

Pressemeddelelse den 6. januar 2021: Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive traktaterne foreslåede af Putin. Interview med rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen til Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

KØBENHAVN – I lyset af den eskalerende spænding mellem USA/NATO og Rusland, som kan føre til en varm krig, ja endog atomkrig, foretog Schiller Instituttet i Danmark et timelangt engelsksproget video/lydinterview med Rusland-ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen den 30. december 2021.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er cand. mag. i idéhistorie og historie, og var i slutningen af 1990'erne Politikens Moskva-korrespondent. Han er forfatter til flere bøger om Rusland og Ukraine, leder af Russisk-Dansk Dialog og lektor i kommunikation og kulturelle forskelle på Niels Brock handelshøjskole. Jens Jørgen Nielsen underviser på Folkeuniversitetet og andre steder, ligesom han arbejder med danske eksportvirksomheder, der vil ind på det russiske, ukrainske og hviderussiske marked. Han har i mange år arrangeret rejser til Rusland.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen, med mange års erfaring i at analysere

Rusland, Ukraine og vestlige holdninger og handlinger i forhold til Rusland, taler tydeligt om konsekvenserne, hvis ikke Vesten er villig til seriøst at forhandle en diplomatisk løsning på de "røde linjer", som Putin og andre førende russiske talsmænd har udtalt er ved at blive krydset: Hvis Ukraine tilslutter sig NATO, og hvis NATO's ekspansion mod øst fortsætter, og hvorfor USA og NATO burde underskrive Putins foreslåede traktater om disse spørgsmål.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen tager fat på de ændringer, der er nødvendige på den vestlige side, som vil afgøre, om de kommende forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland om disse "røde linjer" den 10.-13. januar vil lykkes med at trække verden tilbage fra randen af krig.

Interviewet er endnu vigtigere efter bekendtgørelsen den 3. januar 2022 for første gang af en fælles erklæring fra stats- og regeringscheferne for de fem atomvåbenstater, som også er de permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd om, at "atomkrig ikke kan vindes og aldrig må udkæmpes", og dermed anerkendelsen af hvad der er på spil under den nuværende krise.

Nogle højdepunkter:

Et højdepunkt er Jens Jørgen Nielsens personlige diskussion i 1989 med Mikail Gorbatsjov om NATO-udvidelse mod øst:

"Faktisk havde jeg en lang snak med Mikhail Gorbatsjov, den tidligere leder af Sovjetunionen, i 1989, lige da NATO begyndte at bombe Serbien, og da de indlemmede Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn i NATO. Man bør huske på at Gorbatsjov er en meget rar person. Han er en meget livlig person, med godt humør og en erfaren person. Men da vi begyndte at snakke, spurgte jeg ham om NATO-udvidelsen, som foregik præcis den dag, hvor vi snakkede. Han blev meget dystert, meget trist, fordi han sagde: Altså, jeg talte med James Baker, Helmut Kohl fra Tyskland og

flere andre personer, og de lovede mig alle ikke at flytte en tomme mod øst, hvis Sovjetunionen ville lade Tyskland forene DDR (Østtyskland) og Vesttyskland, for at blive ét land, og komme til at blive medlem af NATO, men ikke bevæge sig en tomme mod øst.'... Det stod ikke skrevet, for, som han sagde, "Jeg troede på dem. Jeg kan se, at jeg var naiv."

Et andet vigtigt afsnit er, hvad Jens Jørgen Nielsen ville sige til Biden, og andre NATO-statschefer, i en privat diskussion før de kommende forhandlinger mellem USA/NATO og Rusland. "Jeg ville sige, 'Se, Joe, jeg forstår dine bekymringer. Jeg forstår, at du ser dig selv som en forkæmper for frihed i verden, ... men ser du, det spil, du nu spiller med Rusland, er et meget, meget farligt spil. Og russerne, som et meget stolt folk, man kan ikke tvinge dem', angående USA's og nogle europæiske landes politik, til at skifte Putin ud med en anden præsident. "Jeg kan forsikre dig, Joe Biden, vær sikker på, at hvis det lykkes, eller hvis Putin dør i morgen, eller de på en eller anden måde får en ny præsident, kan jeg forsikre dig om, at den nye præsident vil være lige så hård som Putin, måske endda hårdere... Jeg tror,□□det ville være klogt for dig, lige nu, at støtte Putin, eller at handle med Putin, engagere sig med Putin og lave noget diplomati, fordi alternativet er en mulighed for krig, og du burde ikke gå over i historien som den amerikanske præsident, der sikrede menneskehedens udryddelse. Det ville være et dårligt, meget dårligt eftermæle for dig.'

Han forholder sig til den reelle mulighed for, at vi søvngængeragtigt går ind i atomkrig, som før 1. Verdenskrig, som svar på Schiller Instituttets memorandum Er vi søvngængeragtigt på vej til atomekrig? den 24. december 2021.

"[Man] kan forestille sig, hvad der vil ske, hvis Kina, Iran og Rusland havde en militær alliance, der gik ind i Mexico, Canada, Cuba, måske også opstillede missiler dér... [T]anken om en atomkrig er forfærdelig for os alle, og det er derfor jeg

synes, at politikere må komme til fornuft... for milliarder vil dø i dette. Og det er et spørgsmål, om menneskeheden vil overleve. Så det er et meget, meget alvorligt spørgsmål. Og jeg tror vi bør spørge om Ukraines ret til at have NATO-medlemskab, som dets egen befolkning egentlig ikke ønsker, er det virkelig værd at risikere en atomkrig for? Sådan vil jeg sige det.”

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

Fuld støtte til seriøse forhandlinger med Rusland og underskrivelse af de to foreslåede traktater, som opfordret af Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Forkerte forestillinger i vesten om Rusland og Putin, og manglen på vilje til at håndtere andre kulturer som ligeværdige, medmindre de er ligesom os.

Hvordan pro-vestlige holdninger i Rusland, herunder af Jeltsin og Putin, blev afvist, og Rusland derefter vendte sig mod Kina.

Hvordan Ukraine-krisen ikke startede med "annekteringen" af Krim, men med det han kalder "et kup" mod den ukrainske præsident Janukovitj, som ønskede økonomiske forbindelser både med EU og Rusland; plus baggrunden for Krim-spørgsmålet.

Vigtigheden af en dialog mellem kulturer, herunder "Musikalsk dialog mellem Kulturer"-koncerterne i København, arrangeret af Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog og Det kinesiske Kulturcenter i København.

Jens Jørgen Nielsens opbakning til mange af Schiller Instituttets idéer og indsatser.

Mere information, eller for at aftale et nyt interview, kontakt:

Michelle Rasmussen fra Schiller Institutet i Danmark: 53 57 00 51, si@schillerinstitut.dk, www.schillerinstitute.com; www.schillerinstitut.dk

Afskrift på engelsk: (Kortet på side 15 viser NATO, hvis Ukraine og Georgien bliver medlemmer.)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Interview med Rusland ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive traktaterne foreslået af Putin. Interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Why the U.S. and NATO should sign the treaties proposed by Putin?

Udgivet på Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) tidsskrift bind 49, række 2 den 14. januar 2022. Her er en pdf-version:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Kortet på side 15 viser NATO udvidelse, hvis Ukraine og Georgien bliver medlemmer.

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen, by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, conducted December 30, 2021. Mr. Nielsen has degrees in the history of ideas and communication. He is a former Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s. He is the author of several books about Russia and the Ukraine, and a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization. In addition, he is an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Hello, viewers. I am Michelle Rasmussen, the Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. This is an interview with Jens Jørgen Nielsen from Denmark.

The Schiller Institute released a [[memorandum]][] December 24 titled "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III." In the beginning, it states, "Ukraine is being used by geopolitical forces in the West that answer to the bankrupt speculative financial system, as the flashpoint to trigger a strategic showdown with Russia, a showdown which is already more dangerous than the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, and which could easily end up in a thermonuclear war which no one would win, and none would survive."

Jens Jørgen, in the past days, Russian President Putin and other high-level spokesmen have stated that Russia's red lines are about to be crossed, and they have called for treaty negotiations to come back from the brink. What are these red lines and how dangerous is the current situation?

%%Russian 'Red Lines'

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Thank you for inviting me. First, I would like to say that I think that the question you have raised here about red lines, and the question also about are we sleepwalking into a new war, is very relevant. Because, as an historian, I know what happened in 1914, at the beginning of the First World War—a kind of sleepwalking. No one really wanted the war, actually, but it ended up with war, and tens of million people were killed, and then the whole world disappeared at this time, and the world has never been the same. So, I think it's a very, very relevant question that you are asking here.

You asked me specifically about Putin, and the red lines. I heard that the Clintons, Bill and Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry, and many other American politicians, claim that we don't have things like red lines anymore. We don't have zones of influence anymore, because we have a new world. We have a new liberal world, and we do not have these kinds of things. It belongs to another century and another age. But you could ask the question, "What actually are the Americans doing in Ukraine, if not defending their own red lines?"

Because I think it's like, if you have a power, a superpower, a big power like Russia, I think it's very, very natural that any superpower would have some kind of red lines. You can imagine what would happen if China, Iran, and Russia had a military alliance, going into Mexico, Canada, Cuba, maybe also putting missiles up there. I don't think anyone would doubt what would happen. The United States would never accept it, of course. So, the Russians would normally ask, "Why should we accept that Americans are dealing with Ukraine and preparing, maybe, to put up some military hardware in Ukraine? Why should we? And I think it's a very relevant question. Basically, the Russians see it today as a question of power, because the Russians, actually, have tried for, I would say, 30 years. They have tried.

I was in Russia 30 years ago. I speak Russian. I'm quite sure

that the Russians, at that time, dreamt of being a part of the Western community, and they had very, very high thoughts about the Western countries, and Americans were extremely popular at this time. Eighty percent of the Russian population in 1990 had a very positive view of the United States. Later on, today, and even for several years already, 80%, the same percentage, have a negative view of Americans. So, something happened, not very positively, because 30 years ago, there were some prospects of a new world.

There really were some ideas, but something actually was screwed up in the 90s. I have some idea about that. Maybe we can go in detail about it. But things were screwed up, and normally, today, many people in the West, in universities, politicians, etc. think that it's all the fault of Putin. It's Putin's fault. Whatever happened is Putin's fault. Now, we are in a situation which is very close to the Cuban Missile Crisis, which you also mentioned. But I don't think it is that way. I think it takes two to tango. We know that, of course, but I think many Western politicians have failed to see the compliance of the western part in this, because there are many things which play a role that we envisage in a situation like that now.

The basic thing, if you look at it from a Russian point of view, it's the extension to the east of NATO. I think that's a real bad thing, because Russia was against it from the very beginning. Even Boris Yeltsin, who was considered to be the man of the West, the democratic Russia, he was very, very opposed to this NATO alliance going to the East, up to the borders of Russia.

And we can see it now, because recently, some new material has been released in America, an exchange of letters between Yeltsin and Clinton at this time. So, we know exactly that Yeltsin, and Andrei Kozyrev, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs at this time, were very much opposed to it. And then Putin came along. Putin came along not to impose his will on

the Russian people. He came along because there was, in Russia, a will to oppose this NATO extension to the East. So, I think things began at this point.

And later on, we had the Georgian crisis in 2008, and we had, of course, the Ukraine crisis in 2014, and, also, with Crimea and Donbass, etc.

And now we are very, very close to—I don't think it's very likely we will have a war, but we are very close to it, because wars often begin by some kind of mistake, some accident, someone accidentally pulls the trigger, or presses a button somewhere, and suddenly, something happens. Exactly what happened in 1914, at the beginning of World War I. Actually, there was one who was shot in Sarajevo. Everyone knows about that, and things like that could happen. And for us, living in Europe, it's awful to think about having a war.

We can hate Putin. We can think whatever we like. But the thought of a nuclear war is horrible for all of us, and that's why I think that politicians could come to their senses.

And I think also this demonization of Russia, and demonization of Putin, is very bad, of course, for the Russians. But it's very bad for us here in the West, for us, in Europe, and also in America. I don't think it's very good for our democracy. I don't think it's very good. I don't see very many healthy perspectives in this. I don't see any at all.

I see some other prospects, because we could cooperate in another way. There are possibilities, of course, which are not being used, or put into practice, which certainly could be.

So, yes, your question is very, very relevant and we can talk at length about it. I'm very happy that you ask this question, because if you ask these questions today in the Danish and Western media at all—everyone thinks it's enough just to say that Putin is a scoundrel, Putin is a crook, and everything is good. No, we have to get along. We have to find some ways to

cooperate, because otherwise it will be the demise of all of us.

%%NATO Expansion Eastward

Michelle Rasmussen: Can you just go through a little bit more of the history of the NATO expansion towards the East? And what we're speaking about in terms of the treaties that Russia has proposed, first, to prevent Ukraine from becoming a formal member of NATO, and second, to prevent the general expansion of NATO, both in terms of soldiers and military equipment towards the East. Can you speak about this, also in terms of the broken promises from the Western side?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Actually, the story goes back to the beginning of the nineties. I had a long talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, the former leader of the Soviet Union, in 1989, just when NATO started to bomb Serbia, and when they adopted Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO. You should bear in mind that Gorbachev is a very nice person. He's a very lively person, with good humor, and an experienced person.

But when we started to talk, I asked him about the NATO expansion, which was going on exactly the day when we were talking. He became very gloomy, very sad, because he said,

[[[begin quote indent]]]

Well, I talked to James Baker, Helmut Kohl from Germany, and several other persons, and they all promised me not to move an inch to the East, if Soviet Union would let Germany unite the GDR (East Germany) and West Germany, to become one country, and come to be a member of NATO, but not move an inch to the East.

[[[end quote indent]]]

I think, also, some of the new material which has been released—I have read some of it, some on WikiLeaks, and some

can be found. It's declassified. It's very interesting. There's no doubt at all. There were some oral, spoken promises to Mikhail Gorbachev. It was not written, because, as he said, "I believed them. I can see I was naive."

I think this is a key to Putin today, to understand why Putin wants not only sweet words. He wants something based on a treaty, because, basically, he doesn't really believe the West. The level of trust between Russia and NATO countries is very, very low today. And it's a problem, of course, and I don't think we can overcome it in a few years. It takes time to build trust, but the trust is not there for the time being.

But then, the nature of the NATO expansion has gone step, by step, by step. First, it was the three countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—and then, in 2004, six years later, came, among other things—the Baltic republics, and Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. And the others came later on—Albania, Croatia, etc. And then in 2008, there was a NATO Summit in Bucharest, where George Bush, President of the United States, promised Georgia and Ukraine membership of NATO. Putin was present. He was not President at this time. He was Prime Minister in Russia, because the President was [Dmitry] Medvedev, but he was very angry at this time. But what could he do? But he said, at this point, very, very clearly, "We will not accept it, because our red lines would be crossed here. We have accepted the Baltic states. We have retreated. We've gone back. We've been going back for several years," but still, it was not off the table.

It was all because Germany and France did not accept it, because [Chancellor Angela] Merkel and [President François] Hollande, at this time, did not accept Ukraine and Georgia becoming a member of NATO. But the United States pressed for it, and it is still on the agenda of the United States, that Georgia and Ukraine should be a member of NATO.

So, there was a small war in August, the same year, a few

months after this NATO Summit, where, actually, it was Georgia which attacked South Ossetia, which used to be a self-governing part of Georgia. The incumbent Georgian president, Mikheil Saakashvili did not want to accept the autonomous status of South Ossetia, so Georgia attacked South Ossetia. Russian soldiers were deployed in South Ossetia, and 14 of them were killed by the Georgian army. And you could say that George W. Bush promised Georgian President Saakashvili that the Americans would support the Georgians, in case Russia should retaliate, which they did.

The Russian army was, of course, much bigger than the Georgian army, and it smashed the Georgian army in five days, and retreated. There was no help from the United States to the Georgians. And, I think, that from a moral point of view, I don't think it's a very wise policy, because you can't say "You just go on. We will help you"—and not help at all when it gets serious. I think, from a moral point of view, it's not very fair.

%%A Coup in Ukraine

But, actually, it's the same which seems to be happening now in Ukraine, even though there was, what I would call a coup, an orchestrated state coup, in 2014. I know there are very, very different opinions about this, but my opinion is that there was a kind of coup to oust the sitting incumbent President, Viktor Yanukovich, and replace him with one who was very, very keen on getting into NATO. Yanukovich was not very keen on going into NATO, but he still had the majority of the population. And it's interesting. In Ukraine, there's been a lot of opinion polls conducted by Germans, Americans, French, Europeans, Russians and Ukrainians. And all these opinion polls show that a majority of Ukrainian people did not want to join NATO.

After that, of course, things moved very quickly, because Crimea was a very, very sensitive question for Russia, for

many reasons. First, it was a contested area because it was, from the very beginning, from 1991, when Ukraine was independent—there was no unanimity about Crimea and its status, because the majority of Crimea was Russian-speaking, and is very culturally close to Russia, in terms of history. It's very close to Russia. It's one of the most patriotic parts of Russia, actually. So, it's a very odd part of Ukraine. It always was a very odd part of Ukraine.

The first thing the new government did in February 2014, was to forbid the Russian language, as a language which had been used in local administration, and things like that. It was one of the stupidest things you could do in such a very tense situation. Ukraine, basically, is a very cleft society. The eastern southern part is very close to Russia. They speak Russian and are very close to Russian culture. The western part, the westernmost part around Lviv, is very close to Poland and Austria, and places like that. So, it's a cleft society, and in such a society you have some options. One option is to embrace all the parts of society, different parts of society. Or you can, also, one part could impose its will on the other part, against its will. And that was actually what happened.

So, there are several crises. There is the crisis in Ukraine, with two approximately equally sized parts of Ukraine. But you also have, on the other hand, the Russian-NATO question. So, you had two crises, and they stumbled together, and they were pressed together in 2014. So, you had a very explosive situation which has not been solved to this day.

And for Ukraine, I say that as long as you have this conflict between Russia and NATO, it's impossible to solve, because it's one of the most corrupt societies, one of the poorest societies in Europe right now. A lot of people come to Denmark, where we are now, to Germany and also to Russia. Millions of Ukrainians have gone abroad to work, because there are really many, many social problems, economic problems,

things like that.

And that's why Putin—if we remember what Gorbachev told me about having things on paper, on treaties, which are signed—and that's why Putin said, what he actually said to the West, “I don't really believe you, because when you can, you cheat.” He didn't put it that way, but that was actually what he meant: “So now I tell you very, very, very, very clearly what our points of view are. We have red lines, like you have red lines. Don't try to cross them.”

And I think many people in the West do not like it. I think it's very clear, because I think the red lines, if you compare them historically, are very reasonable. If you compare them with the United States and the Monroe Doctrine, which is still in effect in the USA, they are very, very reasonable red lines. I would say that many of the Ukrainians, are very close to Russia. I have many Ukrainian friends. I sometimes forget that they are Ukrainians, because their language, their first language, is actually Russian, and Ukrainian is close to Russian.

So, those countries being part of an anti-Russian military pact, it's simply madness. It cannot work. It will not work. Such a country would never be a normal country for many, many years, forever.

I think much of the blame could be put on the NATO expansion and those politicians who have been pressing for that for several years. First and foremost, Bill Clinton was the first one, Madeline Albright, from 1993. At this time, they adopted the policy of major extension to the East. And George W. Bush also pressed for Ukraine and Georgia to become members of NATO.

And for every step, there was, in Russia, people rallying around the flag. You could put it that way, because you have pressure. And the more we pressure with NATO, the more the

Russians will rally around the flag, and the more authoritarian Russia will be. So, we are in this situation. Things are now happening in Russia, which I can admit I do not like, closing some offices, closing some media. I do not like it at all. But in a time of confrontation, I think it's quite reasonable, understandable, even though I would not defend it. But it's understandable. Because the United States, after 9/11, also adopted a lot of defensive measures, and a kind of censorship, and things like that. It's what happens when you have such tense situations.

We should just also bear in mind that Russia and the United States are the two countries which possess 90% of the world's nuclear armament. Alone, the mere thought of them using some of this, is a doomsday perspective, because it will not be a small, tiny war, like World War II, but it will dwarf World War II, because billions will die in this. And it's a question, if humanity will survive. So, it's a very, very grave question.

I think we should ask if the right of Ukraine to have NATO membership—which its own population does not really want— “Is it really worth the risk of a nuclear war?” That's how I would put it.

I will not take all blame away from Russia. That's not my point here. My point is that this question is too important. It's very relevant. It's very important that we establish a kind of modus vivendi. It's a problem for the West. I also think it's very important that we learn, in the West, how to cope with people who are not like us. We tend to think that people should become democrats like we are democrats, and only then will we deal with them. If they are not democrats, like we are democrats, we will do everything we can to make them democrats. We will support people who want to make a revolution in their country, so they become like us. It's a very, very dangerous, dangerous way of thinking, and a destructive way of thinking.

I think that we in the West should study, maybe, a little more what is happening in other organizations not dominated by the West. I'm thinking about the BRICS, as one organization. I'm also thinking about the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, in which Asian countries are cooperating, and they are not changing each other. The Chinese are not demanding that we should all be Confucians. And the Russians are not demanding that all people in the world should be Orthodox Christians, etc. I think it's very, very important that we bear in mind that we should cope with each other like we are, and not demand changes. I think it's a really dangerous and stupid game to play. I think the European Union is also very active in this game, which I think is very, very—Well, this way of thinking, in my point of view, has no perspective, no positive perspective at all.

%%Diplomacy to Avert Catastrophe

Michelle Rasmussen: Today, Presidents Biden and Putin will speak on the phone, and important diplomatic meetings are scheduled for the middle of January. What is going to determine if diplomacy can avoid a disaster, as during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just called this a “reverse missile crisis.” Or, if Russia will feel that they have no alternative to having a military response, as they have openly stated. What changes on the Western side are necessary? If you had President Biden alone in a room, or other heads of state of NATO countries, what would you say to them?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I would say, “Look, Joe, I understand your concerns. I understand that you see yourself as a champion of freedom in the world, and things like that. I understand the positive things about it. But, you see, the game you now are playing with Russia is a very, very dangerous game. And the Russians, are a very proud people; you cannot force them. It's not an option. I mean, you cannot, because it has been American, and to some degree, also European Union

policy, to change Russia, to very much like to change, so that they'll have another president, and exchange Putin for another president."

But I can assure you, if I were to speak to Joe Biden, I'd say, "Be sure that if you succeed, or if Putin dies tomorrow, or somehow they'll have a new President, I can assure you that the new President will be just as tough as Putin, maybe even tougher. Because in Russia, you have much tougher people. I would say even most people in Russia who blame Putin, blame him because he's not tough enough on the West, because he was soft on the West, too liberal toward the West, and many people have blamed him for not taking the eastern southern part of Ukraine yet—that he should have done it.

"So, I would say to Biden, "I think it would be wise for you, right now, to support Putin, or to deal with Putin, engage with Putin, and do some diplomacy, because the alternative is a possibility of war, and you should not go down into history as the American president who secured the extinction of humanity. It would be a bad, very bad record for you. And there are possibilities, because I don't think Putin is unreasonable. Russia has not been unreasonable. I think they have turned back. Because in 1991, it was the Russians themselves, who disbanded the Soviet Union. It was the Russians, Moscow, which disbanded the Warsaw Pact. The Russians, who gave liberty to the Baltic countries, and all other Soviet Republics. And with hardly any shots, and returned half a million Soviet soldiers back to Russia. No shot was fired at all. I think it's extraordinary.

"If you compare what happened to the dismemberment of the French and the British colonial empires after World War II, the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact was very, very civilized, in many ways. So, stop thinking about Russia as uncivilized, stupid people, who don't understand anything but mere power. Russians are an educated people. They understand a lot of arguments, and they are interested in cooperating. There will

be a lot of advantages for the United States, for the West, and also the European Union, to establish a kind of more productive, more pragmatic relationship, cooperation. There are a lot of things in terms of energy, climate, of course, and terrorism, and many other things, where it's a win-win situation to cooperate with them.

"The only thing Russia is asking for is not to put your military hardware in their backyard. I don't think it should be hard for us to accept, certainly not to understand why the Russians think this way."

And we in the West should think back to the history, where armies from the West have attacked Russia. So, they have it in their genes. I don't think that there is any person in Russia who has forgot, or is not aware of, the huge losses the Soviet Union suffered from Nazi Germany in the 1940s during World War II. And you had Napoleon also trying to—You have a lot of that experience with armies from the West going into Russia. So, it's very, very large, very, very deep.

Michelle Rasmussen: Was it around 20 million people who died during World War II?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: In the Soviet Union. There were also Ukrainians, and other nationalities, but it was around 18 million Russians, if you can count it, because it was the Soviet Union, but twenty-seven million people in all. It's a huge part, because Russia has experience with war. So, the Russians would certainly not like war. I think the Russians have experience with war, that also the Europeans, to some extent, have, that the United States does not have.

Because the attack I remember in recent times is the 9/11 attack, the twin towers in New York. Otherwise, the United States does not have these experiences. It tends to think more in ideological terms, where the Russians, certainly, but also to some extent, some people in Europe, think more

pragmatically, more that we should, at any cost, avoid war, because war creates more problems than it solves. So, have some pragmatic cooperation. It will not be very much a love affair. Of course not. But it will be on a very pragmatic—

%%The Basis for Cooperation

Michelle Rasmussen: Also, in terms of dealing with this horrible humanitarian situation in Afghanistan and cooperating on the pandemic.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Of course, there are possibilities. Right now, it's like we can't even cooperate in terms of vaccines, and there are so many things going on, from both sides, actually, because we have very, very little contact between—

I had some plans to have some cooperation between Danish and Russian universities in terms of business development, things like that, but it turned out there was not one crown, as our currency is called. You could have projects in southern America, Africa, all other countries. But not Russia, which is stupid.

Michelle Rasmussen: You wrote two recent books about Russia. One is called, *On His Own Terms: Putin and the New Russia*, and the latest one, just from September, *Russia Against the Grain*. Many people in the West portray Russia as the enemy, which is solely responsible for the current situation, and Putin as a dictator who is threatening his neighbors militarily and threatening the democracy of the free world. Over and above what you have already said, is this true, or do you have a different viewpoint?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Of course, I have a different point of view. Russia for me, is not a perfect country, because such a country does not exist, not even Denmark! Some suppose it is. But there's no such thing as a perfect society. Because societies are always developing from somewhere, to somewhere,

and Russia, likewise. Russia is a very, very big country. So, you can definitely find things which are not very likable in Russia. Definitely. That's not my point here.

But I think that in the West, actually for centuries, we have—if you look back, I have tried in my latest book, to find out how Western philosophers, how church people, how they look at Russia, from centuries back. And there has been kind of a red thread. There's been a kind of continuation. Because Russia has very, very, very often been characterized as our adversary, as a country against basic European values. Five hundred years back, it was against the Roman Catholic Church, and in the 17th and 18th Centuries it was against the Enlightenment philosophers, and in the 20th century, it was about communism—it's also split people in the West, and it was also considered to be a threat. But it is also considered to be a threat today, even though Putin is not a communist. He is not a communist. He is a conservative, a moderate conservative, I would say.

Even during the time of Yeltsin, he was also considered liberal and progressive, and he loved the West and followed the West in all, almost all things they proposed.

But still, there's something with Russia—which I think from a philosophical point of view is very important to find out—that we have some very deep-rooted prejudices about Russia, and I think they play a role. When I speak to people who say, "Russia is an awful country, and Putin is simply a very, very evil person, is a dictator," I say, "Have you been in Russia? Do you know any Russians?" "No, not really." "Ok. But what do you base your points of view on?" "Well, what I read in the newspapers, of course, what they tell me on the television."

Well, I think that's not good enough. I understand why the Russians—I very often talk to Russian politicians, and other people, and what they are sick and tired of, is this notion that the West is better: "We are on a higher level. And if

Russians should be accepted by the West, they should become like us. Or at least they should admit that they are on a lower level, in relation to our very high level.”

And that is why, when they deal with China, or deal with India, and when they deal with African countries, and even Latin American countries, they don't meet such attitudes, because they are on more equal terms. They're different, yes, but one does not consider each other to be on a higher level.

And that's why I think that cooperation in BRICS, which we talked about, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, I think it's quite successful. I don't know about the future, but I have a feeling that if you were talking about Afghanistan, I think if Afghanistan could be integrated into this kind of organization, one way or another, I have a feeling it probably would be more successful than the 20 years that the NATO countries have been there.

I think that cultural attitudes play a role when we're talking about politics, because a lot of the policy from the American, European side, is actually very emotional. It's very much like, “We have some feelings—we fear Russia. We don't like it,” or “We think that it's awful.” And “Our ideas, we know how to run a society much better than the Russians, and the Chinese, and the Indians, and the Muslims,” and things like that. It's a part of the problem. It's a part of our problem in the West. It's a part of our way of thinking, our philosophy, which I think we should have a closer look at and criticize. But it's difficult, because it's very deeply rooted.

When I discuss with people at universities and in the media, and other places, I encounter this. That is why I wrote the latest book, because it's very much about our way of thinking about Russia. The book is about Russia, of course, but it's also about us, our glasses, how we perceive Russia, how we perceive not only Russia, but it also goes for China, because

it's more or less the same. But there are many similarities between how we look upon Russia, and how we look upon and perceive China, and other countries.

I think this is a very, very important thing we have to deal with. We have to do it, because otherwise, if we decide, if America and Russia decide to use all the fireworks they have of nuclear [armament] power, then it's the end.

You can put it very sharply, to put it like that, and people will not like it. But basically, we are facing these two alternatives: Either we find ways to cooperate with people who are not like us, and will not be, certainly not in my lifetime, like us, and accept them, that they are not like us, and get on as best we can, and keep our differences, but respect each other. I think that's what we need from the Western countries. I think it's the basic problem today dealing with other countries.

And the same goes, from what I have said, for China. I do not know the Chinese language. I have been in China. I know a little about China. Russia, I know very well. I speak Russian, so I know how Russians are thinking about this, what their feelings are about this. And I think it's important to deal with these questions.

%% 'A Way to Live Together'

Michelle Rasmussen: You also pointed out, that in 2001, after the attack against the World Trade Center, Putin was the first one to call George Bush, and he offered cooperation about dealing with terrorism. You've written that he had a pro-Western worldview, but that this was not reciprocated.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes. Afterwards, Putin was criticized by the military, and also by politicians in the beginning of his first term in 2000, 2001, 2002, he was criticized because he was too happy for America. He even said, in an interview in the BBC, that he would like Russia to

become a member of NATO. It did not happen, because—there are many reasons for that. But he was very, very keen—that's also why he felt very betrayed afterward. In 2007, at the Munich Conference on Security in February in Germany, he said he was very frustrated, and it was very clear that he felt betrayed by the West. He thought that they had a common agenda. He thought that Russia should become a member. But Russia probably is too big.

If you consider Russia becoming a member of the European Union, the European Union would change thoroughly, but they failed. Russia did not become a member. It's understandable. But then I think the European Union should have found, again, a *modus vivendi*.

Michelle Rasmussen: A way of living together.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, how to live together. It was actually a parallel development of the European Union and NATO, against Russia. In 2009, the European Union invited Georgia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, to become members of the European Union, but not Russia. Even though they knew that there was really a lot of trade between Ukraine, also Georgia, and Russia. And it would interfere with that trade. But they did not pay attention to Russia.

So, Russia was left out at this time. And so eventually, you could say, understandably, very understandably, Russia turned to China. And in China, with cooperation with China, they became stronger. They became much more self-confident, and they also cooperated with people who respected them much more. I think that's interesting, that the Chinese understood how to deal with other people with respect, but the Europeans and Americans did not.

%%Ukraine, Again

Michelle Rasmussen: Just before we go to our last questions. I want to go back to Ukraine, because it's so important. You

said that the problem did not start with the so-called annexation of Crimea, but with what you called a coup against the sitting president. Can you just explain more about that? Because in the West, everybody says, "Oh, the problem started when Russia annexed Crimea."

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, if you take Ukraine, in 2010 there was a presidential election, and the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe] monitored the election, and said that it was very good, and the majority voted for Viktor Yanukovich. Viktor Yanukovich did not want Ukraine to become a member of NATO. He wanted to cooperate with the European Union. But he also wanted to keep cooperating with Russia. Basically, that's what he was like. But it's very often claimed that he was corrupt. Yes, I don't doubt it, but name me one president who has not been corrupt. That's not the big difference, it's not the big thing, I would say. But then in 2012, there was also a parliamentary election in Ukraine, and Yanukovich's party also gained a majority with some other parties. There was a coalition which supported Yanukovich's policy not to become a member of NATO.

And then there was a development where the European Union and Ukraine were supposed to sign a treaty of cooperation. But he found out that the treaty would be very costly for Ukraine, because they would open the borders for European Union firms, and the Ukrainian firms would not be able to compete with the Western firms.

Secondly, and this is the most important thing, basic industrial export from Ukraine was to Russia, and it was industrial products from the eastern part, from Dnipropetrovsk or Dniepro as it is called today, from Donetsk, from Luhansk and from Kryvyj Rih (Krivoy Rog), from some other parts, basically in the eastern part, which is the industrial part of Ukraine.

And they made some calculations that showed that, well, if you

join this agreement, Russia said, "We will have to put some taxes on the export, because you will have some free import from the European Union. We don't have an agreement with the European Union, so, of course, anything which comes from you, there would be some taxes imposed on it." And then Yanukovich said, "Well, well, well, it doesn't sound good," and he wanted Russia, the European Union and Ukraine to go together, and the three form what we call a triangular agreement.

But the European Union was very much opposed to it. The eastern part of Ukraine was economically a part of Russia. Part of the Russian weapons industry was actually in the eastern part of Ukraine, and there were Russian speakers there. But the European Union said, "No, we should not cooperate with Russia about this," because Yanukovich wanted to have cooperation between the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia, which sounds very sensible to me. Of course, it should be like that. It would be to the advantage of all three parts. But the European Union had a very ideological approach to this. So, they were very much against Russia. It also increased the Russian's suspicion that the European Union was only a stepping-stone to NATO membership.

And then what happened was that there was a conflict, there were demonstrations every day on the Maidan Square in Kiev. There were many thousands of people there, and there were also shootings, because many of the demonstrators were armed people. They had stolen weapons from some barracks in the West. And at this point, when 100 people had been killed, the European Union foreign ministers from France, Germany and Poland met, and there was also a representative from Russia, and there was Yanukovich, a representative from his government, and from the opposition. And they made an agreement. Ok. You should have elections this year, in half a year, and you should have some sharing of power. People from the opposition should become members of the government, and things like that.

All of a sudden, things broke down, and Yanukovych left, because you should remember, and very often in the West, they tend to forget that the demonstrators were armed. And they killed police also. They killed people from Yanukovych's Party of the Regions, and things like that. So, it's always been portrayed as innocent, peace-loving demonstrators. They were not at all. And some of them had very dubious points of view, with Nazi swastikas, and things like that. And Yanukovych fled.

Then they came to power. They had no legitimate government, because many of the members of parliament from these parts of the regions which had supported Yanukovych, had fled to the East. So, the parliament was not able to make any decisions. Still, there was a new president, also a new government, which was basically from the western part of Ukraine. And the first thing they did, I told you, was to get rid of the Russian language, and then they would talk about NATO membership. And Victoria Nuland was there all the time, the vice foreign minister of the United States, was there all the time. There were many people from the West also, so things broke down.

%%Crimea

Michelle Rasmussen: There have actually been accusations since then, that there were provocateurs who were killing people on both sides.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Yes, exactly. And what's interesting is that there's been no investigation whatsoever about it, because a new government did not want to conduct an investigation as to who killed them. So, it was orchestrated. There's no doubt in my mind it was an orchestrated coup. No doubt about it.

That's the basic context for the decision of Putin to accept Crimea as a part of Russia. In the West, it is said that Russia simply annexed Crimea. It's not precisely what

happened, because there was a local parliament, it was an autonomous part of Ukraine, and they had their own parliament, and they made the decision that they should have a referendum, which they had in March. And then they applied to become a member of the Russian Federation. It's not a surprise, even though the Ukrainian army did not go there, because there was a Ukrainian army. There were 21,000 Ukrainian soldiers. 14,000 of these soldiers joined the Russian army.

And so, that tells a little about how things were not like a normal annexation, where one country simply occupies part of the other country. Because you have this cleft country, you have this part, especially the southern part, which was very, very pro-Russian, and it's always been so. There's a lot of things in terms of international law you can say about it.

But I have no doubt that you can look upon it differently, because if you look at it from the point of people who lived in Crimea, they did not want—because almost 80-90% had voted for the Party of the Regions, which was Yanukovych's party, a pro-Russian party, you could say, almost 87%, or something like that.

They have voted for this Party. This Party had a center in a central building in Kiev, which was attacked, burned, and three people were killed. So, you could imagine that they would not be very happy. They would not be very happy with the new government, and the new development. Of course not. They hated it. And what I think is very critical about the West is that they simply accepted, they accepted these horrible things in Ukraine, just to have the prize, just to have this prey, of getting Ukraine into NATO.

And Putin was aware that he could not live, not even physically, but certainly not politically, if Sevastopol, with the harbor for the Russian fleet, became a NATO harbor. It was impossible. I know people from the military say "No, no way." It's impossible. Would the Chinese take San Diego in the

United States? Of course not. It goes without saying that such things don't happen.

So, what is lacking in the West is just a little bit of realism. How powers, how superpowers think, and about red lines of superpowers. Because we have an idea in the West about the new liberal world order. It sounds very nice when you're sitting in an office in Washington. It sounds very beautiful and easy, but to go out and make this liberal world order, it's not that simple. And you cannot do it like, certainly not do it like the way they did it in Ukraine.

Michelle Rasmussen: Regime change?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, regime change.

%%The Importance of Cultural Exchanges

Michelle Rasmussen: I have two other questions. The last questions. The Russian-Danish Dialogue organization that you are a leader of, and the Schiller Institute in Denmark, together with the China Cultural Center in Copenhagen, were co-sponsors of three very successful Musical Dialogue of Cultures Concerts, with musicians from Russia, China, and many other countries. You are actually an associate professor in cultural differences. How do you see that? How would an increase in cultural exchange improve the situation?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, it cannot but improve, because we have very little, as I also told you. So, I'm actually also very, very happy with this cooperation, because I think it's very enjoyable, these musical events, they are very, very enjoyable and very interesting, also for many Danish people, because when you have the language of music, it is better than the language of weapons, if I can put it that way, of course. But I also think that when we meet each other, when we listen to each other's music, and share culture in terms of films, literature, paintings, whatever, I think it's also, well, it's a natural thing, first of all, and it's unnatural not to have

it.

We do not have it, because maybe some people want it that way, if people want us to be in a kind of tense situation. They would not like to have it, because I think without this kind of, it's just a small thing, of course, but without these cultural exchanges, well, you will be very, very bad off. We will have a world which is much, much worse, I think, and we should learn to enjoy the cultural expressions of other people.

We should learn to accept them, also, we should learn to also cooperate and also find ways—. We are different. But, also, we have a lot of things in common, and the things we have in common are very important not to forget, that even with Russians, and even the Chinese, also all other peoples, we have a lot in common, that is very important to bear in mind that we should never forget. Basically, we have the basic values we have in common, even though if you are Hindu, a Confucian, a Russian Orthodox, we have a lot of things in common.

And when you have such kind of encounters like in cultural affairs, in music, I think that you become aware of it, because suddenly it's much easier to understand people, if you listen to their music. Maybe you need to listen a few times, but it becomes very, very interesting. You become curious about instruments, ways of singing, and whatever it is. So, I hope the corona situation will allow us, also, to make some more concerts. I think it should be, because they're also very popular in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. As Schiller wrote, it's through beauty that we arrive at political freedom. We can also say it's through beauty that we can arrive at peace.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes.

%%The Role of Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, its founder and international President, are leading an international campaign to prevent World War III, for peace through economic development, and a dialogue amongst cultures. How do you see the role of the Schiller Institute?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, I know it. We have been cooperating. I think your basic calls, appeals for global development, I think it's very, very interesting, and I share the basic point of view. I think maybe it's a little difficult. The devil is in the details, but basically, I think what you are thinking about, when I talk about the Silk Road, when I talk about these Chinese programs, Belt and Road programs, I see much more successful development that we have seen, say, in Africa and European countries developing, because I have seen how many western-dominated development programs have been distorting developments in Africa and other parts of the world. They distort development.

I'm not uncritical to China, but, of course, I can see very positive perspectives in the Belt and Road program. I can see really, really good perspectives, because just look at the railroads in China, for instance, at their fast trains. It's much bigger than anywhere else in the world. I think there are some perspectives, really, which I think attract, first and foremost, people in Asia.

But I think, eventually, also, people in Europe, because I also think that this model is becoming more and more—it's also beginning in the eastern part. Some countries of Eastern Europe are becoming interested. So, I think it's very interesting. Your points of your points of view. I think they're very relevant, also because I think we are in a dead-end alley in the West, what we are in right now, so people anyway are looking for new perspectives.

And what you come up with, I think, is very, very interesting, certainly. What it may be in the future is difficult to say

because things are difficult.

But the basic things that you think about, and what I have heard about the Schiller Institute, also because I also think that you stress the importance of tolerance. You stress the importance of a multicultural society, that we should not change each other. We should cooperate on the basis of mutual interests, not changing each other. And as I have told you, this is what I see as one of the real, real big problems in the western mind, the western way of thinking, that we should decide what should happen in the world as if we still think we are colonial powers, like we have been for some one hundred years. But these times are over. There are new times ahead, and we should find new ways of thinking. We should find new perspectives.

And I think it goes for the West, that we can't go on living like this. We can't go on thinking like this, because it will either be war, or it'll be dead end alleys, and there'll be conflicts everywhere.

You can look at things as a person from the West. I think it's sad to look at Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and those countries, Syria to some extent also, where the West has tried to make some kind of regime change or decide what happens. They're not successful. I think it's obvious for all. And we need some new way of thinking. And what the Schiller Institute has come up with is very, very interesting in this perspective, I think.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, when you speak about not changing other people, one of our biggest points is that we actually have to challenge ourselves to change ourselves. To really strive for developing our creative potential and to make a contribution that will have, potentially, international implications.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Definitely

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute is on full

mobilization during the next couple of weeks to try to get the United States and NATO to negotiate seriously. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche has called on the U.S. and NATO to sign these treaties that Russia has proposed, and to pursue other avenues of preventing nuclear war. So, we hope that you, our viewers, will also do everything that you can, including circulating this video.

Is there anything else you would like to say to our viewers before we end, Jens Jørgen?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: No. I think we have talked a lot now. Only I think what you said about bringing the U.S. and Russia to the negotiation table, it's obvious. I think that it should be, for any prudent, clear-thinking person in the West, it should be obvious that this is the only right thing to do. So of course, we support it 100%.

Michelle Rasmussen: Okay. Thank you so much, Jens Jørgen Nielsen

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I thank you.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 15.
december 2021:
Kun samarbejde kan besejre
pandemien og forhindre
atomkrig**

Se også 2. del: 3 min.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

2. del: 3 min.

lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/tg151221.mp3>

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19. november 2021: Er Sputnik chok kommet? USA og Kina taler sammen, og EU anerkender kernekraft som grøn energi

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Emner:

Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference

Vil vesten samarbejde med Rusland og Kina om verdens problemer?

Giv vesten en fremtid, ikke blot en nulstilling og afskaffelsen af det moderne industrisamfund.

Biden-Xi Jinping online-topmøde

Diplomatiske initiativer vedrørende Hviderusland-Polen

COP 26: Modstand mod at afskaffe fossile brændstoffer.
Udviklingslandene vil have økonomisk udvikling

Mere energi? Byg kernekraftværker og øg fusionskraftsforskning

Fhv. diplomat Friis Arne Petersen: Europa skal tilslutte sig
Bælte- og Vejinitiativet og lære infrastrukturøkonomi fra Kina

COVID-19

Vores bedste råd til den danske og andre regeringer:
Lyt til Schiller Instituttet og Lyndon LaRouche – vi har
løsningerne

**Forhenværende dansk diplomat,
Friis Arne Petersen,
opfordrer Europa til
at slutte sig til Bælte- og
Vej-Initiativet
og lære om**

infrastrukturøkonomi fra Kina

There is an English version below.

København, 10. november (EIRNS) – Den tidligere danske ambassadør Friis Arne Petersen holdt en yderst vigtig tale i går, hvor han opfordrede Europa til at slutte sig til Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet (BRI), og udfordrede Europa og USA til at lære fra Kina, hvordan man skaber økonomisk vækst ved hjælp af investeringer i storstilet, højteknologisk infrastruktur. Hans konklusion var, at vi bliver nødt til at forstå infrastrukturens rolle i at skabe økonomisk vækst. Hvis vi sørger for vandforsyning, energi og transport, så vil der være vækst, fordi mennesker er kreative.

Friis Arne Petersen var dansk ambassadør til USA, Kina og Tyskland (5 år i hvert land fra 2005 til 2020), såvel som tidligere direktør for det danske udenrigsministerium. Før dette var han direktør for udenrigsministeriets russiske og østeuropæiske afdeling. Han er også økonom.

Konferencen »Geoøkonomi eller Geopolitik«, som både fandt sted fysisk og blev live-streamet, blev afholdt på Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS), den førende udenrigspolitiske tænketank som er tilknyttet det danske udenrigsministerium. Den kan ses på engelsk ovenover eller her: <http://www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics>

En repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet uddelte konferenceindbydelser til alle deltagere og stillede to spørgsmål (ved 1 time 54 minutter). Se nedenfor.

Først forklarede Lars Erslev Andersen, en DIIS-forsker, Halford Mackinders idé om britisk geopolitik og det eurasiske kerneland (11:50 minutter inde). Han stillede spørgsmålet, hvad det betyder for Europa, at Kina investerer i det centralasiatiske kerneland – er det

geopolitik eller geoøkonomi?

Her er højdepunkterne fra Friis Arne Petersens tale, som havde titlen »Er Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet geoøkonomi eller geopolitik?« (begynder 30 minutter inde).

Lær af Kina: Vi koncentrerer os ikke nok om, hvordan Kina skabte deres succesfulde økonomiske udvikling. Hvorfor er infrastruktur så vigtigt for Kina, både indenfor og udenfor landets grænser?

Finansiell udvikling: Kineserne var utilfredse med Den internationale Valutafond (IMF) og Verdensbanken, så de oprettede Den asiatiske infrastruktur- og Investeringsbank (AIIB). Til trods for opposition fra USA, efter at Storbritannien tilsluttede sig, og dernæst Frankrig og Tyskland, ringede Friis Arne Petersen til København og sagde, at vi bliver nødt til at varetage nationale interesser og tilslutte os.

Infrastruktur for en forenet nation: Udfordringen for Kina var ikke blot ulighed, men nationens samhørighed. Det vestlige Kina måtte udvikles. Det har også en global indvirkning. De opbyggede industrierne for at forsyne infrastrukturen med goder. De forsøgte at udvikle de bedste, billigste teknologier og i deres målrettethed forårsagede de en overproduktion, hvilket BRI hjælper dem af med.

Manglen på strategiske visioner indenfor infrastruktur i USA og Europa: Han kritiserede USA's program med kvantitative lempelser, siden Obama og fremefter, for ikke at investere i de nyeste transportteknologier ligesom Kina, der byggede et højhastighedstognet på tusindvis af kilometer. Han henviste til Los Angeles' forældede havn og transportinfrastruktur som den medvirkende årsag til den nuværende forsyningskrise.

Europa: Friis Arne Petersen fortalte en historie om den tid,

da SF's formand, transportminister Pia Olsen Dyhr, mødtes med den kinesiske transportminister, imens Friis Arne Petersen var ambassadør. Den kinesiske minister spurgte hende om den nyligt forhandlede (meget uambitiøse) danske togfond og bemærkede, »Tja, det er en begyndelse, men vi eksperimenterer allerede med tog, der kan køre 500 km/t«. De skaber forskningsbaseret innovation. Den danske ambassade i Kina begyndte gradvist at forstå transportøkonomi. Tyskland var et negativt eksempel ved at nægte at hjælpe Danmark med at bygge Femern Bælt-forbindelsen (mellem Danmark og Tyskland).

Tilbagevisningen af beskyldningen om gældsdiplomati: Friis Arne Petersen citerede en rapport fra forskere fra Johns Hopkins University og Harvard Business School, »Kinesiske banker er villige til at omstrukturere betingelserne for de eksisterende lån, og har faktisk aldrig beslaglagt et andet lands aktiver, mindst af alt havnen i Hambantota [i Sri Lanka]«. Han sagde også, at landene langs BRI har en større gæld til vestlige kreditorer, end til Kina. (Den tredje taler ved begivenheden, DIIS-forsker Yang Jiang, satte også spørgsmålstegn ved beskyldningen om gældsdiplomati.)

Den tredje tale, »Centralasien: Konkurrencen om Kernelandet«, givet af Yang Jiang, omhandlede forskellige asiatiske landes, samt Tyrkiets, investeringer i Centralasien.

Spørgerunden: Efter at have identificeret sig selv, takkede en repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet, Michelle Rasmussen, Friis Arne Petersen for hans vigtige tale og sagde, at Schiller Instituttet har kørt en kampagne for at Danmark, Europa og USA tilslutter sig BRI, frem for at betragte det som en trussel. Hun henviste til sin uddeling af flyveblade og sagde, at videokonferencen denne uge vil besvare nogle af disse spørgsmål.

Hun stillede to relaterede spørgsmål. Det første var, hvordan vi kan få USA og Europa til at holde op med at betragte Kina,

og særligt BRI, som en trussel, og i stedet se fordelene ved et økonomisk samarbejde. Vores motto er Fred gennem økonomisk Udvikling, fordi fortsættelsen af at betragte Kina og Rusland som trusler, og forfølgelsen af en konfrontationspolitik, fører til faren for krig.

Det andet spørgsmål var, hvad han mente om at integrere Afghanistan med BRI – kineserne er beredte på at gøre dette. Ville det ikke være vigtigt for USA og Europa – særligt de lande der var engagerede i krigen – at håndtere denne skrækkelige økonomiske krise i Afghanistan gennem et samarbejde med Kina?

Friis Arne Petersen svarede, at der er for mange opdelinger, snak om rivalisering eller de mange usikkerheder, som findes i forbindelse med Asiens fremgang. På samme tid som der er en vækst i den vestlige handel med Asien, for eksempel USA's køb af mange kinesiske produkter nu efter pandemien, er vi fuldstændig besat af ideen om politisk konfrontation og systemiske udfordringer.

Jeg betragter verdensordenen gennem økonomi. Fremskridtet i retningen af FN's udviklingsmål, takket være Asiens økonomiske præstation, giver mig en optimisme mht., at disse alarmister og folk, som ønsker at politisere og se farer og militære modstandere overalt, vil tabe. Vi bliver nødt til at betragte vores nationers samlede interesser.

På den ene side har Kina, med sine 14 nabolande, en større strategisk udfordring end USA, men Kina ser altid disse nabolande som muligheder, ligesom det som BRI for eksempel kunne opnå i Afghanistan. USA og Vesten har en meget klar interesse i at Afghanistans naboer, som for eksempel Kina, Pakistan og Indien, forsøger at tage vare på deres region, fordi de muligvis kan gøre dette bedre, end vi gjorde det i løbet af de sidste 20 år.

English:

COPENHAGEN, Nov. 10 (EIRNS) – Former Danish ambassador Friis Arne Petersen gave an extremely important speech yesterday calling for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative, and challenging Europe and the U.S. to learn from China how to generate economic development through large scale, high-technology infrastructure investment. His conclusion was we have to understand the role of infrastructure in growth economics. If we ensure water, power and transportation, there will be growth, because humans are creative.

Friis Arne Petersen was the Danish ambassador to the U.S., China and Germany (5 years in each country from 2005-2020), as well as the former director of the Danish Foreign Ministry, and, before that, director for the Foreign Ministry's Russia/Eastern Europe division. He is also an economist.

The event, "Goeconomics or geopolitics," both on-site and streamed, was held at the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), the leading foreign policy think tank, affiliated with the Danish Foreign Ministry. See it, in English, [here](http://www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics). (www.diis.dk/en/event/geoeconomics-or-geopolitics)

A Schiller Institute representative distributed conference invitations to all attendees, and asked two questions (at 1 hour 54 minutes), see below.

First, Lars Erslev Andersen, a DIIS researcher, explained Halford Macinder's idea of British geopolitics and the Eurasian heartland (at 11:50 minutes). He posed the question, what does it mean for Europe, that China is investing in the Central Asian heartland, is it geopolitics or goeconomics?

Here are highlights from Friis Arne Petersen's speech, entitled, "Is the Belt and Road Initiative goeconomics or geopolitics?," (at 30 minutes).

Learn from China: We are not concentrating enough on how China created their successful economic development. Why is infrastructure so important for China, both inside and outside the country?

Financing development: The Chinese were dissatisfied with the IMF and World Bank, so they created the AIIB. Despite opposition from the U.S., after the UK joined, then France and Germany, Friis Arne Petersen called Copenhagen and said that we have to take care of our national interest and join.

Infrastructure for a unified nation: The challenge for China was not just inequality, but the cohesion of the nation. Western China had to be developed. It also has global impact. They simultaneously built up the industries to provide the products for the infrastructure, trying to develop the best, cheapest technologies, and in their zeal, causing overproduction, which the BRI helps alleviate.

Lack of strategic infrastructure vision in the U.S. and Europe: The U.S.: He attacked the U.S. stimulus programs from Obama onwards, for not investing in the newest transportation technologies, like China, which built thousands of miles of high-speed rail. He referenced the Los Angeles port's antiquated harbor and transportation infrastructure as the contributing cause for the current bottleneck.

Europe: Friis Arne Petersen told an anecdote about the time SF's chairman Pia Olsen Dyhr met with the Chinese transportation minister while Friis Arne Petersen was ambassador. The Chinese minister asked her about the newly negotiated (very unambitious) Danish train plan, and he replied, "Well, that's a beginning, but we are experimenting with trains that can run 5-600 miles per hour." The Danish Embassy in China gradually started to understand transportation economics. Germany was a negative example for refusing to help Denmark build the Fehmarnbelt tunnel (between Denmark and Germany).

Debunking the debt diplomacy accusation: Friis Arne Petersen cited a report from researchers from Johns Hopkins University and Harvard Business School, "Chinese banks are willing to restructure the terms of existing loans and have never actually seized an asset from any country, much less the port of Hambantota [Sri Lanka]." He also said that BRI countries owe much more to Western lenders, than China. (The third speaker at the event, DIIS researcher Yang Jiang, also challenged the debt diplomacy accusation.)

The third speech was "Central Asia: competing for the Heartland," about investment in Central Asia by different Asian countries and Turkey by Yang Jiang.

Q&A: After identification, Schiller Institute organizer Michelle Rasmussen thanked Friis Arne Petersen for his important speech, and said that the Schiller Institute has been campaigning for Denmark, Europe, and the U.S. to join the BRI, instead of looking at it as a threat. She referenced her leaflet distribution, and said that our video conference this weekend will answer some of these questions.

She posed two related questions. One is, how can we get the U.S. and Europe to stop looking at China, and specifically the BRI, as a threat, and to see the advantages of economic cooperation? Our slogan is peace through development, because if we continue to regard China and Russia as threats, and pursue a confrontation policy, we are threatened with war.

The other question is what you think about integrating Afghanistan into the BRI – the Chinese are ready to do that. Wouldn't it be important for the U.S. and Europe, especially the countries in the war, to deal with this terrible economic crisis in Afghanistan, through cooperating with China?

Friis Arne Petersen said that there are too many division lines, talk of rivalry, or the many uncertainties that lie in the advance of Asia. At the same time that there is an

increase of western trade with Asia, for example, the U.S. buying so many Chinese products now after the pandemic, we are totally obsessive about political confrontation, and systemic challenges.

I approach the world order through economy. The progress towards the UN development goals due to the economic performance of Asia makes me optimistic that these alarmists, and people who want to politicize and see danger and military adversaries everywhere, will lose. We have to look at the total interests of our nations.

On the one hand, China, with its 14 neighboring countries, is more strategically challenged than the U.S., but China always sees the neighboring countries as opportunities, like what the BRI will do in Afghanistan. The U.S. and the West have a very clear interest in having Afghanistan's neighbors, like China, Pakistan and India, try to manage their region, because they, possibly, can do that better than we did during the last 20 years.

NYHEDSORIENTERING SEPTEMBER- OKTOBER 2021: Rapport fra seminaret i København: Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred

gennem økonomisk udvikling

Indholdsfortegnelse:

Overblik rapport s. 1

Tom Gillesberg: Krigsførende til fredsskabende s. 3

Hussein Askary: Gør en ende på kynismen: Imperiets grusomme »store spil« er dødt s. 4

Professor Pino Arlacchi: En succesfuld strategi til at udrydde opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan s. 9

H.E. Ambassadør Ahmad Farooq fra Pakistan: Et perspektiv på at flytte Afghanistan fremad s. 15

Udtalelse fra Kinas og Irans ambassader i Danmark s. 17-18

Opråb om menneskesyn og klimaspørgsmålet s. 18

Invitation til Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference den 13.-14. november: bagsiden

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Afskrift, Video, lyd, rapport: Afghanistan seminar: Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. den 11. oktober 2021 i København

(Denne opdateret video inkluderer udtalelser fra de kinesiske og iranske ambassader i Danmark og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som begynder 1 time 50 min. ind i videoen.)

(This updated video includes statements from the Chinese and Iranian embassies in Denmark and Helga Zepp-LaRouche at 1 hour 50 min.)

Lydfil af præsentationerne på engelsk (videoen inkluderer diskussionen):

Audio of the presentations in English (The video includes the discussion):

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/211011presentations-cut-mp32.mp3>

Afskriftet på engelsk findes nedenunder.

The transcript in English is below.



For English, find the flag below.

Afghanistan: Hvad nu?

Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Et seminar/webcast afholdt af Schiller Institut i Danmark
af Michelle Rasmussen

Afghanistan: Hvad nu?

Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Et seminar/webcast afholdt af Schiller Institut i Danmark

Introduktion af Michelle Rasmussen

Schiller Institut i Danmark afholdt et succesfuldt, kombineret seminar og webinar under overskriften: "Afghanistan: Hvad nu? Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling", som fandt sted den 11. oktober 2021 i København. Videoen af begivenheden kan ses her: <https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=31793>

Nu, hvor krigen i Afghanistan er forbi, og mange i Vesten er rystede over hændelserne, er vi konfronteret med en enestående mulighed for at forandre en politik baseret på regimeskifte og militære interventioner til en politik for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Dette er tilfældet for Afghanistan og også resten af verden. Alle på denne klode kan nu se den massive fiasko af Vestens krige for regimeskifte siden 2001. De har kostet millioner af liv og billioner af dollars.

Dette paradigmeskifte kunne ikke være mere presserende i lyset af den humanitære krise i Afghanistan. En omfattende nødhjælpsindsats er absolut nødvendig, som kræver at den afghanske regerings finansielle midler, nu indefrosset i USA og i andre lande, bliver frigivet, og at det internationale samfund af regeringer og hjælpeorganisationer reagerer.

Men det kræver også en langsigtet indsats i opbygningen af Afghanistans interne infrastruktur og at forbinde landet med Den nye Silkevej (Bælte- og Vejinitiativet), såvel som forbedringen af landets uddannelses- og sundhedssystem. Det er ligeså en gylden mulighed for

at opgive geopolitik og at etablere et samarbejde til gensidig fordel mellem USA og Europa på den ene side, og Kina, Rusland og andre nationer på den anden.

Derfor tog Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, med kort varsel, initiativet til at organisere dette seminar/webinar med særlige gæster samlet i København. Diplomater fra Sydvestasien, Nordafrika og Asien, samt medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet deltog i seminaret, der var Schiller Instituttets første fysiske møde siden starten af COVID-19. Yderligere var der deltagere fra Asien, Sydvestasien, Afrika og Europa via en live stream.

[Indbydelsen](#) indeholdt en indsigt i de afgørende spørgsmål på spil nu fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifteren og præsident af det internationale Schiller Institut.

Alle talerne har været aktivt involverede i spørgsmålet om Afghanistan. De var:

Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets Koordinator for Sydvestasien og bestyrelsesmedlem af [Belt and Road Institute in Sweden](#), forfatter af [Geoøkonomiens dagry – Udvidelsen af Bælte og Vej til Afghanistan](#), medforfatter af [Udvidelsen af Den nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: En vision for en økonomisk Renæssance](#), og arabisk oversætter af [Den nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen](#). Hussein Askary, oprindeligt fra Irak, har for nyligt deltaget i mange webcasts og er blevet interviewet på fjernsynet i forskellige lande.

Hussein Askary beskrev den humanitære nødsituation, som det afghanske folk er konfronteret med, og potentialet for at Schiller Instituttets og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches program for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling kunne blive en realitet for Afghanistan og for verden efter sammenbruddet af det gamle system med vedvarende krige. En vigtig pointe, som han understregede, var, at hvis de vestlige regeringer fortsætter med at indefryse Afghanistans finansielle midler og tilbageholde deres hjælp til genopbygningen af Afghanistan, blot for at bevise at Taliban var ude af stand til at lede nationen, ville det føre til katastrofale resultater. Afghanistan

har været et isoleret hul i kortet i midten af den spændende økonomiske udvikling, som Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ har skabt, og nu er det på tide at bringe den udviklingsdynamik til Afghanistan. Han opfordrede Europa og USA til at samarbejde for at opnå det mål.

Prof. Pino Arlacchi, administrerende direktør for FN's Agentur for narkotikabekæmpelse og kriminalitetsforebyggelse (1997-2002), tidligere EU-rapportør for Afghanistan og i øjeblikket sociologiprofessor ved Skolen for politikvidenskab på Sassari Universitet i Italien ([Prof. Arlacchis hjemmeside](#)). Prof. Arlacchi deltog i to af Schiller Instituttets tidligere webcasts om Afghanistan.

Seminaret havde muligheden for at høre den person, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har foreslået bliver udpeget til repræsentant for de vestlige lande i Afghanistan. Prof. Arlacchi gav deltagerne en personlig, insider-beretning om, hvordan han succesfuldt forhandlede med Taliban, hvilket resulterede i tilintetgørelsen af opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan før 2001; hvordan USA og Storbritannien besluttede at gøre en ende på den politik efter krigens påbegyndelse; hvad der nu skal gøres for at tilintetgøre opiumproduktionen; og hvad de vestlige landes rolle overfor Afghanistan burde være nu. Prof. Arlacchi understregede, at Vestens rolle burde begynde med at anerkende den nye regering, og acceptere at de har kontrollen over landet. Hvis de behandles med respekt, som vinderne i konflikten, kan alle vigtige spørgsmål blive forhandlet, begyndende med spørgsmålet om kvinders rettigheder.

H. E. Ahmad Farooq, ambassadør for Pakistan til Kongeriget Danmark siden april 2020. 2013-2016: Rådgiver/stedfortrædende permanent repræsentant for Pakistan ved Den permanente mission for Pakistan til FN-agenturer i Rom. 2010-2013: Rådgiver for Pakistans permanente mission til De forenede Nationer i New York. Medlem af Pakistans Sikkerhedsråd i løbet af Pakistans medlemskab for FN's sikkerhedsråd fra 2012 til 2013. 2018-2020: Generaldirektør indenfor terrorbekæmpelse ved FN og andre multilaterale fora. 2016-2018 og 2008-2010: en FN-direktør indenfor FN's generalforsamling, FN's

sikkerhedsråd, terrorbekæmpelse, FN's fredsmissioner og andre politiske og freds- og sikkerhedsspørgsmål.

H. E. ambassadør Farooq talte om det komplekse forhold mellem Pakistan og Afghanistan og beskrev i detaljer, hvordan de sidste 40 års uro i Afghanistan har påvirket Pakistan. I lang tid var det klart, at den amerikanske ledede militære tilgang ville slå fejl. Han sagde, at vi har brug for en geoøkonomisk strategi, og, som Pakistans statsminister, Imran Khan, opfordrede til dette, at udvikle Afghanistan og forbinde det med de omkringliggende lande. H. E. ambassadør Farooq konkluderede med idéer fra Pakistans nationale digter, Muhammad Iqbal, som kaldte Afghanistan for "Asiens hjerte". Iqbal udtalte, at hvis der er fred i Afghanistan, er der fred i Asien, og hvis der er uro i Afghanistan, er der uro i Asien.

Ordstyrer var **Tom Gillesberg**, formand for **Schiller Institut** i Danmark og chefen for Executive Intelligence Review i København. Tom Gillesberg afholder et webcast hver anden uge for Schiller Institut i Danmark og er en tidligere parlaments- og byråds kandidat.

Tom Gillesberg kommenterede på den danske deltagelse i krigen for regimeskifte og opfordrede til, at Danmark og andre regeringer i koalitionen burde skifte fra krigsstiftelse til fredsbevaring.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sendte en meddelelse til seminaret, hvor hun bebudede, at Schiller Institut ville have en aktionsdag torsdag den 14. oktober for at stoppe indefrysningen af afghanske finansielle midler og opfordrede andre til at deltage.

Den **kinesiske ambassade i Danmark** sendte en udtalelse til seminaret. Den **afghanske ambassade i Oslo** i Norge indsendte også en udtalelse, og talerne tog nogle af de nævnte spørgsmål op. En diplomat fra **Irans ambassade i Danmark** præsenterede en udtalelse til seminaret om deres anstrengelser for at optage de afghanske flygtninge, hvilket er besværliggjort under de uretfærdige amerikanske sanktioner. Dermed havde seminaret deltagelse af diplomater fra Afghanistan og Afghanistans umiddelbare østlige nabo, Pakistan, den vestlige nabo, Iran, og den nordvestlige

nabo Kina.

De to ugers intensive organiseringsproces inkluderede personlige besøg hos 38 ambassader, hvilket resulterede i flere spontane møder, samt henvendelsen til yderligere ambassader og danske politiske og forsvarsrelaterede institutioner. Derudover uddelte Schiller Instituttet i Danmark sin særlige nyhedsorientering om Afghanistan og indbydelsen til seminaret ved en begivenhed, som blev ledt af den danske udviklingsminister, Flemming Møller Mortensen, afholdt i Dansk institut for internationale Studier. Begivenheden var organiseret for at rådgive ministeren om det, som han beskrev som dilemmaet, der involverer Afghanistans akutte humanitære krise, nu efter at Taliban har overtaget magten.

Talerne fra seminaret, og dele fra diskussionen kommer også i Executive Intelligence Review. Vi håber at videoen og afskrifterne vil give dig en bedre indsigt i hvad vi må gøre nu, for at lette nøden for den afghanske befolkning og påbegynde en ny kurs for verdens politiske, strategiske og økonomiske fremtid.

Afskrifter:

Tom Gillesbergs introduktion til Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan-seminar den 11. oktober 2021:

Følgende afskrifter blev udgivet i Executive Intelligence Review den 22. oktober 2021. Vi er igang med at oversætte talerne og udtalelserne til dansk:

Hussein Askarys tale ved Afghanistan seminaret i København: Gør en ende på kynismen: Imperiets grusomme "store spil" er dødt

Pino Arlaachi: En succesfuld strategi til at udrydde opiumproduktionen i Afghanistan

Udtalelse fra Den kinesiske Ambassade til Schiller

Instituttets Afghanistan seminar den 11. oktober 2021



Download (PDF, Unknown)

Invitationen:

Nu, hvor krigen i Afghanistan er forbi, og mange i vesten er rystet over begivenhederne, er der en mulighed for at udskifte den politik, der har været baseret på regimeskifte og militære interventioner, til en politik for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Det gælder for Afghanistan og også for resten af verden.

Og det haster, fordi der er en akut humanitær krise i Afghanistan. Der kræves både en stor nødhjælpsindsats, men også en langsigtet indsats for at opbygge Afghanistans infrastruktur i forbindelse med Den nye Silkevej (Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet), og landets uddannelsessystem og sundhedsvæsen.

Det bør være anledning til at forlade geopolitik og etablere et samarbejde mellem USA/Europa og Kina, Rusland og andre nationer.

Læs mere nedenunder.

Vi håber, at du kan deltage i seminaret.



Invitation in English:

The Schiller Institute cordially invites you to attend our seminar:

Afghanistan: What Now?

Peace through economic development

Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 Time: 13:00 – 16:00

Place: In the center of Copenhagen

Free admission. Registration necessary (Lunch will not be served.)

A Corona pass is required for the protection of all participants.

For more information and to register, contact:

Michelle Rasmussen: 53 57 00 51 or

Feride Gillesberg: 25 12 50 33 or

si@schillerinstitut.dk

Speakers:

✘ Hussein Askary: the Schiller Institute's Southwest Asia Coordinator, board member of the Belt and Road Institute in Sweden, author of Dawn of Geo-Economics – Extending the Belt and Road to Afghanistan, and co-author of Extending the New Silk Road to West Asia and Africa: A Vision of an Economic Renaissance, Arabic translator of The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge, originally from Iraq

✘ Prof. Pino Arlacchi: Executive Director of the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (1997-2002) (who negotiated an almost total elimination of opium production with the Taliban before 2001), and former EU Rapporteur on Afghanistan. Currently professor of Sociology at the School of Political Science of the University of Sassari in Italy. Prof. Pino Arlacchi's homepage.

✘ H.E. Ahmad Farooq, Ambassador of Pakistan to Kingdom of Denmark: Ambassador in Denmark since April 2020. 2013-2016:

Counsellor/Alternate Permanent Representative of Pakistan at the Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the Rome-based UN Agencies, Rome. 2010-2013: Counsellor Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations, New York. Member of Pakistan's Security Council team during Pakistan's membership of the UN Security Council from 2012 to 2013. 2018-2020: Director General (Counter Terrorism) dealing with counter terrorism at the United Nations and other multilateral forums. 2016-2018 and 2008-2010: Director United Nations, dealing with UN General Assembly, UN Security Council, Counter Terrorism, UN Peacekeeping and other political and peace and security issues.

Moderator: Tom Gillesberg: Chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, Bureau Chief for Executive Intelligence Review in Copenhagen.

Background:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and international chairman of the Schiller Institute stated in a webcast on August 21, just a few days after the Taliban took control of Kabul, "Exactly three weeks ago, we had a seminar here on this [Schiller Institute] channel on the situation in Afghanistan. I compared it in terms of importance to the fall of the [Berlin] Wall in 1989, which was the beginning of the end of the Soviet Union. I said it may not be quite as big as the collapse of the entire Soviet Union, but what is happening in Afghanistan is of the same nature, because it is the end of a system."

The new system has to be defined by a peace through development strategy for Afghanistan and the entire region. On August 17 Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, "It's very good that the war has ended, and I think it is, on the contrary, the real chance to integrate Afghanistan into a regional economic development perspective, which is basically defined by the Belt and Road Initiative of China. There is a very clear agreement of Russia and China to cooperate in dealing with this situation. The interest of the Central Asian republics to

make sure there is stability and economic development, there is the possibility to extend the CPEC, the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor, into Afghanistan, into Central Asia, so I think it's a real opportunity. But it does require a complete change in the approach...

“If the European nations and the United States would understand that this is a unique chance, if they cooperate, rather than fight Russia and China, and their influence in the region, and they join hands in the economic development there – there needs to be a perspective for the reconstruction of Afghanistan in a serious way, as it was not done in the last 20 years, for sure – then this can become a very positive turning point, not only for Afghanistan, but also for the whole world.”

Peace through economic development is a policy which the Schiller Institute has been campaigning for since its founding in 1984, and which the late Lyndon LaRouche's political movement has been advocating since the 1970's, by designing economic development programs for most of the world. Our efforts intensified after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, proposing a policy called the Eurasian Land-Bridge, or the New Silk Road, later extended to become the World Land-Bridge concept. There is a reflection of some of the key elements of this policy in the Belt and Road Initiative announced by Xi Jinping in 2013.

Now, after 20 years of war, Afghanistan is facing an appalling humanitarian catastrophe. Helga Zepp-La-Rouche wrote in “Can “the West” Learn?: What Afghanistan Needs Now” on September 5: “World Food Program Director David Beasley, who visited Afghanistan last week in August, announced that 18 million Afghans are starving—more than half the population—and 4 million are at risk of starvation next winter without massive help. The WHO fears a medical disaster in view of the scarcely existing health system in the midst of the COVID pandemic, and only around 1 million people are vaccinated so far...”

The necessary economic development emphatically includes building a modern health system, as well as educational expansion, extending the Belt and Road Initiative's infrastructure connectivity projects, industrial development projects, and agricultural programs designed to eliminate opium production."

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche has proposed that Italian Prof. Pino Arlacchi, Executive Director of the UN Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (1997-2002), and former EU Rapporteur on Afghanistan, be appointed as coordinator for the western countries' economic development efforts in Afghanistan. He had negotiated an almost total elimination of opium production with the Taliban before 2001, which then was reversed under the ensuing years during the U.S. and NATO military operations. Arlacchi again proposed a plan in 2010, which was thwarted by the EU, Britain, and the United States.

Zepp-LaRouche: "Afghanistan is the one place where the United States and China can begin a form of cooperation that can be a baby step toward strategic cooperation putting humanity's common goals in the foreground. Ultimately, its realization indicates the only way that the end of mankind in a nuclear Armageddon can be prevented."

Afghanistan is the test case of whether the West is able to learn from its mistakes, and join with the rest of the world for a peace through economic development policy – the path to a new paradigm for all humanity.

We sincerely hope that you will be able to join us for this crucial discussion.

For more information and to register, contact:

Michelle Rasmussen: 53 57 00 51 or

Feride Gillesberg: 25 12 50 33 or

si@schillerinstitut.dk

Resources:

Homepages :

Danish: www.schillerinstitut.dk

English: www.schillerinstitute.org

Articles:

Nyhedsorientering August 2021: Link: Afghanistan: Hvad nu?: Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

Hussein Askary: Dawn of Geo-Economics – Extending the Belt and Road to Afghanistan, August 18, 2021.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: “Can “the West” Learn?: What Afghanistan Needs Now.”, September 5, 2021

Schiller Institute videos:

Afghanistan: A Turning Point in History After the Failed Regime-Change Era, July 31, 2021 (two weeks before the Taliban takeover of Kabul.) Link: Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan-konference:

Spred ideen om et fælles udviklingsprogram med det samme

Afghanistan: Opportunity for a new epoch, Interview with Helga Zepp-LaRouche on August 17, 2021, two days after the Taliban took control of Kabul by Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Link: Afghanistan: Potentiale for en ny epoke:

Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 17. august 2021 af Michelle Rasmussen

Tom Gillesberg: POLITISK ORIENTERING EKSTRA den 16. august 2021:

Vil Kabuls fald skabe en ny vestlig politik?

Now, More Urgent Than Ever: Afghanistan–Opportunity for a New Epoch for Mankind, August 21, 2021 Link: Schiller Instituttets Afghanistan opfølgingskonference 21. august 2021:

Tom Gillesberg: POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6. september 2021: Efter Afghanistan: Kollaps af Vestens vrangforestillinger

kan være begyndelsen på en bedre verden

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6. september 2021: Efter Afghanistan: Kollaps af Vestens vrangforestillinger kan være begyndelsen på en bedre verden

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Schiller Instituttets Venner på TV2 Lorry i serien "RUC undersøger" – De små partier

Se programet her på TV2 Lorrays hjemmeside. (17 min.)

TV2 Lorry: »Hvilke emner har de små partier fokus på, og hvad er det, der driver folkene bag«. Dokumentaren produceret af Rasmus Ahlefeldt Simonsen og Sebastian Hartmann, journaliststuderende fra Roskilde Universitets kandidatuddannelse, blev vist på TV2 Lorry den 1.-4. september 2021. Det 17 minutter lange program satte lys på Schiller

Instituttets Venner og Tværpolitisk Forening i Dragør. Spidskandidat Tom Gillesberg blev interviewet, og han fremviste mange af sine berømte valgplakater. »Jeg lever og ånder for visioner, for store idéer, for noget der har betydning – at sætte en dagsorden, som har afgørende betydning for fremtiden«.

Følgende er vores rapport til vores Schiller Institut kollegaer rundt om i verden:

Documentary about the Friends of the Schiller Institute's coming election campaign in Denmark shown on a major TV station

A very good 17-minute documentary about the Friends of the Schiller Institute (SIVE) and one other small party was, and will be, broadcast a total of four times on the local Copenhagen area affiliate of TV2, one of the two national TV programs.

Here is the link: <https://www.tv2lorry.dk/ruc-undersoeger/ruc-undersoeger-de-ukendte-partier-14>

The program is called "The Small Parties," and was made by two journalist students from Roskilde University's master's degree program. They chose SIVE out of many small parties and lists which will run in the November municipal elections.

There are several sections of the interview they conducted with Copenhagen mayoral candidate Tom Gillesberg, as well as candidates Feride Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Another highlight is that many of our famous election posters are shown, with and without Tom's explanation. There are also pictures of interesting political and cultural artifacts in our office, including a LaRouche presidential election poster.

A university associate professor is interviewed who describes SIVE as a "serious party," and concludes that while some

people think that voting for a small party is a waste of their vote, it can actually be an important way to support issues that voters think are important, which can influence the larger parties.

The election posters shown included: When the bubble bursts – a New Bretton Woods; Economic collapse; Glass-Steagall or chaos; Before a new financial crash – Bank separation; Win-Win with BRICS– not collapse and war; Before the next financial crash – Copenhagen should join the Silk Road; Helium-3 from the Moon for unlimited fusion energy on Earth and Free music education – Create a new renaissance – Classical music for all children.

Here are some excerpts:

Narrator: Some parties have a great vision.

Tom Gillesberg: For us, it is about what kind of future we all will live in.

Narrator: Very big.

Gillesberg: We also want to go out into the universe...

Narrator: SIVE has issues like bank separation, and to get Helium-3 fuel from the Moon.

Narrator: Big political thoughts are thought up in their office... They have run for office since 2005...

Narrator: The amount of votes is not everything for Tom Gillesberg.

Gillesberg: The only reason I wanted to have anything to do with politics was not to get a position or popularity, but because it is about how can we make the world better. ..The level [of the big political parties] is too low. I live and breath for a vision, for great ideas, about things of great importance – to set an agenda, which has crucial meaning for

the future. I have not met any party in Denmark, which is close to doing that. Yes, if there were, I would join.

Michelle Rasmussen says that Tom Gillesberg is an excellent candidate because he follows world developments and our campaign initiatives. Feride Gillesberg says that she hopes that Tom were elected, because it is in Denmark's interest. She would like to see him becoming the prime minister's advisor because Denmark has a patriot, a thinker who is engaged in Denmark's future. Use him as inspiration....

Narrator: SIVE is very serious about their campaign, a seriousness that many of the other [small] parties lack. [This led to the section with the university assistant professor.]

Narrator: Just because they don't get a lot of votes, it does not effect their large political engagement, and to try to have influence on something that is important for them.

Afghanistan kommentar: Korthuset falder af Jens Jørgen Nielsen, Rusland ekspert, forfatter, Lektor

20. august 2021 – (Facebook post) 20 års militær indsats i Afghanistan, trillioner af Dollars, 43 danske soldaters liv og

mange tusinder dræbte, flygtningestrømme m.m. Det er bare lidt af det, som egentlig skulle være kronen på værket, nemlig en bæredygtig afghansk stat med en moderne hær. På uger har det vist sig at være en illusion. Det hele væltede, som var det et korthus. Situationen minder påfaldende om situationen i Vietnam i 1975.

Diskussionen i medierne har handlet om, hvordan man får reddet mennesker ud af Kabul og om, hvorvidt Taliban er blevet mere moderat og moderne. Fint og relevant. Men vi skal vel have en debat om de store linjer, om hvordan vi i Vesten overhovedet agerer uden for vores kulturkreds. Vi mangler i den grad svar på de store spørgsmål. Hvorfor faldt den afghanske hær totalt fra hinanden, den bestod af ca. 300.000 soldater med alt moderne militært udstyr? Hvorfor har de afghanske soldater eller befolkningen ikke lyst til at kæmpe for den afghanske stat? Og hvorfor flygtede præsidenten, Ashraf Ghani? Og hvorfor støtter en stor del af befolkningen tilsyneladende Taliban?

Jeg har ikke de endegyldige svar. Men vi kan da se lidt langsigtet på tingene. Situationen kan da minde situationen for 30 år siden, da de sovjetiske styrker forlod Afghanistan i 1989. Jeg mødte tilfældigvis nogle sovjetiske soldater i Tadsjikistan, de var på vej hjem fra Afghanistan. De havde ingen illusioner. Men dengang holdt Kabul regeringen i det mindste stand mod islamisterne i over 2 år, før Mohammad Najibullah blev fjernet i 1992 og senere hængt. Men efter at de vestlige styrker begyndte at trække sig tilbage, har vi reelt ikke set nogen modstand fra den afghanske hær side. Skyldes det, at de ikke ser nogen grund til at kæmpe for en regering der fleste anser for at være korrump? Hvis ja, hvorfor har vi så støttet disse regeringer. Præsident Ashraf Ghani flygtede – rygter siger med mange penge. Rygter siger også, at de løbende regeringer har været voldsomt korrumperte. I medierne har vi hørt mere om korrupsion i Rusland end i Afghanistan. En forklaring kunne også være, at mange afghanere

modtog penge for at være soldater, men reelt ikke deltog. Eller at soldaterne ikke fik penge eller meget få. Hvorfor har efterretningsvæsenerne og forskellige institutter og tænketanke ikke kunne levere konkret viden om det?

Hvorfor har Taliban tilsyneladende ret stor opbakning i landet? Ikke i Kabul naturligvis, hvor der bor mange moderne og pro-vestlige afghanere. Men omkring 80 % af de 38 millioner indbyggere i landet er fattige bønder, som ser anderledes på det. Da Sovjetunionen invaderede Afghanistan i 1979, begyndte USA straks at støtte mujahedin bevægelsen, den kom fra hele Mellemøsten, ikke mindst fra Saudi Arabien og andre arabiske lande plus Pakistan o.a. De fik mange våben fra USA, og en af lederne var Osama bin Laden. Mujahedin'erne begyndte senere at kæmpe indbyrdes. Taliban var en ren afghansk, især pashtun bevægelse, som begyndte at skabe en vis form for orden i landet. Meget tyder på, at bønderne satte pris på, at udenlandske styrker blev jaget ud. Nej, jeg mener ikke, at Taliban var søde, men vi skal vide hvorfor en del afghanere støtter dem. Taliban sad ved magten indtil terrorangrebet i 2001 med islamistiske regler for kvinder om tildækning m.m. Men det var mange af bønderne formentlig ligeglade med. Så kom NATO landene med den hidtil største militæroperation. Opgaven var til at begynde med at finde Osama bin Laden, som angiveligt skulle befinde sig i Afghanistan. Taliban accepterede Osama bin Laden, men havde ikke noget med terrorangrebet at gøre. NATO-landene skulle fange og uskadeliggøre Osama bin Laden.

Men hvad skulle vores opgave ellers bestå i – i Afghanistan? I 2011 fandt amerikanerne Osama bin Laden, og dræbte ham. Vel at mærke i Pakistan. Hvad skulle vi så? Skulle vi indføre demokrati, sikre kvinders rettigheder, skulle vi yde humanitær bistand? Eller ville amerikanerne sikre, at der ikke kom en pro-russisk eller en pro-kinesisk leder til magten i Afghanistan? Eller var Danmark i Afghanistan, fordi vi ville vise solidaritet med USA, og fordi det var vigtigt for os, at

være afholdt i Washington? Hvis vi skulle opbygge et normalt demokratisk samfund, hvor var så projekterne, vejene, infrastrukturen, hospitalerne? Og hvor var analytikerne, efterretningsvæsenerne, som kunne give en nøgtern ikke-ideologisk vurdering af situationen i stedet for komiske Ali beretninger? Og hvorfor har det amerikanske efterretningsvæsen i øvrigt ikke delt sin viden om Talibans hurtige fremmarch med sine allierede?

Rækken af spørgsmål er lang. Jeg er ikke sikker på, at vi får svar på dem alle. Men det er blevet tid for refleksion over dels, hvorfor det gik galt og dels, hvordan vi skal ændre vores adfærd fremadrettet. For det første kunne man godt få den tanke, at det ville være en god idé for Danmark og andre NATO allierede at foretage egne vurderinger og ikke blindt tro på alt, hvad USA kommer med. Danmark og andre NATO-lande kommer til at fremstå som underdanige vasalstater.

For det andet kunne det være, at en gang for alle skulle lægge 1990'ernes fremherskende ideologi på hylden. Efter Sovjetunionens fald blev det en udbredt opfattelse i vestlige politiske kredse, at den vestlige liberale ideologi og tolkning var den eneste rigtige og universelle tilgang. Alle verdens lande skulle følge den angelsaksiske model og blive demokrater på samme måde. I og med, at Sovjetunionen var væk som ideologisk og militær stormagt var vejen banet for en verden i USA's billede. Grundlæggende var det en arrogant opfattelse, som ignorerer forskelle i kultur og historie. Hvad værre er, når man gennemfører dette projekt at eksportere demokrati med militær, går det som regel fundamentalt galt, ja disse aktioner fremmer i virkeligheden det de vil forhindre. Det er vanskeligt at komme til andre konklusioner efter Talibans lyn-sejr. Den vestlige ideologi gør os blind for virkeligheden i et land som Afghanistan. Mange af dem, NATO-alliancen støttede i Afghanistan, var i virkeligheden dybt korrupte narkosmuglere, som udnyttede bønderne. Ja selv den amerikanske hær har formentlig været en del af narco-business.

Det flød med penge til latterlige formål, og mange vestlige firmaer og også militærfolk har haft snablen nede i disse kasser. Hvordan kan det være anderledes, når der vælter penge ind over et fattigt land? Enkeltstående isolerede pigeskoler som prestigeprojekter gør ikke nogen forskel, hvis samfundet ellers er korrump, og der mangler strukturer, som kan støtte op om det.

Jeg har venner, som har været udstationeret, ligesom jeg har undervist soldater, der skulle udstationeret i Afghanistan. Jeg er imponeret over deres beredvillighed til at kæmpe for det gode, selv med livet som indsats. I mange tilfælde har de opsøgt dialog med lokale og støttet projekter i overensstemmelse med vores nationale værdier. Men deres opgave har været principielt umulig. Og det er politikernes ansvar, ikke soldaternes.

Om fremtiden: Jeg tror ikke, der er nogen tvivl om, at Afghanistan vil komme ind i kredsen omkring organisationen Shanghai Cooperation Organization, hvor Kina og Rusland spiller første violin. Rusland og Kina vil formentlig i endnu højere grad blive dominerende magter i Asien. USA's meget pinlige exit – og billedet af afghanere, der falder fra flyvende fly i døden på landingsbanen, vil blive symbolet på et inkompetent USA på vej ned. I SCO deltager både Iran, Pakistan, Indien, de centralasiatiske lande. Vi i Vesten kommer ikke uden om at tænke det igennem og efter min mening vænne os til, at verden ikke er vores alene. Der er andre lande og kulturer, som tænker anderledes, men som er effektive på deres egen måde. Vi er ikke verdens navle, som vi har troet i snart 500 år. Vi kan glæde os over det eller begræde det, men det er en realitet, som vi skal forholde os til.

USA har nedsat en kommission til at undersøge den civile opbygning. SIGAR, hedder den. Den sidste rapport er en sønderlemmende kritik af den amerikanske politik og korrupsion i Afghanistan. Bare vi havde sådan en i Danmark: [Klik her](#).

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er cand.mag. i idéhistorie og historie, tidligere nyhedskorrespondent (Politiken) i bl.a. Rusland og taler flydende russisk [og forfatter af flere bøger om Rusland og Ukraine]. Han er konsulent og underviser i kommunikation og kulturforskelle. Derudover er han kulturguide i bl.a. Polen, Irland og Tjekkiet og har tidligere arbejdet for FOA samt den danske ambassade i Estland. (kort biografi fra frydenlund.dk)

New Chapter in NSA-Danish Intelligence Scandal: NSA Targetted Denmark's Own Allies. EIR artikel af Michelle Rasmussen

Abonnér her på EIR-Online, en gang om ugen. LaRouche-bevægelsens internationale tidsskrift.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Collage: Michelle Rasmussen. World: Gerd Altmann/Pixabay NSA: U.S. government, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons; FE: By Skjoldbro – Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0;

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 31. maj 2021: Hvad er Danmarks interesser?

At være spion for NSA imod Danmarks naboer? Eller noget helt andet?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Resumé:

Rettet:

COVID-19: USA hamstrer vacciner mens Rusland og Kina sender vacciner til fattige lande.

Vi kan ikke besejre pandemien, med mindre vi sikrer vacciner til alle lande uanset om de kan betale for dem. USA, Rusland, Kina og andre nationer må samarbejde om at bygge et moderne sundhedsvæsen i alle lande.

NSA-FE og Operation Dunhammer:

Efter Tom Gillesberg beskrev DR's afsløring, stillede han

spørgsmålet "Hvad er Danmarks interesser?"

Er det regimeskiftepolitik, som i Afghanistan, Irak, Libyen, Syrien og Iran?

Eller Ukraine, Rusland, Kina og Hviderusland?

Er det at medvirke til at spionere mod Tyskland, Frankrig, Sverige og Norge på vegne af NSA, USA's overvågningstjeneste?

Eller skal vi arbejde for et nyt paradigme, hvor USA og Europa samarbejder med Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre nationer for at skabe økonomisk udvikling – at løse konflikterne gennem at gå op i en højere enhed/modsætningernes sammenfald, hvor vi løser problemerne gennem at finde vores fælles interesser.

Hviderusland: Aktivist Roman Pratasevich, der blev arresteret efter hans fly blev tvunget til at lande i Hviderusland, har været aktiv militært i Ukraine med den højreekstremistiske Azov-batallion. Havde møder på højt niveau i USA og fik masser af støtte derfra. En britisk-amerikansk efterretningsoperatør?

USA-Rusland: Topmøde mellem Biden og Putin den 16. juni i Schweiz. Et skridt i den rigtige retning, hvis det ikke bliver saboteret.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches talte til Moskvas Akademiske Økonomisk Forum bla. om den blindgyde grøn omstilling og grøn New Deal er, da det er et fatalt tilbageskridt at sænke energikildernes og samfundets energigennemstrømningstæthed i stedet for at øge den.

Den grønne New Deal betyder en massiv sænkning af levestandarden, især i de fattige lande. Vi har brug for økonomisk udvikling i stedet for.

Finansverdenen: Centralbankernes massive pengepumpning begynder at vise sig i stigning i råstofpriserne. Hvis de hæver renten for at bekæmpe inflationen, går mange firmaer,

som lever på lånte penge, konkurs. Vi har brug for LaRouches fire økonomiske love, begyndende med en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling.

Følg med i Schiller Instituttets onlinekonference den 26.-27. juni og organiserer andre til at gøre det samme. Kontakt os og bliv aktiv.

Schiller Instituttet · Hvad er Danmarks interesser? At være spion for NSA imod Danmarks naboer? Eller noget helt andet?

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 26. marts 2021: Biden-administration øger konfrontationen med Rusland og Kina. SI-konference viser et alternativ

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet · Biden-administration øger konfrontationen med Rusland og Kina. SI-konference viser et alternativ

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 4. marts 2021:

Det er ikke i Israel, men i samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, at COVID-19 og andre problemer løses

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd: (Der er ingen lyd i et par korte udfald, hvor der blev stillet spørgsmål.)

Schiller Institutet · Det er ikke i Israel, men i samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, at COVID-19 og andre problemer løses

Formand Tom Gillesbergs blev interviewet på DR P4, om at stille op som løsgænger,

den 23. februar 2021

3 minutter:

Schiller Institutet · Tom Gillesberg På P4 23.2.21

København, 23. februar 2021 (Schiller Institutet i Danmark) – I dag blev Tom Gillesberg interviewet af DR's populære landsdækkende radiokanal P4 i et program om løsgængere. De to værter, Knud Lind og Lotte Friis, ønskede at diskutere, hvorfor der i øjeblikket er det største antal løsgængere i Folketinget nogensinde, som alle har forladt de politiske partier, de blev valgt til at repræsentere, efter at de var blevet valgt. P4-værterne kontaktede Tom Gillesberg, fordi de ønskede at tale med ham om faktisk at stille op som en løsgænger, og fordi de erkendte, hvad der forstås af mange, at han er blevet en politisk institution i Danmark på grund af sine mange valgkampagner. Her er et udskrift af det 3 minutter lange interview, som blev sendt direkte kl.10.40.

P4 vært: (Efter at have forklaret, at de nuværende løsgængere havde forladt deres partier efter de var blevet valgt, fortsatte værten) Men der er også dem, der stiller op til valg som løsgængere. Og nu skal vi helt til bunden med måske den meste erfarne herhjemme i netop det, at stille op til valg som løsgænger, Tom Gillesberg, velkommen i " Formiddag på 4'eren."

Tom Gillesberg: Tak.

P4: Du er formand for Schiller Institutet og har været stillet op til samtlige kommunal- og Folketingsvalg siden 2005. Man er fristet til bare indledende at spørge, hvorfor meldte du ikke ind i et parti? Så kan det være, at chancen for at komme ind er større?

Gillesberg: Fordi hele min idé var at ændre hele den politiske diskussion – at tage de virkelig store spørgsmål op, der bestemmer, hvordan fremtiden se ud, og så inddrage befolkningen i dem. Og det er ikke, hvad de politiske partier

gør, så min platform har ikke været, at jeg skal have en politisk karriere. Siden jeg mødte Lyndon LaRouche og blev politisk aktiv, var det, at få de store spørgsmål, der bestemmer fremtiden, sat på dagsorden. Og det at stille op som løsgænger eller til kommunalvalget har været en måde for mig at komme ud med de visioner og idéer.

P4: Ja, fordi nogle af dine mærkesager gennem årene har været, at vi skal hente stoffet helium-3 på Månen og bruge det til at lave fusionsenergi her på Jorden, og du har også haft, at der skal oprettes et dansk magnettognet, der skal kobles til den Nye Silkevej, som er en togrute til Beijing. Og der er intet i vejen med det, og points for det overordnet set, men jeg har lyst til at spørge, har du overvejet nogle lidt mere enkle mærkesager?

Gillesberg: Det er de her store spørgsmål, der kommer til at bestemme, hvilken fremtid vi får. Hvis vi vil have det gode liv for hele Jordens befolkning uden at skulle få, for eksempel, et fossil mareridt, som mange frygter, så skal man bruge helium-3, så skal vi have fusionsenergi. Og det er noget, som ikke kommer af sig selv. Det kræver en intensiv indsats i et-to årtier af mange nationer, og hvis vi er med i det i Danmark, så skaber vi den her fantastiske fremtid.

Men hvis ikke vi tager de her store dagsordener ind, så er der ikke nogle gode løsninger. Så bliver det sådan noget med, at vi skal spare, for at andre kan få det bedre, og det, mener jeg, ville være komplet tåbeligt.

P4: Men Tom, noget af det at være politiker er, et eller andet sted, at vil have noget af det igennem, kort sagt. Hvordan bliver du ved med at tro på det her?

Gillesberg: Det gør jeg ved – vi har, lige i den her uge, faktisk tre nationer, som netop er kommet til Mars. Og når jeg tidligere har snakket om Mars, og at vi skal ud i rummet, så siger folk, "Hvad er det for noget mærkelig fremtidsmusik? "

Men det sker. Spørgsmålet er: Kina gør det her. Kina kommer til at tage helium-3 ned fra Månen til fusionsenergi på Jorden. Så det kommer til at ske. Spørgsmålet er så, om vi her i Danmark og vi her i Vesten, skal være med til det? Om vi skal være en del af den spændende fremtid, eller vi bare bliver sådan et eller andet museum, hvor folk kan komme og danse folkedans, og se hvordan man levede i gamle dage.

P4: Tak skal du have, Tom Gillesberg.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 29. januar 2021: Regimeskifte i USA og den "grønne genstart" fjerner ikke verdens problemer

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: (via Zoom)

eller her på YouTube.

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet tager på det kraftigste afstand fra Men in Black

Schiller Instituttet pressemeddelelse den 25. januar 2021

25. januar 2021 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark tager på det kraftigste afstand fra de holdninger, demonstrationer og aktiviteter, der er foregået under betegnelsen "Men in Black".

Schiller Instituttet har været meget aktive for at sikre en effektiv bekæmpelse af COVID-19-pandemien (se udtalelsen Operation virus ud af skindpelsen fra den 30. marts 2020, og for at sikre, at vi både i Danmark og internationalt kan få oprustet sundhedssystemerne – både med henblik på at få nedkæmpet COVID-19-pandemien og forhindre andre pandemier som måtte true menneskeheden i fremtiden.

Schiller Instituttet har støttet den internationale indsats for at få udviklet vacciner imod COVID-19 og ønsker dem udbredt hurtigst muligt i Danmark og i resten af verden.

Vi beklager, at et tidligere medlem i Schiller Instituttet og kandidat for Schiller Instituttets Venner, Christian B. Olesen, har valgt at være aktiv i Men in Black, som det blandt andet kunne læses i dagbladet Politiken den 24. januar 2021. Christian var medlem i Schiller Instituttet indtil november 2020, men har aldrig diskuteret Men in Black med Schiller Instituttet. Så længe han fortsat er aktiv i og deler holdninger med Men in Black er han ikke velkommen igen i Schiller Instituttet.

Tom Gillesberg

Formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark

Kontakt formand Tom Gillesberg: mobil: +45 24 48 29 97

Eller mobil: +45 53 57 00 51

Fusionskraft og Kina. Interview med Dr. Luo DeLong, direktør for ITER Kina foretog af Michelle Rasmussen i København.

Den følgende artikel blev udgivet i EIR tidsskrift den 21. januar 2021:

The following interview was conducted on February 27, 2018, at the Big Science Business Forum 2018 in Copenhagen, by Michelle Rasmussen of EIR Copenhagen. It was published in Europe at that time, but never published in the United States. The video of the interview can be seen [here](#), and an interview with the Communications Director of Fusion For Energy, the European section of ITER, can be seen [here](#).

EIR: Hello. We're reporting from the Big Science Business Forum 2018 in Copenhagen, Denmark. I'm very happy that Dr. Luo DeLong, who is China's director for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER China), has been kind enough to speak to us about the Chinese fusion energy program. Dr. Luo, could you say something about China's involvement generally, why China thinks it's important to develop fusion energy, and also, about China's involvement in the ITER

project, and any other projects?...

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 18. december 2020:

Vil den amerikanske befolkning tage magten tilbage i deres land?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video 1. del:

Video 2. del (3 min.):

Lyd:

Skal en ny præsident træde til eller den siddende genindsættes?

På trods af mediernes påstand om mangelfulde beviser på valgsvindler, er der tydelige beviser på dette. Fremfor at berette om dette gentager de danske medier blot, hvad de hører fra Reuters og andre.

Hvordan kunne Trump være årsag til en republikansk sejr i både

Senatet og Repræsentanternes Hus (hvor demokraterne flertal mindskedes), men ikke en sejr til sig selv?

Klager i retssystemet underkendtes på teknikaliteter og pragmatisme.

Det amerikanske retssystem handler ikke om rigtigt eller forkert.

Eksempelvis blev LaRouche og sine nærmeste medarbejdere uskyldigt dømt til fængsel i 1980'erne.

I USA er der en kamp om magten og den ender ikke den 20. januar.

Det samme apparat, som støtter Joe Biden, diskuterer hvordan man kan vinde en atomkrig gennem brugen af taktiske atomvåben. Det var præcist denne krigfraktion, som Trump blev valgt til at stoppe.

Indtil den 20. januar er Trump stadig præsident. Han burde f.eks. benåde Julian Assange og Edward Snowden, og frikende Lyndon LaRouche. Han burde udnævne en særlig anklager:

“Var der en kriminel sammensværgelse for at underminere den demokratiske proces?”

Trump bør også afklassificere den information, der afslører efterretningstjenesterne ugerninger.

Kampen er ikke mod den “dybe stat”, men mod det britiske Imperiums kontrol over USA.

Angående COVID-19 huserer en del konspirationsteorier, men det egentlige spørgsmål er: Hvorfor gjorde vi ikke som Kina? De havde kun problemer det første kvartal og er nu tilbage med de samme vækstrater som før pandemien begyndte.

Kina har lige fuldført en succesrig Chang'e 5 rum mission til Månen, hvor en sonde samlede månestøv. De har en langsigtet plan om at udvinde Helium-3 til fusionskraftreaktorer og de er også meget engageret i et forskningsprogram til udvikling af fusionsenergi.

Hvad der er sket i Kina kan sammenlignes med 18.- og 19.-tallets USA, under Lincoln og Franklin DRoosevelt.

Hele verden er kaotisk, men på en sådan måde, at potentialet for en bedre fremtid viser sig.

Glem, i denne sammenhæng, ikke at se den seneste konference

fra Schiller Instituttet fra weekenden.

Schiller Instituttet · Vil den amerikanske befolkning tage magten tilbage i deres land?

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20. november 2020: Hvis præsident Trump besejrer valgsvindlen får vi en anden og bedre verden Posted 46 minutes ago

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet · Hvis præsident Trump besejrer valgsvindlen får vi en anden og bedre verden

Dansk videokonference søndag den 8. november: Verden efter valget i USA

Talere:

Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:
Kan Trump og den amerikanske befolkning forsvare Trumps

valgsejr imod valgsvindlen? (på dansk)

Gæstetaler: Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, bestyrelsesmedlem, Bælte- og Vejinitiativ Institut i Sverige (brixsweden.org):

Nu skal USA og Europa tilslutte sig Kinas nye Silkevej, og mobilisere fødevarerressourcer til bekæmpelse af sult i Afrika. (på engelsk)

Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:

Beethoven 250 år. (på dansk)

Lyd:

Hussein Askarys præsentation som skærskilt video:

Hussein Askary's presentation as a separate video in English:

Kan Trump og den amerikanske befolkning forsvare Trumps valgsejr imod valgsvindlen?

Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Resumé

USA: Valgsvindel med stemmerne i svingstaterne for at få Joe Biden valgt som USA's præsident er en del af den farvede revolution i USA for at få et regimeskifte og få afsat Donald Trump.

Dette regimeskifte har været fokus for efterretningstjenesterne og deres partnere i medierne siden Trump vandt præsidentvalget i 2016. Først med beskyldningerne om tråde til Rusland (Steel-rapporten fra britiske efterretningstjeneste, der kom med falske beskyldninger), så løggen om Russigate, der er blevet modbevist, rigsretssagen og 4 års angreb fra medierne.

Mediernes erklæring af, at Biden har vundet valget og NATO-landes lykønskning af Biden, er et forsøg på at etablere et fait accompli og forhindre at valgsvindlen bliver afsløret.

Trump forsøger at få valgene i delstaterne undersøgt så valgsvindlen kan blive afdækket og retfærdigheden ske fyldest. Mobilisering af vælgerne for at forsvare demokratiet og beskytte Trumps valgsejr.

Massiv censur i medierne og på sociale medier for at forhindre præsident Trump i at tale til befolkningen.

Trump fik over 7 millioner flere stemmer end i 2016 selvom ikke alle stemmerne på ham er blevet tilskrevet ham.

Konkrete historier om valgsvindelen begynder at komme frem.

Tidligere NSA tekniker beskriver hvorledes programmet "Scorecard" kan bruges til at ændre stemme rapporterne fra valgstederne.

Vil USA's befolkning lykkes med at forsvare den demokratiske proces og Trumps valgsejr?

Hvis kuppet lykkes vil demokraterne forsøge at vinde de to sidste senatspladser i Georgia så Bidens kontrollører også kan kontrollere Senatet, udvide Højesteret og få magten der.

Hvis Biden bliver præsident er der konfrontation med Rusland og Kina på dagsorden. Vil vi få krig? Atomkrig?

Oveni COVID-19 krisen i USA og dens økonomiske effekter venter en nedsmeltning af finanssystemet. Med en grøn New Deal vil utilfredsheden i befolkningen blive enorm. Hvad følger efter den censur imod dissidenter, der allerede er i gang?

Topmøde i Davos 9.-11. november med blandt andet Mark Carney, den nye chef for Bank of England Andrew Bailey, Blackrocks Fink, IMF, ECB, Bill Gates etc. om at gennemtvinge kredittørke imod alle investeringer, der ikke er "grønne". Digitale valutaer så centralbankerne får den fulde økonomiske magt.

Der er en verden uden for Vestens og NATO's kontrol. Kina og Rusland er ikke kuede.

COVID-19 var et lille bump på vejen for Kina. Man har igen vækst og Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og international økonomisk opbygning fortsætter.

Vesten kan ikke stoppe Kina. Vil man forsøge krig? En atomkrig kan ikke vindes, men vil gale hoveder i Vesten forsøge alligevel?

Vil vi i stedet få en "Sputnik-effekt", hvor Vesten må skifte kurs tilbage til økonomisk, videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt for at kunne konkurrere med Kina og alle de, der vil samarbejde med Kina? Eller vil Vesten blive irrelevant?

De, der satser på økonomisk vækst drevet af menneskelig kreativitet og videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt vinder i det lange løb.

Vi lever i farlige tider men står også potentielt over for det største spring fremad i menneskehedens historie.

Lyt til hele talen her.

Nu skal USA og Europa tilslutte sig Kinas nye Silkevej, og mobilisere fødevarerressourcer til bekæmpelse af sult i Afrika.

Gæstetaler: Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets

koordinator for Sydvestasien, bestyrelsesmedlem, Bælte- og Vejinitiativ Institut i Sverige (brixsweden.org):

Hussein Askary præsenterede den akutte voksende sultekatastrofe i Afrika og hvordan den kan løses. Dels gennem en nødaktion for at fragte fødevarer fra USA, Europa, Rusland og Kina, men også gennem at opbygge Afrikas egne fødevarerproduktion og skabe økonomisk udvikling, især infrastrukturprojekter og industrialisering i samarbejde med Kinas Bælte- og Vej-Initiativ.

Hussein Askary præsenterede Afrikas egne udviklingsplaner, Kinas rolle i at virkeliggøre dem, og hvorfor USA og Europe skal deltage.

Hussein Askary brugte en Powerpoint præsentation til illustration under talen, som også findes, som en særskilt video på engelsk her.

Beethoven 250 år og menneskehedens æstetiske opdragelse

Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Vi har en civilisationskrise: en konfrontationspolitik, som kan føre til krig med Rusland og Kina, en COVID-19-pandemi, økonomiske og finansielle kriser og en voksende sulstkatastrofe i Afrika.

Vil vi etablere en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden eller vil det ende i kaos og krig?

Det er en kamp mellem helt forskellige menneskesyn.

LaRouche understregede altid: hvad er forskellen mellem mennesker og dyr?

Er vi dyriske?

Eller har vi en iboende kreativ erkendelsesevne, som gør

os i stand til at opdage nye principper – noget nyt, som ingen andre har tænkt på.

I videnskab opdager vi nye naturvidenskabelige principper.

I kunst opdager vi nyt om vores egne kreative evner, som kan deles med andre, som i et orkester eller kor eller med tilhørerne.

Skønhed, som Schiller sagde, forædle vores følelser og vores intellekt –

ikke kun rå følelser som dominerer os uden intellekt, ikke kun intellekt uden medfølelse og næstekærlighed.

Men gennem at lege, speciel gennem kunst, at spille, kan de to gå op i en højere enhed, som vi kalder en æstetisk tilstand, når vi er omfavnet af skønhed.

Det var Schillers løsning efter den franske revolution, som ikke endte som den amerikanske, men i et blodbad.

Platon skrev, at den vigtigste uddannelse for sjælen var musik – at fylde sjælen med skønhed og gøre den skøn.

Mennesket ville så lovprise skønhed, modtage den med glæde i sin sjæl, og blive til en skøn sjæl.

Den 16. december fejrer vi Beethoven 250-års fødselsdag. Vi fejrer ham, som en af de mest kreative sjæle i historien, men vi fejrer også menneskehedens erkendelsesmæssige evner.

Studér Beethoven for bedre at forstå, hvad vi mennesker er.

Beethoven, selv da han ikke var i stand til at høre sin egne musik, hørte den alligevel i sit sind, og udfordrede sig selv til at lave det ene gennembrud efter det anden.

Der var ingen stilstand eller entropi, men

hvad LaRouche kalder ikke-entropi.

At viljemæssigt blive mere og mere bevist om, at kende sine egne erkendelsesmæssige evner, og presse dem til det yderste for at kunne stige op til det næste niveau, og som han skrev, at nærme sig Guds egen skaberkraft.

Og han havde et formål: at opløfte den trængende menneskehed.

Han var bevidst om musikkens rolle med at forædle menneskene.

Gennem at spille, synge eller lytte, kan Beethovens kreativitet deles med andre –
noderne på papiret, er ikke kun toner, men nøglen til Beethovens kreative sind.

Og dermed kan andre mennesker bekræfte et positivt menneskesyn, som også havde en politisk dimension for Beethoven – stræben efter frihed.

Som Schiller sagde, vejen til frihed går gennem skønhed.

For at fejre Beethoven så lyt til eller syng og spil hans værker. Genoplev hans åndelige gennembrud, bekræft den menneskelig kreativitet, skab et samfund, hvor vi kan genopdage den tabte kunst at skabe skøn musik, måske endnu mere kreativ end Beethoven, og udvikle vores erkendelsesmæssige evner, for hele menneskehedens skyld.

Så blev der spillet den første del af 2. sats af Beethovens 7. symfoni, dirigeret af Wilhelm Furtwängler, som eksempel.

Ud fra en enkel begyndelse tilføjes flere og flere stemmer for at skabe noget stort og opløftende.

Billede af det amerikanske flag. WikiImages fra Pixabay

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 1. oktober 2020: Chok og overraskelser venter fremtil USA's valg den 3. november

Politisk orientering med formand Tom Gillesberg

Schiller Instituttet · Stemme 006

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17. september 2020: Forberedes der en farvet revolution og et militærkup imod præsident

Trump i USA?

Med Tom Gillesberg

Schiller Instituttet · N

NYHEDSORIENTERING SEPTEMBER 2020:

**Krigsmagerens dommedagskurs
eller et nyt paradigme
blandt suveræne nationer
forenet gennem menneskehedens
fælles mål**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3. september 2020:

Vil oligarkiet starte krig for at forhindre et genvalg af Donald Trump? Vær med på konferencen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Schiller Instituttet · Vil oligarkiet starte krig for at forhindre et genvalg af Donald Trump? Vær med på konferencen.