I have lived for many years – you can look at the color of my hair – you can be sure that I have lived for several decades. I don't remember during all these years after the Second World War, we are in a situation like we are in now. I was a small boy during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. I didn't know very much about it, but I remember my parents and all adults were very nervous about it. But still, I would say now I sometimes look back at this time of the Cold War, and I think things were much better at this time. I never thought I should come to this point. Sometimes I wake up in the morning and hope everything was a nightmare, but I'm afraid it is not. I'm afraid I'm alive and I'm not sleeping, I'm not dreaming; it is reality right now. I'll just say about the Cuban Missile Crisis, Khrushchev and Kennedy, they found common language like they say in Russian [phrase in Russian 57:01], and they got along and they found a solution pretty quickly. They somehow respected each other. Think of Nixon and Brezhnev; their relationship was – of course they were opponents, competitors – of course they were, but they had some respect for each other. Same goes for Reagan and Gorbachev and so on. So, that's why I think that the time right now is awful, because we don't have this respect. If you look at how they describe Putin in all the media, and have been doing so for I would say 15, almost 20 years, it's like denigration, open

hatred, scorn and such kinds of things. I think it's a very bad omen, it's a very bad sign that we are in for some very troublesome times.

I would like to talk a little about two questions which very seldom are being asked, and very seldom being answered. The first question, which I will talk a little bit more about at length is, "How did we end up there? How did it come to be that now, 30 years after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, we ended up in this situation where we are actually closer than ever to the annihilation of the human race?" I think it's a very basic question. Of course, the second question is "What do we do? How shall we get out of this? How do we get to the negotiation table to negotiate peace terms, things like that?" And maybe a third question, of course, "How do we build a new world? It's not right now, because now is about how do we prevent a nuclear war?"

I will handle these two questions. How did we get there? I think Jan Øberg will talk a little bit more about what we should do, or maybe even more, what we should not do. Well, I can say that I've been around for almost 30 years, actually also this time I was working in Russia, I worked at some embassies in the former Soviet Republics, and started to learn the Russian language even before that. Secondly, I was married to a Russian, 30 years back, in 1992. We had hopes for a new world, we had just left the Cold War, and we had hopes that we should live in a peaceful world. And here we are, 30 years later. But there is some hope; we are not divorced, we are not planning to do so, so there's a little hope there I would say.

Back to what has happened. In 1991, when the Soviet Union was dissolved, and the Warsaw Pact was dissolved, I travelled a lot in Russia. I was very much in Russia, I had Russian friends. They were all enthusiastic, they were all optimistic. "Now we are entering a new world. Now we have a harmonious world marked by harmony and peace and development, and things like that." They said they emphatically wanted to be part of the West; they wanted to share our values and things like that. If you have this picture in the beginning of the 1990s, it was very difficult to live in Russia because everything

broke down and there was chaos. But they wanted to be part of the West. So, the good question is, what actually happened? Why didn't it turn out this way? There are several step stones in this, I would say, because already in the beginning of the 1990s, Bill Clinton came to power in the United States. He first endorsed a plan of the Eastern European countries becoming part of NATO, leaving Russia outside. In this way, I would say he declined the proposal of Mr. Gorbachev to build a European house. There was actually a plan to build a European house, but it was a European house based on military, and with Russia being outside. At this time in the United Nations, even in Europe, many people warned that it would not work; it definitely would not work, because even the liberals in Russia, and many of those pro-Western liberals said, "It's a very bad idea."

But it worked this way, because Clinton was very much insisting on this. And it started at this time. Then they had, I don't know if it was bad luck, maybe intentionally, that they adopted Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, at the same time as it started to bomb in Serbia. And Serbia is a very close historical ally for Russia.

So, at this time, I was a journalist. I talked to a lot of people. I talked to Sakharov's widow, Yelena Bonner; I talked to all the liberals—who didn't I talk to at this time? And everyone was very sharply opposed to this. At this time, I think if you should put a year, it was 1999, a year when the split actually began; maybe it started a little earlier, but at this time it was obvious. And then, Putin came into this situation; he didn't create this situation. Many people think that the Russians were liberals and that the evil Putin came along. No! It's the other way around. Actually, Putin took the agenda of the Russian people, and even not that, because funny enough, Putin was very eager to join NATO. It's very interesting to talk about this today. He wanted Russia to join NATO, at least he said so in an interview with BBC in 2000, when he first became President.

But even in Afghanistan, Putin supported the West. He helped the West in Afghanistan. He did everything to become friends.

He made a speech in the Bundestag in Berlin, and he did everything he could. But he found out that it was in vain, because Russia was doomed to be left out of this new security architecture, because European security was NATO without Russia.

I think everything started to deteriorate from this. You could make some stepping stones. I'll just mention a very few. You can say that in 2008 there was a NATO summit in Bucharest, Romania. At this point, George W. Bush was President, and he invited Georgia and Ukraine to become part of NATO. Well, France and Germany were not that enthusiastic about this, so they actually turned it down. But it was kept on the agenda, that these two countries had an invitation. And Putin was present at this conference, and he was very, very angry. But nothing happened really. And you can say the solution at the NATO summit was the worst conceivable resolution, because first, they made the Ukrainians and Georgians think that they would have the backing of NATO if they attacked Russia, or like Saakashvili in Georgia did in 2008. And secondly, it raised the suspicion of the Russians, and it didn't solve anything. From that, it became even worse. In Ukraine, even at this time, you had a very Russophobic government. In Ukraine, you have approximately 50% Russian speakers, who wanted not to join Russia, but to have friendly relations with Russia and at least be neutral as a state. Many of the western parts of Ukraine, many people there thought otherwise, that they should join NATO and the European Union. So, it's a divided country in many ways.

But at least at this point in 2008, Ukraine was invited [to join NATO]. Interestingly enough, 17% of the Ukrainian population wanted to join NATO; 66% did not want to join NATO. I think those are very interesting figures, because it says everything about how America had an agenda to pull Ukraine out of the Russian orbit, and they didn't even hide it. Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was National Security Advisor, wrote a book about the {Grand Chessboard}: he openly wrote, yes, we want to tear Ukraine out of the orbit of Russia. So, how much stability could you build there? And things got even in worse.

And interestingly, in 2010, Viktor Yanukovych from the Party of Regions, was elected President, and in 2012 his party and some other parties had the majority. And they were in favor of Ukraine continuing to be a neutral country, and secondly, they were in favor of close cooperation with Russia in terms of gas deliveries and the rent of the naval base of Sevastopol and Crimea, and so on. Then, you had a discussion – Helga already mentioned it – about the Association Agreement with the European Union. And Yanukovych read it very carefully, and found out that it was not very benevolent for Ukraine, and he declined to sign it.

Then, came the Maidan, and all this kind of things, and in February 2014 there was actually what I would call a coup. In my opinion, you cannot call it anything but a coup. It was not in the Parliament. There were not enough votes in the Parliament, and it was a military coup, nothing short of it, I would say.

Then came the destruction of Ukraine, because in the eastern part they had voted in towns like Lugansk, almost 90% had voted for the Party of Regions; in Donetsk it was 85%; Crimea the same, 85% had voted for this party, which had just been kicked out of the government. So, of course, they reacted to this. And in Crimea, there was a secession from Ukraine, and they eventually became a part of Russia.

So, then the war started: The Ukrainian Army started to attack the republics that had declared themselves independent. Because you can say from a legal point of view, if you can make a coup in Kyiv, you can also make a coup in Donetsk. At least in Donetsk and Lugansk they had referendums. They elected new government parties in these two republics. So, at least there, the sanctions regime started and even much more deterioration between NATO and Russia, much more. At this time, it was actually a real war going on in Donbass, which is the eastern part of Donbass, which is a region of Ukraine.

Many people in Denmark, I would now discuss these matters with my fellow Danes, and I say “maybe you know that 14,000 people have been killed in this war?” “What? No, it’s Russian

propaganda.” Well, it’s definitely not, because it’s the assessment of the OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I think is probably the only source we have for these kinds of figures. At least some thousands of this 14,000 are civilian people, and among those, many children. But the Russians can also see we don’t cry for these children, we don’t raise Russian flags for these children in our countries in the West. So, many Russians tend to think “OK, then, if we want to secure the security of Russian speakers, it should be Russia because the European Union is not at all interested.” The Ukrainian government is certainly not interested in protecting human rights for those people who wanted to keep their language or have some normal relations to Russia.

So, this is something which is going on in Russia, and at least in part of the divided country of Ukraine. In February 2015, there was a very interesting conference in Minsk, and Lukashenko was the host there. It was an agreement between France, Germany, Russia, and Ukraine, and also those two republics. They signed an agreement according to which Ukraine was supposed to have direct negotiations with the leaders of those two republics – Donetsk and Lugansk. The idea was that Ukraine was supposed to amend its constitution to allow for autonomous entities in Ukraine. The thought being that Donetsk and Lugansk would be autonomous entities in Ukraine, deciding about which language there would be and deciding also about having veto in questions about military policy, and things like that. And I think it was actually the best you could achieve, and I think at this point I would commend Merkel, because she made this agreement without the immediate support of the U.S.A. She did it on her own; she brought Hollande from France with her, and made this agreement, which is the best you could achieve at the time.

But, very soon, it became clear that Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko was not the master in his own house, as we say, because he wanted to get it through in the Parliament. What happened? Some of these right-wing groups that Helga also talked about, exploded. Members of the Parliament, three people were killed at this point. They threatened Poroshenko,

and said that if he would even go on and realize these provisions in the Minsk II Agreement, he would be killed in a basement. He didn't want to be killed in a basement, so he stopped it. Later on, Zelenskyy, the same goes for him. He said when he ran for President that he wanted to make peace. He wanted also to fulfill the agreements of Minsk II, and what happened? He was threatened too, and nothing happened. Both Poroshenko and later Zelenskyy said that we will not fulfill this agreement. It's clear speech, you would say.

But at this point, Germany and France didn't say anything. You could have imagined that they would have told the Ukrainian government, "Please, you signed an agreement. We expect that you will fulfill the provisions of the agreement." So much more that this Minsk II became part of the United Nations policy. The Security Council has adopted it as official UN policy, but the Ukrainian government didn't care about it, and no Western country would ever mention that they should fulfill this agreement.

Now, I see that I am running out of time. I'll just say that if you go a little further, Zelenskyy came to power – 70% of the Ukrainian population supported him. Why? Because he said he was for peace; he would like to have an agreement with Russia; he will solve their problems with negotiations in Donbass, with Lugansk and Donetsk. But he was threatened also, and he went back from this policy. Instead, he invited even more [military aid from the U.S.] from 2017-18, it was during the reign of Donald Trump, Ukraine was armed more and more, and they started to have common military exercises. They installed military technique also in the Eastern part, and also in Ukraine. So, you could say that even though Ukraine was not part of NATO, NATO was in Ukraine, of course. I would go even further, and say that last year, in 2021, there were several interesting things. One year ago, or even more, it was in March last year, Zelenskyy claimed that he had to declare war. He said he would like to take back Crimea and Donbass with the military, and supported by NATO, not with NATO soldiers, but NATO equipment, NATO training, and things like that.

And in 2021, there was a naval exercise in the Black Sea with 32 countries participating in this. And further on, you could say that in February 2022, on Feb. 16, if you look at what the OSCE assessment is of what happened, where they count how many explosions, how many shootings, how many killings, how many this and that—it's their job to do this. They said that from Feb. 16th, there was an increase of almost 30 times more explosions. What does that mean? It means that the Ukrainian Army at this point already had started a war! 110,000 Ukrainian soldiers were ready in Donbass and ready to enter Donbass. Also, they had claimed, as I said, that they would like to take Crimea.

So, now we go to Feb. 24th. Putin had to deal with the situation. I'm not endorsing Putin's decision. I'm not sure it's right; I'm not saying it's right. But he had a very, very difficult situation. So, this situation did not just come out of the blue, out of nothing: Of course, there's a context, there's a history before that. And if we would like to solve the problem, we should find ways to find peaceful solutions. I think we should start here. We should start with "Why did we end up here?" And also, we need to somehow look into "Why did we end up here?" Maybe we made some mistakes, maybe we did some things here in our part of the world. Maybe we did something that could make Putin think that we had evil intentions. Because very often we say NATO is a defensive organization that couldn't dream of upsetting anything. But if you look at what is happening in Ukraine in the last year, at least from March 2021 to February 2022, if you look at what happened there, if you sit in Russia and watch what's happening there, it's very, very obvious, that there is the intention of taking this back.

This is a red line for Russia. They said so. There's no doubt that Russia has a red line, and somehow you have to act on it. I'm not saying it's the right thing to do, but to say that Putin is a madman, that he just became crazy or something, I think it's not relevant. I'm not saying he made the right decision, but he's not a madman. He looks at the world from another angle, actually.

RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much, Jens Jørgen.

**English transcript:
Introduction and Helga Zepp-
LaRouche's keynote speech
at the Schiller Institute's
Danish-Swedish seminar
We Need a New Security And
Development Architecture for
All Nations,
Not a Strengthening of
Geopolitical Blocs,
May 25, 2022**

May 25, 2022 (EIRNS)—Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, opened the online seminar this afternoon:

Your Excellencies and diplomats from many countries on four continents, guest speakers, members and friends of the Schiller Institute, ladies and gentlemen,

Welcome to this seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institutes in Denmark and Sweden, which is also being live streamed on YouTube. The title is, "We Need a New International Security

and Development Architecture, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs. NO in the Danish June 1 referendum about abolishing the EU Defense opt-out, and NO to Sweden and Finland joining NATO." I am Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, and I will be the moderator today.

After the start of the war in Ukraine, a dramatic shift in defense policy has been proposed in three of the Nordic countries. Denmark is having a referendum on June 1 about joining the EU's military activities, and Sweden's and Finland's governments want to join NATO. We think that it is necessary to discuss these issues from a higher standpoint.

Our keynote speaker, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and international chairwoman of the Schiller Institute stated on May 19, that this is the most dangerous moment in world history. There is war in Europe, and many experts are warning that if the war were not ended soon, and a diplomatic solution crafted, and if those advocating increasing the geopolitical confrontation were not politically defeated, the war could escalate to, even, nuclear war. At the same time, the world economy is in crisis.

While the dangers are great, there is hope, because there are solutions in the form of a new security and development architecture, including proposals by the late Lyndon LaRouche, the founder of our political movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the Schiller Institute, for a security agreement modeled on the Peace of Westphalia, combined with increased economic development cooperation between countries.

We have called this meeting to discuss:

- What caused the current extremely dangerous military, and economic crisis.
- Why strengthening the EU military arm with Danish participation, and Sweden and Finland joining NATO would only

exacerbate geopolitical conflict, and

- What are the principles upon which we can create a new security and development architecture, for the benefit of all nations and people.

We want to ensure that both the dangers and solutions are known, and that an effective movement is built to stop a further escalation of this war and its economic effects, and prevent future wars and economic destruction. Somehow, humanity must create the conditions where war is not an option, in this era of nuclear weapons.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote

May 25, 2022 (EIRNS)—Here is the Keynote of Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche: We Need a New Security And Development Architecture for All Nations, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs: Why Sweden and Finland Should *Not* Join NATO, and ‘No’ in the Referendum in Denmark to Join EU’s Military,” the online seminar in Denmark and Sweden today. She was introduced by Schiller Institute in Denmark Vice President Michelle Rasmussen, who moderated the seminar.

The video is available here:

On the international Schiller Institute YouTube channel:
https://youtu.be/8Dt9D_D_U4U

On the Danish YouTube channel: <https://youtu.be/1Pji0vjD9Kg>

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hello, good day, Ladies and Gentlemen: As Michelle just said, I have stated that we are facing the most dangerous crisis in the history of mankind. Now, why am I am saying that? Obviously, that includes two world wars in the 20th century, the Cuban Missile Crisis, so it’s a big order. Well, the first reason is the most obvious, for the very first time, we are facing the real danger of a global nuclear war,

and if it would ever come to that, it for sure would mean the annihilation of the human species.

In the recent period, the illusion has developed that a limited nuclear war can be fought, and won, or that protracted, hybrid nuclear/conventional war can take place. This was the subject of a maneuver in January of this year, called "Global Lightning," which had the idea that you have some nuclear bombs, neutron bombs, space war, cyberwar, and this would go on for weeks. Now, the famous nuclear arms specialist, former MIT Prof. Ted Postol has developed all the arguments why this is completely ludicrous, that why, if one uses only one single nuclear weapon, it is the logic of nuclear war, that all will be used.

In the recent months, since the war in Ukraine started, you hear from all kinds of politicians and journalists and who knows who else making reckless talk, saying things like "even if there is the risk of nuclear war, we have to send heavy weapons to Ukraine. We can't be blackmailed." Or, "it won't happen, because nobody would be so foolish to do this." Well, I don't think that that is a convincing argument.

The second reason why I am saying we are in the worst crisis ever, is that we experience a civilizational breakdown, the end of an entire system. Now, this has many elements. We have an immediate danger of an escalation of the war, as a result of the present chicken-game policies conducted by NATO against Russia. We are facing a hyperinflationary blowout of the Western neoliberal financial system, which was long in process, even before the war in Ukraine started. We are looking at a world famine, which according to the United Nations is threatening 1.7 billion people with starvation. That is 20% of the entire human species. The pandemic is not over, and all of this is threatening social chaos as a result, and that chaos, all by itself, could threaten to plunge the world into a war.

If one listens to the Western media, and all kinds of politicians, it is naturally all to be blamed on Putin. He is being given all possible names right now, that he has caused an "unprovoked war of aggression"; that he is responsible for world famine; that he is the cause of inflation; and so forth and so on. If you say any argument for the real causes of the present situation, you are immediately accused of fake news, you are called a "Putin agent," it is denounced as Russia propaganda.

Well, it has very little to do with Ukraine. In reality, this present confrontation is about the world order. It is a fight between a unipolar world, which is really a world empire based on the "U.S.-British special relationship," whereby the Anglo-American hegemon insists that only the so-called "rules-based order" which they have defined is valid; versus a world in which the rise of China and countries associated with Russia and China insist on their own right for economic development.

We are right now at the most precarious moment: The neoliberal system is collapsing. It is not strong enough any more to enforce its will, but the new order is not yet clearly defined. Naturally, in the officially allowed discussion, it is being said that this is a fight between the "democracies" and the "autocratic regimes." Well, right now, if you listen to what certain politicians and people like Stoltenberg are saying, we are heading toward a potential total decoupling between the West, plus the Five Eyes, plus Japan, Australia, and South Korea, versus a part of the world which includes Russia, China, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS, plus many countries that are now trying to become part of the BRICS, which is most of the Global South.

In frantic trips, Blinken is running around the world, trying to convince people to join the faction of the "democracies." President Biden right now is in Asia, doing the same thing. Chancellor Scholz just went to Africa, von der Leyen to India,

all in an effort to isolate Russia and China, but it's not working: Because India, Indonesia, Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, and many others do not want to be pulled into a geopolitical confrontation between the two sides. And what we are actually experiencing is a real renaissance of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Well, we should not overlook, given the American policies, the role of the British, which is "Global Britain," which is really a new word for the British Empire, which contrary to the views of many, has only changed its shape, but not its essence. Take, for example, an article by Malcolm Chalmers, Deputy Director General of the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), which happens to be the oldest official think tank associated with the Royal household, and the British military. They describe themselves as the "world's oldest and leading U.K. defense and security think tank." They're proposing a "Cuban Missile Crisis on steroids," which could result over the Ukrainian attempt to retake Crimea, which would make it easier, in their view, to settle the Ukraine-Russia war. And this is the stunning proposition in this article, which has the headline, "This War Still Presents Nuclear Risks—Especially in Relation to Crimea," which was published on May 20 by the RUSI think tank. [<https://rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/war-still-presents-nuclear-risks-especially-relation-crimea>]

Chalmers discusses how Russia could be forced into a nuclear confrontation, by sending evermore sophisticated weapons to Ukraine, from which it would ultimately back down. Chalmers describes NATO's strategy over the last three months as that of "boiling the Russian frog." You all remember the picture—according to the story, I don't think it's actually true—but according to the story, if you throw a frog into boiling water, the frog it will jump out; but if you put the frog into the water pot, when the water is cold, and then you slowly increase the temperature, the frog ends up being boiled

without noticing. So he talks about “boiling the Russian frog” by progressively increasing “size and sophistication of the weapons they have been prepared to supply to Ukraine.” Because of those weapons, “the next period will see Ukraine reversing most of Russia’s recent territorial gains, including Kherson and even Mariupol.” That, however, would not occasion a nuclear threat, nor would Ukraine, using those weapons and territorial gains to destroy bridges, railheads, storage sites, and airbases inside Russia. But should Ukraine move to retake Crimea, strike a “tempting target,” of the Kerch Bridge for example, now, that could lead to a “Crimea Missile Crisis,” Chalmers argues. “A specific threat to use nuclear weapons in relation to Crimea ... might be viewed by Putin as a way to restore some of his coercive power, even if he (and the U.S.) doubted whether he would deliver on such a threat... If a red line were not accepted by Ukraine, Russia might then feel that it had to consider a series of further escalatory options, such as putting its nuclear forces on higher alert.” They are already on alert. “Faced with the alternative of the likely loss of Crimea, Putin might believe that Ukraine (with U.S. encouragement) would be likely to blink first. It would be a moment of extreme peril, with all the parties seeking to understand the intent of each other even as they looked to pursue their national interests.

“Precisely because of the peril inherent in such a situation, a nuclear crisis of this sort could make it easier for leaders to make difficult compromises. Provided that the war was ended and the blockade of Odesa lifted, Ukraine’s leaders might be willing to postpone a settlement of the Crimea question. For Putin, the failure of the invasion, and the subsequent success of the Ukrainian counteroffensive, would have been a massive humiliation. But he would at least be able to argue that the might of the Russian strategic arsenal had, at a moment of great national weakness, successfully deterred NATO’s designs for dismembering Russia. This could be enough for both sides to avoid the worst outcome of all.”

I mean, this is complete insanity, you know! Saying that one has to threaten to retake Crimea, and then get all the nuclear weapons on the highest alert, and then we can sit down and settle. So he calls that a Crimea Cuban Missile Crisis on steroids.

Now, that policy of “boiling the Russian frog,” that has not started three months ago, but that has been the method since 1990, when on Feb. 9, 1990, James Baker III promise to Gorbachev, that NATO would not move one inch eastward. In the entire Yeltsin period, there was a policy to reduce the former superpower into a raw materials exporting nation, with the “shock therapy” of Jeffrey Sachs, and between 1991-1994, the industrial potential of Russia was reduced to only 30%. There is a very important book by Sergei Glazyev, which describes the 1990s, with the title *Genocide: Russia and the New World Order*, because that is what was imposed on Russia at that time.

Now, the crime of Putin is that he tried to reverse that, and had some success with it. The answer was color revolutions, regime change, humanitarian wars, like the 20 years in Afghanistan, where as a result of the hasty retreat of NATO and the U.S. in August, now, there are 24 million people at starvation levels in Afghanistan, exposed to COVID, measles, polio, without adequate medicine. So, if one would have equally detailed TV coverage of Afghanistan for 20 years, like we see it now with Ukraine every day, maybe the world would have been equally upset—or, maybe not, because the Afghans are not white.

Then you had the Iraq War in 2003, about which Nancy Pelosi admitted publicly that all responsible people knew ahead of time that there were no weapons of mass destruction. You had Libya. Hillary Clinton, during the Durham investigation in the United States, had to admit that the entire basis of Russiagate were all lies. Did one see anything about that in the mainstream media? Absolutely not! At least not in Europe.

Then there was Syria. Then you had the 2014 Maidan coup, about which Victoria Nuland bragged, \$5 billion were spent by the State Department on NGOs, and, let's not forget, the Azov Battalion, which media in the West are now saying, there are no Nazis in Ukraine—but it is a documented fact that there are.

Now, Putin, as a result of this “boiling the Russian frog,” over almost 30 years, on Dec. 15 demanded legally binding security guarantees from the United States and NATO. He has not received an answer from the U.S. or NATO on the core demands, only on arms control, but that was not the essence of what he was demanding. The head of the Russian Security Council, Nikolay Patrushev, said that Russia had no other way, because they were threatened in the existence of the statehood of Russia, when they made what they call the “special military operation” in Ukraine. And one can absolutely argue that Russia was in a situation, according to UN Charter Article 51, which is a question of self-defense and not of aggression.

Now, we are facing with Finland and Sweden, the sixth expansion of NATO. That is the answer, which Stoltenberg even brags about. He says, “Putin wanted less NATO, now he gets more NATO.” So the boiling temperature is just being increased.

One has to take this insane policy of causing a Crimea Cuban Missile Crisis, together with another British policy, which was exposed in a paper by the Henry Jackson Society in 2020, which they put again on the front page of the Henry Jackson Society website, which means it's ongoing policy of that think tank. It is a report outlining a strategy to use the infamous “Five Eyes” alliance—U.K., U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand—as the instrument to force through the decoupling of the West from China. This rabidly anti-Russia, anti-China neocon think tank is run by British intelligence, through among others, the former MI6 Chief Sir Richard Dearlove, who is the main brain of Russiagate, which was completely

discredited as a lie; and he was one of the founders of the Henry Jackson Society and is one of its principals today.

So, even the attempt to decouple China from the international system, before consummated, could detonate an economic nuclear bomb upon the entire world economy. China is not just the world's largest trading power: It's currently generating the highest rate of scientific and technological development on the planet, a productive power which the developing sector nations and the collapsing Western nations urgently require if they want to survive. But actual nuclear warfare could also be the result, because part of the Henry Jackson Society strategy is to build up ties with Taiwan leading to its separation from China. China has made abundantly clear that it will respond with overwhelming military force to any attempt to split Taiwan off from the rest of the nation of China. This is as dangerous a proposition as a NATO-backed Ukraine moving to retake Crimea. So, when President Biden made a gaffe in answer to a reporter on his recent trip to Japan, "Would the United States defend Taiwan militarily?" Biden said, again, "Yes." And he had to be correct, again, by the White House.

Now, the Chinese already had editorials where they said, this is not a "gaffe," this is a signal of what is the real intention of the United States. And Chas Freeman, who was Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and he was the official translator for President Nixon in his 1972 trip to China, and a career diplomat, he warned, and called it a colossal mistake for Biden to have made such a stupid statement.

President Biden is currently championing these precisely British strategies on his current trip to Asia. Fresh from celebrating the expansion of NATO, Biden is to unveil a grandiose Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) during his stop in Japan as the highlight of the trip. National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan stated bluntly on Wednesday, May 18, that the message of the IPEF is that "democracies and open

societies of the world stand together to shape the rules of the road. We think that message will be heard everywhere. We think it will be heard in Beijing.”

Fifty-two U.S. Senators sent Biden off on his trip with instructions that Taiwan be incorporated as one of the “countries” participating in the IPEF, which is clearly not acceptable from the standpoint of China, because it is a violation of the One China policy.

Now, just today, if you open the media, if you look at the TV, if you look at TV or newspapers, a huge scandal story about pictures from the supposed labor camps in Xinjiang, were “investigated” by a group of international media, that 1 million Uighurs would have been tortured, beaten in labor camps, forced labor, and so forth. Naturally, our so-called Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock immediately had an outcry demanding a transparent clearing up of the accusations. Calls that all relations with China should be cut—after cutting relations with Russia—and that all trade with China should be stopped, now, let’s look at it realistically: China in 2021 was the third largest partner for the EU export of goods, 10.2%, and the largest partner for the EU import of goods, 22.4%; for Germany, it was the largest trading partner for goods in 2021, with a volume of trade of over €245 billion. To cut that would mean total economic suicide, which is already happening with the relations with Russia.

What is the source of this incredible story? The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, one of the leading newspapers in Germany, says, all the photos and data have been made available through Adrian Zenz, a German anthropologist, and longtime Xinjiang observer. Now, this Mr. Adrian Zenz claims that he got all of that from an “unnamed source” who had access to cyber, cyberwar spying and whatnot. Well, that’s a very dubious observation. But Adrian Zenz is not an unknown entity: The blog, The Grayzone, and the very respected investigative journalist Ajit Singh and Max Blumenthal already wrote

articles in 2019, after he had come up with a similar story about genocide in Xinjiang, that Mr. Zenz is a “far-right fundamentalist Christian who opposes homosexuality and gender equality, supports ‘scriptural spanking’ of children, and believes he is ‘led by God’ on a ‘mission’ against China.,” because the end-times are near and the rise of the anti-Christ is also coming. He is on a complete rampage, saying that [there is genocide in] Xinjiang because of a collapse of the demographic curve of the Uighurs, and Lyle Goldstein, who is professor at the Naval War College in the United States, says that such a statement is “ridiculous to the point of being inciting to those who lost relatives in the Holocaust.”

There is ample evidence that there is no “demographic collapse” of the Uighurs in Xinjiang: Just the opposite. There is a 2019 study in the British medical journal *Lancet*, which talks about a massive improvement of life expectancy among the Uighurs, a demographic growth rate which is much higher than that of the Han Chinese, an improvement in maternal health, in infant mortality, and all of this represents “a remarkable success story.”

Zenz’s so-called testimony comes from Uighur exiles who are cultivated by the U.S. State Department. Zenz served as a fellow at the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation in Washington, D.C., which is a right-wing lobbying group born out of the National Captive Nations Committee. Now, that is a very, very interesting connection, because that was founded by Ukrainian nationalist Lev Dobriansky, who is heading this institution whose co-chairman was Yaroslav Stetsko, who was a leader of the OUN-B militia, which is the Nazi group that fought along with German Nazis during the occupation of Ukraine in World War II. Stetsko and his wife had a residence in Munich during the entire postwar period, and led from there the “Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.” After he died, Mrs. Stetsko went to Ukraine and rebuilt the OUN-B, the Bandera organization, in the tradition of the ideas of Stepan

Bandera. Now, that is a direct connection to that apparatus, which was heavily led by the Western secret services—Bandera himself joined the MI6 in 1947, and the BND in Munich had a close, at least “knowledge” about these people (to say the least).

Zenz was also deployed by the Jamestown Foundation, a neocon think tank in D.C., which was founded by CIA director William Casey as an extra-governmental channel to pay Soviet dissidents.

If Germany or other European nations fall for this intelligence operation, which is exactly what the Henry Jackson Society talked about, namely the “Five Eyes” at work, if they follow this, it would be complete economic suicide. Now, even Henry Kissinger, at the age of 99 years, is more reasonable, and at Davos, he said the world has at maximum a window of two months to end the Ukraine war through negotiations, and he appealed to Ukraine that they should agree to a territorial compromise to get peace.

At the Schiller conference on April 9, we presented a completely different approach: There is an alternative to the complete decoupling between the so-called “democracies” and the Global South on the other side. The new system is already emerging rapidly. There are many countries which at the recent foreign ministers’ meeting of the BRICS, want to be part of: Argentina, Indonesia, Egypt, Nigeria and many others. You have the BRICS enlarged, you have the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, almost all organizations of the Global South that want to be part of a new international security and development architecture, which basically is the combination of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, together with two other proposals by President Xi Jinping: The Global Development Initiative and the Global Security Initiative, which is actively being implemented.

Now, what we need is such a conference, for a new

international security and development architecture, in the tradition of the Peace of Westphalia. Now, the Peace of Westphalia was the recognition of all war parties that if they would continue the war, no one would be left to enjoy the victory, because they would all be dead. And that is why they developed the principle that any peace must be based on the interest of the other. The security interest of every country on the planet, which today would mean a security architecture emphatically involving Russia and China. And such a conference, must address the causes for such a war danger: Because it is not enough at this point to be against the war. You have to solve the problem that the collapse of the neoliberal financial system is in progress.

Lyndon LaRouche has a unique record that he foresaw what is happening today, the present crisis, already in August 1971, when Nixon ended the old Bretton Woods system, by replacing the fixed-exchange-rate system, with a floating exchange-rate system, and LaRouche predicted at that time, that if you would continue on that road, it would lead to a new depression, the danger of a new war, and fascism. And that is exactly where we are today.

LaRouche proposed Four Laws to solve the crisis. The first step, a global Glass-Steagall banking separation system, must end the casino economy. There must be capital and exchange controls to prevent the speculative manipulation of currencies, which we see right now in much of the world.

Every country must have a National Bank to make credit generation again the question of the sovereign government, and not that of private bankers, in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton. Then, these National Banks must be connected through a credit system which provides long-term, low-interest credit for real investment in the physical economy.

Also, the Fourth Law is that we must have a crash program for fusion technology, which in the recent period has made

tremendous progress, and the commercial use of it is visibly on the horizon. Because we need a massive increase in the productivity of the world economy because just the fact that 1.7 billion people are threatened with starvation, that 2 billion have no clean water, is the proof that the present level of productivity has fallen way below the level of maintaining the present world population of 8 billion people.

And there must be international cooperation, not only for fusion technology, but also for space technology and space travel, because that is the vanguard of scientific and technological realm today.

So we are right now confronted with a situation where the leading governments and institutions are challenged: Are we able to solve the problems of the world, are we able to address the problems which threaten the very existence of mankind, or not? Now, the Schiller Institute has proposed for more than 30 years, first, the Eurasian Land-Bridge; the New Silk Road, and in 2013, we proposed the "New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." Please show the slide: Now, this is a blueprint how we can overcome world poverty, how we can eradicate underdevelopment forever, and how can we create a new, modern world health system for every country in the world, which is the only way how we can overcome old and new diseases, this pandemic and threatening new pandemics.

This is absolutely possible, and this is the vision of how the world will look in a few years, anyway, if we avoid the present danger of nuclear war. The development of infrastructure connecting all continents is the natural way how infrastructure development will continue, provided there is peace. So I think that is something we need to put on the agenda for discussion, and the reason why, despite the incredible danger, one can be optimistic, is because we are the human species, we are capable of reason, and we are not barbarians.

Thank you.

Rasmussen: OK, we have 10 minutes now questions to Helga. ... We have a question from Elena. While we're waiting for Elena, we have a question from Jens Jørgen Nielsen, one of our speakers.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Thank you for a very good presentation. I essentially agree with you. I have one question. As you may know, I live in Denmark, where we will have a referendum in a week's time, about the European Union: We are discussing in our country for the time being, the role of the European Union and whether it should have an army, how should we have security. I would like a few words: How do you think about the European Union in this context? Because I am somehow skeptical, but I would like to hear your opinion on the European Union and the development right now of the European Union in this context? And also specifically the question of the European military arm, which is the subject of referendum? And the policy toward Ukraine and Russia?

Zepp-LaRouche: When there was a referendum about the EU Constitution in France and Holland 2005, which was defeated, because the majority voted against it. And then they shifted it to the Lisbon Treaty, because by not calling it a "constitution" but by calling it a "treaty," it did not require a vote. So this was decided in great secrecy, but we were extremely closely watching it at the time. And if you look at the Charter of the EU as it was agreed upon in Lisbon in December 2007, it is practically interwoven with NATO, in such a degree that the Article 5 of NATO practically also involves the EU. In other words, when you join the EU, you are practically also part of whatever NATO does. And the character of NATO has also dramatically changed, in the last 30 years, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In the time of the Soviet Union, it was a defensive apparatus against the Warsaw Pact. But in the recent period, it has turned into a completely anti-Russian Russophobic alliance, and

therefore, when, in November 2013, when the Ukraine government under Viktor Yanukovich refused to join the EU Association Agreement, it was clear that if Ukraine would join the EU, it would give NATO access to the Black Sea, and that is why he opted out in the last moment.

So, I think that that is an important thing to keep in mind. And the fact that Ursula von der Leyen is at the forefront of all of the policies which I described as British, in my various examples, such as the fight of so-called democracies and so-called autocratic regimes, when she is talking about that every day: She went to India talking like that.

I think the present EU has completely lost touch with the interest of its member-states. I think they have become a gigantic waterhead of a bureaucracy in Brussels which makes for the most part completely ridiculous decisions and orders and rules which are absolutely contrary to the interest of the member countries. And I actually have called for Germany to move out of the EU, because we don't need a bureaucracy to have a unified Europe! We could have a Europe of the Fatherlands, in the spirit of Charles de Gaulle! We could work together for a joint mission to contribute to shaping a new world order in a positive way: We could do that by having national sovereign governments just working together. You don't need this bureaucracy. That is my view, and I would just advise anybody who has an interest in their own sovereignty to not join this colossus.

Rasmussen: Elena, why don't you ask your question now?

Elena: Thank you so much. I find everything that Madam Helga said very, very interesting. And of course, at the moment, as I am very interested in the situation between Ukraine and Russia, my optimistic feeling is that Russia is going to come to a solution with Ukraine. Because as I have heard today, Putin has been somehow winning in the territories. So most likely something good will happen.

However, I think what Madam said is so beautiful, I would like to have something to read if possible. Because my connection was not very good, and I was not able to hear well. However, I would be very grateful if Madam could let me have what she said in a written form, that I can read and study. And I can write an article about what she has said, what are the goals of this new architecture and let other people to know about it.

Rasmussen: Elena we will have a transcript of Helga's comments, and we can send those to you and all the participants. And also the video of this conference will be available to send around.

We have one more questioner, Kwame. We can take a short question.

Kwame: I'm a Swede. Thank you for a nice presentation. My question, because I don't know: Would you say that China is united and in full control of the Chinese Communist Party? Or, are there some Chinese oligarchs that have good connections with their American counterparts? As for they send some money into the [inaud 51:09] laboratory, maybe to somehow get them connected to the globalists in the Western hemisphere. So, my question is, does the Chinese Communist Party have full control of the country?

Zepp-LaRouche: I would say, absolutely yes. And I just should say something, because right now, when you say "Communist," some people fall completely into a coma and have hysterical outbursts. I mean, the Communist Party of China is, in my view—and I don't even think that they would agree with that—but I think they're 90% Confucian, in the tradition of the ancient Chinese traditions and philosophy, which influenced Chinese policy for more than two millennia. And naturally, there is an element of Marxism and communism, but it's a meritocracy.

The way people look at the CPC in the West is completely uninformed, and I can only—my best way of answering is that I was in China for the first time, in 1971, in the middle of the Cultural Revolution, and I could travel around in Shanghai, Tientsin, Qingdao, Beijing, I could visit the countryside: And I saw a country which was really distraught! People were poor, the conditions were very terrible. The beautiful garden of the Summer Palace had been painted all red by the Revolutionary Guards. In any case, this was 51 years ago, and when you go to China now, it is so developed! They have 40,000 km of fast train system, of which nobody in the United States or Europe can even dream, because we have nothing like that! China has made an incredible development: 850 million people have been lifted out of poverty. And I could say many, many more things.

Deng Xiaoping coined the term “judging truth from facts.” And if you look at the facts of the gigantic development of China in the last 40 years, in particular, then this Communist Party has done something right. And if you travel to China, and study Chinese history, and meet people in all ranks of life, professors, students, people living in the countryside, other professions, you go to restaurants, and you see how people live, you find a population which is primarily content. They’re optimistic: They’re not like the Europeans and they’re for sure not like the Germans, who are completely pessimistic, and think nothing can function and you can’t do anything anyway. No. That is not the view in China. They are optimistic; they have, to a very large extent, trust in the government. And I think that the Chinese model, which the West is now regarding as a big competitor and threat, the Chinese model is doing something right, which the West is not doing right! And rather than opposing it, we should go to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and say: We should respect each other, even if the other one has a different social system, and even if the other one has a different way of doing things, according to their history, and their tradition. And I think then, we can absolutely peacefully live together. And

that is my stated view, and I think all the slanders about China are really absolutely unfounded, and in particular, this present campaign by this very dubious Adrian Zenz, we should squash before it really takes hold.

Rasmussen: All right, thank you very much Helga! We really appreciate your very in-depth discussion.

EIR spørger forsvarsministre fra Danmark, Storbritannien og Sverige om en ny sikkerheds- og økonomisk arkitektur på TV2 live

København, 4. marts (EIRNS) – {EIR} stillede et spørgsmål om Schiller Instituttets forslag til en ny sikkerheds- og udviklings arkitektur på et pressemøde i dag med forsvarsministrene fra Danmark, Storbritannien og Sverige, om bord på den danske fregat Niels Juel, ved lanceringen af den militære øvelse Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) i Østersøen. Storbritannien har ledelsen af JEF, og denne øvelse med udgangspunkt i Danmark omfatter også Sverige og de tre baltiske lande, Estland, Letland og Litauen.

Den danske forsvarsminister Morten Bødskov besvarede {EIR}s spørgsmål, i selskab med den britiske forsvarsminister Ben Wallace og den svenske forsvarsminister Peter Hultqvist. Pressekonferencen blev transmitteret direkte og er arkiveret på dansk TV2. Der var filmhold og reportere fra andre danske medier, Sverige, Storbritannien (BBC), Agence France-Presse (AFP) og muligvis også andre lande, hvor det muligvis er

blevet transmitteret.

Her er endnu en video, som også inkluderer TV2's spørgsmål, om Danmark og Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) optrapper krisen med deres militære øvelser i Østersøen.

Hele pressekonferencen kan stadigvæk ses på TV2News den 4. marts 2022: Find "Nordeuropæiske forsvarsministre briefer om samarbejde" her.



"EIR: Michelle Rasmussen fra {Executive Intelligence Review} i USA. I betragtning af alvoren af krigen i Ukraine og faren for optrapning, ligefrem indtil atomkrig, har formanden for Schiller Instituttet Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordret til en international konference om en ny sikkerhedsmæssig og økonomisk arkitektur, der skal tage hensyn til alle landes fælles interesser. Har De en kommentarer til dette – nogen af ministrene?

"Den danske forsvarsminister Morten Bødskov: Der er kun én kommentar, nemlig at det JEF-samarbejde, som vi har indgået her, er vejen frem. Vi står sammen her i dag, for at bekræfte vores værdier, vores samarbejde, og det er vejen frem for den region, som vi befinder os i nu, og jeg er glad for, at vores britiske kollega og min svenske kollega er til stede her i dag."

Under den korte pressekonference om morgenen, rejste BBC spørgsmålet om atomkrig, da der blev spurgt, om Rusland i lyset af det russiske angreb på et ukrainsk atomkraftværk, ville være indstillet på at bruge atomvåben. Den britiske forsvarsminister Ben Wallace, nedtonede faren ved den nuværende situation med atomkraftværket. Han advarede Rusland mod at ramme atomkraftværker ved et uheld eller med vilje, og erklærede, at Putins tankegang synes at være, at der ikke er nogen grænser. Putin bør mindes om, at NATO er en konventionel og nuklear alliance.

Under eftermiddagens pressekonference var {EIR} den anden journalist i rækken, der stillede et spørgsmål, forud for en national dansk TV2-journalist, der sendte direkte, og som stillede fire spørgsmål om, hvorvidt denne Joint Expeditionary

Force-øvelse risikerer at eskalere den nuværende krise. Svaret fra den danske minister var bl.a., at vi er nødt til at trække en streg i sandet over for Putin og sikre friheden i Østersøområdet. {EIR} vil udsende endnu en video med denne udveksling på dansk, efterfulgt af {EIR}'s spørgsmål og svar.

English:

COPENHAGEN, March 4 (ERINS) – EIR asked the question at a press conference with the ministers of defense from Denmark, Great Britain and Sweden, aboard the Danish frigate Niels Juel, on the occasion of the start of the Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) military exercise in the Baltic Sea. The JEF is led by Great Britain, and this exercise, with the starting point in Denmark, also includes Sweden, and the three Baltic countries.

Danish Defense Minister Morten Bødskov answered EIR's question, alongside British Defense Minister Ben Wallace and Swedish Defense Minister Peter Hultqvist.

The press conference was broadcast live and is archived on Danish TV2, and there were film crews and reporters from other Danish media, Sweden, Great Britain (BBC), Agence France Press, and maybe other countries, so it might also have been covered live in other countries.

“EIR: Michelle Rasmussen from Executive Intelligence Review in the United States. Given the seriousness of war in Ukraine and the danger of escalation, even up to nuclear war, the president of the Schiller Institute Helga Zepp-LaRouche has called for an international conference for a new security and economic architecture to address the interests of all countries. Do you have any comments to that – any of the ministers?”

Danish Defense Minister Morten Bødskov: There is only one comment, that the JEF (Joint Expeditionary Force) cooperation that we have made here is the way forward. We stand together here, today, to confirm our values, our cooperation, and

that's the way forward for the region that we are in now, and I'm glad that our British colleague and my Swedish colleague are here today."

During the morning short press conference, the BBC reporter brought the nuclear war question up when he asked if, in light of the Russian attack on a Ukrainian nuclear plant, Russia would be in the mindset to use nuclear weapons. British Defense Minister Ben Wallace played down the danger of the current nuclear plant situation, warned Russia against hitting nuclear plants by accident or intention, said that Putin's mindset seemed to be that there are no limits, and Putin should be reminded that NATO is a conventional and nuclear alliance.

During the afternoon press conference EIR was the second journalist to ask a question, preceded by a national Danish TV2 journalist, broadcasting live, who asked four questions about if this Joint Expeditionary Force exercise can escalate the current crisis. The answer from the Danish minister included that we have to draw a line in the sand for Putin, and ensure freedom in the Baltic region. EIR will release another video with this exchange in Danish and followed by the EIR question and answer.

Interview med freds- og fremtidsforsker Jan Øberg: Om Ukraine-Rusland-USA-NATO

krisen, Danmarks forhandlinger om amerikanske soldater i Danmark, og Xinjiang spørgsmålet, den 21. februar 2022

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

Jan Øberg kan kontaktes her: oberg@transnational.org

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

Lydfil:

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Hello. Today is February 21st, 2022. I am Michele Rasmussen, the vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. And I'm very happy that peace researcher Jan Oberg agreed to this interview. Jan Oberg was born in Denmark and lives in Sweden. He has a PhD in sociology and has been a visiting professor in peace and conflict studies in Japan, Spain, Austria, Switzerland, part time over the years. Jan Oberg has written thousands of pages of published articles and several books. He is the co-founder and director of the Independent TFF, the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research in Lund, Sweden since 1985, and has been

nominated over several years for the Nobel Peace Prize.

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

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

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

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

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

Jan Oberg: Yes, and thank you very much for your very kind and long and detailed introduction of me. I would just say about that point that I'm amazed that this is now a kind of repeated truth in Western media, that Gorbachev was not given such promises. And it rests with a few words taken out of a longer article written years ago by a former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine, who says that Gorbachev did not say so. That article was published by Brookings Institution. Now the truth is, and there's a difference between truth and non truths, and we have

to make that more and more clear when we deal with the West at the moment. The truth is, if you go to the National Security Archives in the U.S., if I remember correctly, the George Washington University that is well documented, their own formulation is that there are cascades of documentation. However, this was not written down in a treaty, or signed by the Western leaders, who one after the other came to Gorbachev's dacha outside Moscow or visited him in Kremlin, and therefore some people would say it's not valid. Now that is not true in politics. If we can't rely on what was said and what was written down by people personally in their notebooks, etc.

George Bush, Margaret Thatcher, Helmut Kohl, James Baker, you can almost mention any important Western leader were unanimous in saying to Gorbachev, we understand that the Warsaw Pact has gone, the Soviet Union has gone, and therefore, we are not going to take advantage of your weakness. James Baker's formulation, according to all these sources, is we're not going to expand nature one inch. And that was said in 89, 90. That is 30 years ago. And Gorbachev, because of those assurances also accepted, which he's been blamed very much for since then, the reunification of Germany. Some sources say that was a kind of deal made that if Germany should be united, which it was very quickly after, it should be a neutral country. But the interpretation in the West was it could remain a member of NATO, but would then include what was at that time the German Democratic Republic, GDR [East Germany] into one Germany. You can go to Gorbachev's Foundation home page and you will find several interviews, videos, whatever, in which he says these things, and you can go to the Danish leading expert in this, Jens Jørgen Nielsen, who has also written that he personally interviewed Gorbachev, in which Gorbachev, with sadness in his eyes, said that he was cheated, or that these promises were broken, whatever the formulation is.

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. In your article, you actually quote from the head of NATO, the general secretary of NATO, back in 1990, one year before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Manfred Wörner, where you say that in these documents released by the U.S. National Security Archive, that you just referred to, "Manfred Wörner gave a well-regarded speech in Brussels in May 1990, in which he argued 'The principal task of the next decade will be to build a new European security structure to include the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. The Soviet Union will have an important role to play in the construction of such a system.' And the next year, in the middle of 1991, according to a memorandum from the Russian delegation who met with Wörner. He responded to the Russians by saying that he personally and the NATO council, were both against expansion "13 out of 16 NATO members share this point of view," and "Wörner said that he would speak against

Poland's and Romania's membership in NATO to those countries leaders, as he had already done with leaders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And he emphasized that we should not allow the isolation of USSR from the European community," and this was even while the U.S.S.R. was still alive. So it must have been even more the case after the U.S.S.R. collapsed, and Russia emerged.

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

And it is very interesting, as you point out, that 13 out of 16 NATO countries, at that time, were at that level, but in came in 1990 Bill Clinton. And he basically said, well, he didn't state it. He acted as though he had stated it, I don't care about those promises, and then he started expanding NATO. And the first office of NATO was set up in Kiev in 1994. That was the year when he did that. And that was a year when I sat in Tbilisi, Georgia, and interviewed the U.S. representative there, who, through a two-hour long conversation, basically talked about Georgia as "our country."

So, you know, it's sad to say it's human to make mistakes, but to be so anti-intellectual, so anti-empathetic, so imbued with your own thinking and worldview, you're not able to take the

other side into account, is much more dangerous than it was at that time, because the leaders we have in the western world today are not up to it. They were earlier, but these are not.

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

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

And it’s well known from one of those who were there, and participated, namely the assistant secretary of State for European Affairs, Mrs. Nuland, and she’s given a speech in the U.S. where, if I remember correctly, she says that the US has pumped \$5 billion into Ukraine over the years, to support democracy and human rights, et cetera, and training courses for young NGOs, et cetera. And it’s obvious that that operation, that ousting of the president, he had to flee to Russia, and the taking over, partly by neo-Nazis and fascists who were present and who probably did the beginning of the shooting and the killing of people, that all this had to do with the promise that was given to Ukraine years before that it would be integrated into the Euro-Atlantic framework. And

then it was kind of stopping and saying, we don't want that anyhow. We will negotiate something else, and we will look into what Putin has to offer, etc.

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

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

But what I'm talking about was something that happened in 2014, and there's no excuse for not mentioning that there's a connection between that coup d'état, and the influence of the West in Ukraine in a very substantial way, and what happened in Donbas and Crimea.

So I'm just saying, if I put it on a more general level, if we look at today's ability to understand, describe, analyze issues as conflicts, we are heading for zero understanding. There is nobody in the press, and nobody in politics who are able, intellectually, to see these things as conflicts, that is, as a problem standing between two or more parties that has

to be analyzed. And conflict resolution is about finding solutions that the parties we have defined as parties, and there certainly are many more than two in this very complex conflict, can live with in the future. What we are down to in banalization is that there is no conflict. There's only one party, Russia, that does everything bad and evil and terrible, while we are sitting in the receiving end, being the good guys who've done nothing wrong in history. Who could never rethink what we did or say, we're sorry, or change our policies, because we are right. There's only one problem. That's them. We're down now to the level in which these things, also the last three months, the accusations about Russia invading Ukraine, has nothing to do with conflict analysis. It is purely focusing on one party, and one party, by definition, is not a conflict.

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

This is not a defense of everything Russia does. What I'm trying to say is there is a partner over there, by the way they call us partners in the West. We call them anything else but partners. We don't even see them. We don't listen to their interests. We didn't listen to Putin when he spoke at the Munich conference in 2007 and said, 'You have cheated us.' And of course, when Gorbachev, 90 years old, says, you have

cheated us, he's not even quoted in the Western world, because there's no space anymore for other views than our own. You know, this autism that is now classical in the Western security policy elite is damn dangerous.

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

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

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

Russia is also Europe.

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

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

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

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

old enough to remember what was said to Gorbachev in those days when the Wall came down and all these things changed fundamentally.

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

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

Jan Oberg: Well, first of all, the question you are raising is a little bit like the seventh doctor who is trying to operate on a patient who is bleeding to death and then saying, "What should we do now?" What I have suggested over 30 years is something that should have been done to avoid the situation today, and nobody listened, as is clear, because you don't listen to researchers anymore who say something else that state-financed researchers do. So it's not an easy question you are raising, of course. I would say, of course, in the

immediate situation, the Minsk agreements, which have not been upheld, particularly by Ukraine in establishing some kind of autonomy for the Donbass area. Now that is something we could work with, autonomous solutions. We could work with confederations, we could work with cantonization, if you will. Lots of what happened, and happens, in the eastern republics of Ukraine. It reminds me of a country I know very well, and partly educated in and worked in during the dissolution, namely Yugoslavia. So much so that it resembles Granica. Ukraine and Granica in Croatia, both mean border areas. Granica means border, and there's so much that could have been a transfered of knowledge and wisdom and lessons learned, had we had a United Nations mission in that part. A peacekeeping mission, a monitoring mission. UN police and U.N. civil affairs in the Donbas region.

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

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

viable option.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that is to me, the the schwerpunkt [main emphasis], the absolutely essential, that is to give the Ukraine people a feeling of security and safety and stability and peace so that they can develop. I find it very interesting that President Zelensky, in this very long interview to the international press a couple of weeks ago, say I'm paraphrasing it. But he says "I'm tired of all these people who say that we are going to be invaded because it destroys our economy. People are leaving. No business is coming in, right?"

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

of Ukraine and its peoples and their needs.

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

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

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

My goodness, people don't read books. There's nothing about conflict prevention. We should prevent violence. We should prevent violent conflict, but preventing conflicts is nonsense, life is getting richer. There's not a family, there's not a school, there's not a workplace, there's not a political party, there's not a parliament in which there are no conflicts. Conflict is what life is made of. Conflict is terribly important because it makes us change and reflect. I'm all for conflicts, and I'm one hundred and ten percent against violence. But people will say "Conflict prevention is something we should work, on and educate people in." Nonsense from people who never read books, as I said.

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

right to self-defense.

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

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

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

The whole thing here that the big elephant in the room we are talking about is, well, there are two of them, is NATO expansion, which we should never have done this way. And secondly, it's the interest of the military-industrial-media-academic complex, as I call it, that earns a hell of a lot of money on people's suffering, and millions of people who, at this moment while we speak, are living in fear and despair because of what they see in the media is going to happen. None of what we see at this moment was necessary. It's all made up by elites who have an interest in these kinds of things happening or the threat of the Cold War. And even if we avoid a big war now, and I hope, I don't pray to anything, but I

hope very much that we do, thanks to some people's wisdom, and it's going to be very cold in Europe in the future after this.

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: I want to go into the other two subjects. Firstly, the question of the negotiations between Denmark and the United States in the context of the political, military and media statements of recent years alleging that Russia has aggressive intentions against Europe and the U.S. the Danish Social Democratic government announced on February 10th that a year ago, the U.S. requested negotiations on a Defense Cooperation Agreement, and that Denmark was now ready to start these negotiations. The government announced that it could

mean permanent stationing of U.S. troops and armaments on Danish soil. And if so, this would be against the decades-long policy of the Danish government not to allow foreign troops or armaments permanently stationed in Denmark. And you wrote an article two days later criticizing these negotiations. Why are you against this?

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

And secondly, what kind of democracy is that? We do not know what that letter in which the Americans asked to have negotiations about this, when it was written and what the content of it was. But what we hear is that a little more than a year ago, we began some negotiations about this whole thing,

that is behind the back of the parliament, and behind the back of the people, and then is presented more or less as a fait accompli. There will be an agreement. The question is only nitty-gritty, what will be in it.

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

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

Jan Oberg: And there the only thing the Danish government will do is, since they know that the "neither confirm nor deny policy" of the U.S., they would not even ask the question. If they are asked by journalists, they would say, "Well, we take for granted that the Americans honor or understand and respect that we will not have nuclear weapons on Danish territory, sea territory, or whatever. Now the Americans are violating that in Japan even. So, this is this is nonsense. There would be more nuclear weapons. I'm not saying they would go off or anything like that. I'm just saying there would be more undermining of Danish principles.

And then the whole thing, of course, has to do with the fact that Denmark is placing itself – and that was something the present government under Mette Frederiksen's leadership did before this was made public – is to put 110 percent of your

eggs in the U.S. basket. This is the most foolish thing you can do, given the world change. The best thing a small country can do is to uphold international law and the UN. Denmark doesn't. It speaks like the U.S. for an international rules-based order, which is the opposite of, or very far away from the international law.

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

Jan Oberg: A good foreign policy is one where you have a good capacity to analyze the world, do scenarios, discuss which way to go, pros and contras, and different types of futures, and then make this decision in your parliament based on a public discussion. That was what we did early, 60s, 70s and 80s. And then also when you become a bomber nation, when you become a militaristic one, when active foreign policy means nothing but militarily active, then, of course, you are getting closer and closer and closer down into the into the darkness of the hole, where suddenly you fall so deeply you cannot see the daylight,

where the hole is. I think it's very sad. I find it tragic. I find it very dangerous. I find that Denmark will be a much less free country in the future by doing these kinds of things. And, don't look at the basis of this agreement as an isolated thing. It comes with all the things we've done, all the wars Denmark has participated in. Sorry, I said we, I don't feel Danish anymore, so I should say Denmark or the Danes. And finally, I have a problem with democratically elected leaders who seem to be more loyal to a foreign government, than with their own people's needs.

China and Xinjiang

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

And also as a wrap-up question in the end, if you wanted to say anything else about what has to be done to make a change from looking at Russia and China as the autocratic enemies of the West, and to, instead, shift to a world in which there is cooperation between the major powers, which would give us the possibility of concentrating on such great task as economic development of the poorer parts of the world?

Jan Oberg: Well, of course, that's something we could speak another hour about, but what we did in our in our tiny think

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

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

Whereas now, significantly, for Western scholarship and media, they don't deal with, are not interested in sources. I'll come back to that. It's part of a much larger, only tell negative stories about China. Don't be interested in China's new social model. Don't be interested in how they, in 30 to 40 years did what nobody else in humankind has ever done. Uplifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and creating a society that I can see the difference from, because I visited China in 1983, and I know what it looked like back then when they had just opened up, so to speak.

And what we are saying is not that we know what happened and happens in Xinjiang, because we've not been there and we are not a human rights organization. We are conflict resolution and peace proposal making policy think tank. But what we do

say is, if you cannot come up with better arguments and more decent documentation, then probably you are not honest. If there's nothing more you can show us to prove that there's a genocide going on at Xinjiang, you should perhaps do your homework before you make these assertions and accusations.

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

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

So what is also striking to me is, very quickly, the uniformity of the press. They have all written the day that the Newline report that you referred to, was published, it was all over the place, including front pages of the leading Western newspapers, including the Danish Broadcasting's website, etc., all saying the same thing, quoting the same bits of parts from it.

The uniformity of this is just mind boggling. How come that nobody said, "Hey, what is this Newlines Institute, by the way, that nobody had heard about before? Who are these people behind it? Who are the authors?" Anybody can sit on their

chair and do quite a lot of research, which was impossible to do 20 years ago. If you are curious, if you are asked to be curious, if you are permitted to be curious, and do research in the media, in the editorial office where you are sitting, then you would find out lots of this here is B.S. Sorry to say so, intellectually, it's B.S.

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

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

These are the kinds of things that make me scared as an intellectual. One thing is what happens out in the world. That's bad enough. But when I begin to find out how this is going on, how it is manipulated internally in editorial offices, close to foreign ministries, etc. or defense ministries is then I say, we are approaching the Pravda moment. The Pravda moment is not the present Pravda [newspaper], but the Pravda that went down with the Soviet Union. When I visited Russia, the Soviet Union at a time for conferences, et cetera, and I found out that very few people believed anything they saw in the media. Now, to me, it's a question of whether the Western media, so-called free media want to save themselves or they want to become totally irrelevant, because at some point, as someone once said, you

cannot lie all the time to all of the people, you may get away with lying to some, to some people, for some of the time.

Michelle Rasmussen: President Lincoln

Jan Oberg: Yeah. So the long story short is this is not good. This deceives people. And of course, some people, at some point, people will be very upset about that. They have been lied to. And also don't make this reference anymore to free and state media. Viewers may like to hear that may not like it, but should know it, the US has just passed a law – They have three laws against China – How to intervene in all kinds of Chinese things, such as, for instance, trying to influence who will become the successor to Dalai Lama, and things like that. They are not finished at all about how to influence Taiwan, and all that, things they have nothing to do with, and which they decided between Nixon and Zhou Enlai that America accepted the One-China policy and would not mix themselves into Taiwanese issues. But that is another broken promise. These media are state media in the U.S. If you take Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia, they are those, particularly the latter, who have disseminated most of these Xinjiang genocide stories, which then bounce back to BBC, etc. These are state media. As an agency for that in in Washington, it's financed by millions of dollars, of course, and it has the mandate to make American foreign policy more understood, and promote U.S. foreign policy goals and views. Anybody can go to a website and see this. Again, I'm back to this, everybody can do what I've done. And that law that has just been passed says the U.S. sets aside 15 hundred million dollars, that's one point five billion dollars in the next five years, to support education, training courses, whatever, for media people to write negative stories about China, particularly the Belt and Road Initiative. Now I look forward to Politiken [Danish newspaper] or Dagens Nyheter [Swedish newspaper] or whatever newspapers in the allied countries who would say, "This comes from a state U.S. media" when it does.

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

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

The world is going towards diversity. And we have other cultures coming up who have other ways of doing things, and we may like it or not. But the beauty of conflict resolution and peace is to do it with those who are different from you. It is not to make peace with those who already love, or are already completely identical with. This whole thing is, unfortunately, a conflict and peace illiteracy that has now completely overtaken the western world. Whereas I see people thinking about peace. I hear people mentioning the word peace. I do not

hear Western politicians or media anymore mention the word peace. And when that word is not, and the discussion and the discourse has disappeared about peace, we are very far out.

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Jan.

**Ny forsvarsalliance med USA:
Mette Frederiksens ultimative
magtarrogance.**

**Udtalelse af Tom Gillesberg,
formand for Schiller Institut
i Danmark den 11. Februar
2022**

Når Mette Frederiksen i sin rolle som statsminister inden for få dage har afholdt hele to pressekonferencer, hvor hun flankeret af udenrigsministeren og forsvarsministeren har talt

i forherligende toner om kampen for frihed og suverænitet, så er det nok et tegn på, at det er netop de erklærede principper, som hun i en studehandel er blevet pålagt at ofre for fortsat opbakning til hendes fremadrettede personlige karriere. Da Anders Fogh Rasmussen brugte sin platform som dansk statsminister til at støtte Storbritanniens og USA's ulovlige krig imod Irak, der blev legitimeret med løggen om at Irak havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, endte det som bekendt med, at han blev belønnet med posten som generalsekretær for Nato og en international rolle som arrangør af konferencer til støtte for den britisk-amerikanske kampagne for at nedbryde suveræniteten hos de lande, der formaster sig til ikke blindt at følge de diktater, der kommer fra London og Washington.

Hvad har Mette Fredriksen gang i? At give USA ret til at udstationere militærpersonel og udstyr på dansk jord under amerikansk suverænitet afskaffer Danmarks nationale suverænitet og vil i stedet afsløre Danmark som en ren amerikansk vasalstat. Selv i de mørkeste stunder under den kolde krig, da Danmark var truet af sovjetiske planer om en besættelse af Danmark, var det noget, som danskere med respekt for både nationen og sig selv ikke ville tillade. Det ville have reduceret Danmark fra en nation til blot at være kanonføde i supermagternes stedfortræderkrig (Afghanistan er et skoleeksempel på, hvordan den slags typisk ender).

Forslaget til en ny forsvarsalliance mellem Danmark og USA har som sin grundantagelse, at vi skal forberede os på krig med Rusland, noget som bliver underbygget af mediernes svulstige krigspropaganda. Men siden den kolde krigs afslutning har Rusland på intet tidspunkt truet Danmark eller andre dele af Nato, men har tværtimod passivt set til, mens stadig flere dele af det tidligere Sovjetunionen og dets interessesfære blev indlemmet i Nato. Da turen så kom til Ukraine, sagde Rusland fra, og kræver nu aftaler, der kan garantere Ruslands fremtidige sikkerhed. Det burde være en kærkommen anledning til at diskutere en inkluderende sikkerhedsarkitektur for

Europa, som det faktisk blev lovet Rusland, da de satte Østtyskland og de andre tidligere Warszawapagt-lande fri i lighed med de andre sovjetrepublikker. En sikkerhedsarkitektur, hvor både øst og vest kan føle sig hjemme. I stedet ser vi en mobilisering for sanktioner og krig, hvor Danmark nu skal spille en udvidet rolle, på bekostning af danske interesser.

Hvordan kan det forsvares, at Mette Frederiksen overhovedet overvejer at sige ja til et for Danmark så ufordelagtigt og potentielt ødelæggende forslag i dag? Blot fordi en ven kræver at få lov til at dele seng med din ægtefælle eller dit barn, så behøver man jo ikke takke ja. Det er tydeligt, at Mette Frederiksen har lavet en aftale med djævelen, som i dette tilfælde er den britisk-amerikanske finansielle magtelite, der kontrollerer den vestlige efterretnings- og sikkerhedspolitik. I betragtning af den berettigede foragt, som Mette Frederiksen med flere udviste for Helle Thorning-Schmidt og andre, der helt åbenlyst var villige til at ofre sine vælgeres og nationens interesser for at være en del af magten, så vil nemesis ramme dobbelt hårdt, hvis Mette Frederiksen fortsætter med dette skoleeksempel på hybris.

Om Mette Frederiksen har fået et tilbud hun ikke kunne afslå, eller hvad hun forventer at få som tak for denne ofring af danske interesser og suverænitet, ved jeg ikke. Givet er det, at det på ingen måde er i dansk interesse at indgå en sådan aftale. Det vil ikke forbedre den danske sikkerhed men kraftigt forværre den. Danmark vil flytte sig selv ind i kategorien af strategiske mål for atommagten Rusland. Danmark udstiller sig samtidigt som et land, der ikke længere frit kan handle og interagere med det voksende antal lande, der i lighed med den nylige Beijing-erklæring fra Rusland og Kina ikke længere vil acceptere en særlig vestlig ret til at bestemme de internationale spilleregler, men som mener, at vi skal have en multipolær inkluderende verdensorden, hvor alle nationer bliver respekteret og kan samarbejde uden først at

skulle spørge om lov i London eller Washington.

At Mette Frederiksen foreslår dette samtidigt med at chefen for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, Lars Findsen, er varetægtsfængslet under anklage for højforræderi og uden mulighed for at kommunikere med offentligheden, bør få mere end et enkelt øjenbryn til at løfte sig og få flere end blot mig til at spørge, hvad pokker der egentlig foregår? Vi må råbe vagt i gevær og få Folketingets medlemmer til at gøre op med den slappe følgagtighed, de plejer at udvise over for magtens arrogance, specielt blandt "de gamle" partier, og sammen med modige patrioter i de danske institutioner få stoppet denne ødelæggelse af dansk suverænitet og danske interesser inden det er for sent.

**NYHEDSORIENTERING den 4.
februar 2022:**

**Mette Frederiksens problem:
Arrogance + Ignorance =
Katastrofe.**

Video, lyd og resumé..

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/tg-4.2.22-cut.mp3>

Resumé:

Før åbningsceremonien ved OL i Beijing er der topmøde mellem Putin og Xi Jinping hvor Rusland og Kina vil bekræfte det tætte venskab og nok fremlægge nye økonomiske samarbejdsaftaler. Man forbereder at gøre sig uafhængige af amerikanske dollars og SWIFT-systemet. Vestens diplomatiske boykot understreger at man ikke kan regne med Vesten.

Mette Frederiksens presse møde på Marienborg, hvor hun annoncerede at Danmark nu er i frontlinjen imod Rusland og ikke ville have en ligeværdig dialog er en farlig kurs. Arrogance + Ignorance = Katastrofe. Man er ikke dumme men dumlærde. Man fravælger med fuldt overlæg fakta, hvis de ikke passer ind i fortællingen man forsøger at sælge. Man overser de dramatiske konsekvenser af de beslutninger man træffer som i FE-sagen, Minksagen og nu korstoget imod Rusland.

Rusland havde ikke kun fået mundtlige løfter om at NATO ikke ville blive udvidet mod Øst. OSCE-aftalen fra Istanbul i 1999 garanterede ikke kun frihed for stater til at indgå alliancer for egen sikkerhed, men også at dette ikke måtte ske på bekostning af andre landes. Der har man ikke respekteret ved udvidelsen af NATO og diskussionen om at integrere Ukraine i Nato. Vi må forhandle og samarbejde med Rusland og Kina så alle kan leve trygt og sikkert.

Hvordan kan Vesten beskylde Kina for at lave (et ikke eksisterende) folkemord i Xinjiang, når man selv gennemfører et reelt folkemord i Afghanistan gennem at fastholde sanktioner og tilbageholde Afghanistans penge i vestlige banker? 20 mio. børn sulter og mange vil dø her i vinter, hvis ikke Vesten skifter kurs.

Se interview med Liu Xing fra Aalborg Universitet på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside.

Nedsmeltningen af det transatlantiske finansielle system er i gang. Siden 2008 er det blevet opbygget gigantiske finansbolser under 13 år med negative renter og kvantitative lempelser.

Inflationen i USA er nu 7 % og den er over 5 % i EU. Det er kun begyndelsen. Den kæmpe gæld der er opbygget skal der nu betales renter på og det er der ikke råd til. Der skal betales mere og værdierne er langt mindre værd. Det kan kun gå galt.

Eneste løsning er LaRouches fire økonomiske love. Lær af Kina. Rusland skal ikke vælge mellem Europa og Asien men være bindeled mellem Europa og Kina.

Hvedebrødsdagene er måske ovre for den danske regering. Kan ikke længere gemme sig bag COVID-19. Se på verden med friske øjne inden det er for sent. Gå med i Schiller Institutet.

Diskussion: Den danske håndtering af COVID-19 var meget bedre end mange andre steder, men det var ikke pga. af regeringen, men fordi der var en høj grad af tillid og samfundssind blandt befolkningen. Husk at mange lande i Europa ikke som Danmark er hoppet med på briternes korstog imod Rusland.

NYHEDSORIENTERING DECEMBER 2021-JANUAR 2022: 2022 er Lyndon LaRouches år// Kan vi undgå krig med Rusland?

Download (PDF, Unknown)