

# Interview med freds- og fremtidsforsker Jan Øberg: Om Ukraine-Rusland-USA-NATO krisen, Danmarks forhandlinger om amerikanske soldater i Danmark, og Xinjiang spørgsmålet, den 21. februar 2022

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

Jan Øberg kan kontaktes her: [oberg@transnational.org](mailto:oberg@transnational.org)

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

Lydfil:

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

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

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Hello. Today is February 21st, 2022. I am Michele Rasmussen, the vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. And I'm very happy that peace researcher Jan Oberg agreed to this interview. Jan Oberg was born in Denmark and lives in Sweden. He has a PhD in sociology and has

been a visiting professor in peace and conflict studies in Japan, Spain, Austria, Switzerland, part time over the years. Jan Oberg has written thousands of pages of published articles and several books. He is the co-founder and director of the Independent TFF, the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research in Lund, Sweden since 1985, and has been nominated over several years for the Nobel Peace Prize.

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

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

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

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

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

**Jan Oberg:** Yes, and thank you very much for your very kind and long and detailed introduction of me. I would just say about that point that I'm amazed that this is now a kind of repeated

truth in Western media, that Gorbachev was not given such promises. And it rests with a few words taken out of a longer article written years ago by a former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine, who says that Gorbachev did not say so. That article was published by Brookings Institution. Now the truth is, and there's a difference between truth and non truths, and we have to make that more and more clear when we deal with the West at the moment. The truth is, if you go to the National Security Archives in the U.S., if I remember correctly, the George Washington University that is well documented, their own formulation is that there are cascades of documentation. However, this was not written down in a treaty, or signed by the Western leaders, who one after the other came to Gorbachev's dacha outside Moscow or visited him in Kremlin, and therefore some people would say it's not valid. Now that is not true in politics. If we can't rely on what was said and what was written down by people personally in their notebooks, etc.

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

leading expert in this, Jens Jørgen Nielsen, who has also written that he personally interviewed Gorbachev, in which Gorbachev, with sadness in his eyes, said that he was cheated, or that these promises were broken, whatever the formulation is.

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

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

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Yes. In your article, you actually quote from the head of NATO, the general secretary of NATO, back in 1990, one year before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Manfred Wörner, where you say that in these documents released by the U.S. National Security Archive, that you just referred to, "Manfred Wörner gave a well-regarded speech in Brussels in May 1990, in which he argued 'The principal task of the next decade will be to build a new European security structure to include the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. The Soviet Union will have an important role to play in the construction of such a system.' And the next year, in the

middle of 1991, according to a memorandum from the Russian delegation who met with Wörner. He responded to the Russians by saying that he personally and the NATO council, were both against expansion "13 out of 16 NATO members share this point of view," and "Wörner said that he would speak against Poland's and Romania's membership in NATO to those countries leaders, as he had already done with leaders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And he emphasized that we should not allow the isolation of USSR from the European community," and this was even while the U.S.S.R. was still alive. So it must have been even more the case after the U.S.S.R. collapsed, and Russia emerged.

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

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

there, who, through a two-hour long conversation, basically talked about Georgia as “our country.”

So, you know, it’s sad to say it’s human to make mistakes, but to be so anti-intellectual, so anti-empathetic, so imbued with your own thinking and worldview, you’re not able to take the other side into account, is much more dangerous than it was at that time, because the leaders we have in the western world today are not up to it. They were earlier, but these are not.

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

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

And it’s well known from one of those who were there, and participated, namely the assistant secretary of State for European Affairs, Mrs. Nuland, and she’s given a speech in the U.S. where, if I remember correctly, she says that the US has pumped \$5 billion into Ukraine over the years, to support democracy and human rights, et cetera, and training courses for young NGOs, et cetera. And it’s obvious that that

operation, that ousting of the president, he had to flee to Russia, and the taking over, partly by neo-Nazis and fascists who were present and who probably did the beginning of the shooting and the killing of people, that all this had to do with the promise that was given to Ukraine years before that it would be integrated into the Euro-Atlantic framework. And then it was kind of stopping and saying, we don't want that anyhow. We will negotiate something else, and we will look into what Putin has to offer, etc.

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

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

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

So I'm just saying, if I put it on a more general level, if we look at today's ability to understand, describe, analyze issues as conflicts, we are heading for zero understanding. There is nobody in the press, and nobody in politics who are able, intellectually, to see these things as conflicts, that is, as a problem standing between two or more parties that has to be analyzed. And conflict resolution is about finding solutions that the parties we have defined as parties, and there certainly are many more than two in this very complex conflict, can live with in the future. What we are down to in banalization is that there is no conflict. There's only one party, Russia, that does everything bad and evil and terrible, while we are sitting in the receiving end, being the good guys who've done nothing wrong in history. Who could never rethink what we did or say, we're sorry, or change our policies, because we are right. There's only one problem. That's them. We're down now to the level in which these things, also the last three months, the accusations about Russia invading Ukraine, has nothing to do with conflict analysis. It is purely focusing on one party, and one party, by definition, is not a conflict.

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

This is not a defense of everything Russia does. What I'm



trying to say is there is a partner over there, by the way they call us partners in the West. We call them anything else but partners. We don't even see them. We don't listen to their interests. We didn't listen to Putin when he spoke at the Munich conference in 2007 and said, 'You have cheated us.' And of course, when Gorbachev, 90 years old, says, you have cheated us, he's not even quoted in the Western world, because there's no space anymore for other views than our own. You know, this autism that is now classical in the Western security policy elite is damn dangerous.

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

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

time, or whatever the formulation was, NATO would accept Russia as a member.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Jan Oberg:** Well, first of all, the question you are raising is a little bit like the seventh doctor who is trying to operate on a patient who is bleeding to death and then saying, "What

should we do now?" What I have suggested over 30 years is something that should have been done to avoid the situation today, and nobody listened, as is clear, because you don't listen to researchers anymore who say something else that state-financed researchers do. So it's not an easy question you are raising, of course. I would say, of course, in the immediate situation, the Minsk agreements, which have not been upheld, particularly by Ukraine in establishing some kind of autonomy for the Donbass area. Now that is something we could work with, autonomous solutions. We could work with confederations, we could work with cantonization, if you will. Lots of what happened, and happens, in the eastern republics of Ukraine. It reminds me of a country I know very well, and partly educated in and worked in during the dissolution, namely Yugoslavia. So much so that it resembles Granica. Ukraine and Granica in Croatia, both mean border areas. Granica means border, and there's so much that could have been a transferred of knowledge and wisdom and lessons learned, had we had a United Nations mission in that part. A peacekeeping mission, a monitoring mission. UN police and U.N. civil affairs in the Donbas region.

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

I've said Minsk. I've said the UN. I've said some kind of internal reforms in Ukraine. I have said, and I would insist on it, NATO must stop its expansion. NATO cannot take the

risk, on behalf of Europe, and the world, to say we insist on continuing with giving weapons to, and finally making Ukraine a NATO member. You can ask Kissinger, you can ask Brzezinski, you can take the most, if you will, right wing hawkish politicians in the West. They've all said neutrality like Finland or Switzerland, or something like that, is the only viable option.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that is to me, the the schwerpunkt [main emphasis], the absolutely essential, that is to give the Ukraine people a feeling of security and safety and stability and peace so that they can develop. I find it very interesting that President Zelensky, in this very long interview to the international press a couple of weeks ago, say I'm paraphrasing it. But he

says "I'm tired of all these people who say that we are going to be invaded because it destroys our economy. People are leaving. No business is coming in, right?"

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

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

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

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

My goodness, people don't read books. There's nothing about conflict prevention. We should prevent violence. We should prevent violent conflict, but preventing conflicts is nonsense, life is getting richer. There's not a family, there's not a school, there's not a workplace, there's not a political party, there's not a parliament in which there are no conflicts. Conflict is what life is made of. Conflict is terribly important because it makes us change and reflect. I'm all for conflicts, and I'm one hundred and ten percent against violence. But people will say "Conflict prevention is

something we should work, on and educate people in." Nonsense from people who never read books, as I said.

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

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

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

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

The whole thing here that the big elephant in the room we are talking about is, well, there are two of them, is NATO expansion, which we should never have done this way. And secondly, it's the interest of the military-industrial-media-academic complex, as I call it, that earns a hell of a lot of



money on people's suffering, and millions of people who, at this moment while we speak, are living in fear and despair because of what they see in the media is going to happen. None of what we see at this moment was necessary. It's all made up by elites who have an interest in these kinds of things happening or the threat of the Cold War. And even if we avoid a big war now, and I hope, I don't pray to anything, but I hope very much that we do, thanks to some people's wisdom, and it's going to be very cold in Europe in the future after this.

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

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

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

**Michelle Rasmussen:** I want to go into the other two subjects. Firstly, the question of the negotiations between Denmark and

the United States in the context of the political, military and media statements of recent years alleging that Russia has aggressive intentions against Europe and the U.S. the Danish Social Democratic government announced on February 10th that a year ago, the U.S. requested negotiations on a Defense Cooperation Agreement, and that Denmark was now ready to start these negotiations. The government announced that it could mean permanent stationing of U.S. troops and armaments on Danish soil. And if so, this would be against the decades-long policy of the Danish government not to allow foreign troops or armaments permanently stationed in Denmark. And you wrote an article two days later criticizing these negotiations. Why are you against this?

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

administration.

And secondly, what kind of democracy is that? We do not know what that letter in which the Americans asked to have negotiations about this, when it was written and what the content of it was. But what we hear is that a little more than a year ago, we began some negotiations about this whole thing, that is behind the back of the parliament, and behind the back of the people, and then is presented more or less as a fait accompli. There will be an agreement. The question is only nitty-gritty, what will be in it.

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

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

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

anything like that. I'm just saying there would be more undermining of Danish principles.

And then the whole thing, of course, has to do with the fact that Denmark is placing itself – and that was something the present government under Mette Frederiksen's leadership did before this was made public – is to put 110 percent of your eggs in the U.S. basket. This is the most foolish thing you can do, given the world change. The best thing a small country can do is to uphold international law and the UN. Denmark doesn't. It speaks like the U.S. for an international rules-based order, which is the opposite of, or very far away from the international law.

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

**Jan Oberg:** A good foreign policy is one where you have a good capacity to analyze the world, do scenarios, discuss which way to go, pros and contras, and different types of futures, and then make this decision in your parliament based on a public

discussion. That was what we did early, 60s, 70s and 80s. And then also when you become a bomber nation, when you become a militaristic one, when active foreign policy means nothing but militarily active, then, of course, you are getting closer and closer and closer down into the into the darkness of the hole, where suddenly you fall so deeply you cannot see the daylight, where the hole is. I think it's very sad. I find it tragic. I find it very dangerous. I find that Denmark will be a much less free country in the future by doing these kinds of things. And, don't look at the basis of this agreement as an isolated thing. It comes with all the things we've done, all the wars Denmark has participated in. Sorry, I said we, I don't feel Danish anymore, so I should say Denmark or the Danes. And finally, I have a problem with democratically elected leaders who seem to be more loyal to a foreign government, than with their own people's needs.

## **China and Xinjiang**

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

And also as a wrap-up question in the end, if you wanted to say anything else about what has to be done to make a change from looking at Russia and China as the autocratic enemies of the West, and to, instead, shift to a world in which there is

cooperation between the major powers, which would give us the possibility of concentrating on such great task as economic development of the poorer parts of the world?

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

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

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

they had just opened up, so to speak.

And what we are saying is not that we know what happened and happens in Xinjiang, because we've not been there and we are not a human rights organization. We are conflict resolution and peace proposal making policy think tank. But what we do say is, if you cannot come up with better arguments and more decent documentation, then probably you are not honest. If there's nothing more you can show us to prove that there's a genocide going on at Xinjiang, you should perhaps do your homework before you make these assertions and accusations.

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

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

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

bits of parts from it.

The uniformity of this is just mind boggling. How come that nobody said, "Hey, what is this Newlines Institute, by the way, that nobody had heard about before? Who are these people behind it? Who are the authors?" Anybody can sit on their chair and do quite a lot of research, which was impossible to do 20 years ago. If you are curious, if you are asked to be curious, if you are permitted to be curious, and do research in the media, in the editorial office where you are sitting, then you would find out lots of this here is B.S. Sorry to say so, intellectually, it's B.S.

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

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

These are the kinds of things that make me scared as an intellectual. One thing is what happens out in the world. That's bad enough. But when I begin to find out how this is going on, how it is manipulated internally in editorial offices, close to foreign ministries, etc. or defense ministries is then I say, we are approaching the Pravda moment. The Pravda moment is not the present Pravda [newspaper], but the Pravda that went down with the Soviet



Union. When I visited Russia, the Soviet Union at a time for conferences, et cetera, and I found out that very few people believed anything they saw in the media. Now, to me, it's a question of whether the Western media, so-called free media want to save themselves or they want to become totally irrelevant, because at some point, as someone once said, you cannot lie all the time to all of the people, you may get away with lying to some, to some people, for some of the time.

**Michelle Rasmussen:** President Lincoln

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

education, training courses, whatever, for media people to write negative stories about China, particularly the Belt and Road Initiative. Now I look forward to Politiken [Danish newspaper] or Dagens Nyheter [Swedish newspaper] or whatever newspapers in the allied countries who would say, "This comes from a state U.S. media" when it does.

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

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

The world is going towards diversity. And we have other cultures coming up who have other ways of doing things, and we may like it or not. But the beauty of conflict resolution and

peace is to do it with those who are different from you. It is not to make peace with those who already love, or are already completely identical with. This whole thing is, unfortunately, a conflict and peace illiteracy that has now completely overtaken the western world. Whereas I see people thinking about peace. I hear people mentioning the word peace. I do not hear Western politicians or media anymore mention the word peace. And when that word is not, and the discussion and the discourse has disappeared about peace, we are very far out.

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

**Michelle Rasmussen:** Thank you so much, Jan.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 16.  
april 2021:**

**Vestens civilisationskrise:  
krig eller fred gennem**

# udvikling

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet · Vestens civilisationskrise: krig eller fred gennem udvikling

---

## Hvordan valget kan vindes: Vær sikker på at 'hvis' sker

5. august (EIRNS) – Tilbage i februar, 2017, næppe to uger efter at Præsident Donald Trump var taget i ed som præsident, udtalte Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at Trump kunne blive den største præsident i USA's historie, hvis han fulgte op på sit løfte om at skabe samarbejdsorienteret forhold med Rusland og Kina, og at arbejdede med disse og andre nationer om det Nye Silkevejs-projekt, for at fremkalde et Nyt Paradigme af økonomisk udvikling for hele menneskeheden, på linje med det beskrevne af Lyndon LaRouche i hans dokument af 08.06.2014, "Fire nye love for at redde USA nu! Ikke en mulighed, men en nødvendighed".

Den Britiske Imperium genkendte dette samme potentiale i Præsident Trump og tog en offentlig ed om, at de aldrig ville tillade noget som helst i den retning at ske – at en anden periode for Trump måtte forhindres for enhver pris, som det blev udtrykt af det engelske overhus i december, 2018. Briterne, med deres Obama-administration, samt andre aktiver, skabte den infame "Russiagate" løgn ud af den tynde luft, for at prøve at sænke Trumps præsidentskab. Den store "Rusland-Rusland-Rusland"-løgn – at Rusland havde hacket den

Demokratiske Nationale Komité's computere, for at give valgsejren til en "medsammensvoren" Trump – er nu blevet miskrediteret vidt og bredt, og med den stadige aktivitet fra LaRouchePAC, Bill Binney, Roger Stone og andre, kunne den bryde sammen hvert eneste øjeblik. Men de samme britiske imperie netværker har nu opdigtet den store "Kina-Kina-Kina"-løgn – at Kina er årsagen til COVID-19-pandemien, som de eksporterede og er ansvarlige for millioner af dødsfald – for at sikre at verdens to største økonomier ikke samarbejder for at sætte en stopper for den globale pandemi og fortsætte derfra til reorganisering af hele det globale, bankerotte finanssystem.

Udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo har haft den førende rolle i at udbrede Kina-Kina-Kina-løgner – samt de destruktive handlinger baseret derpå – og Præsident Trump selv har delvist adopteret dette, i det mindste i offentligheden. Som en konsekvens er de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer ved at løbe ud af kontrol, som hver side eskalerer tonen i meningsudvekslingen. På samme tid er pandemien og den økonomiske krise også ved at løbe ud af kontrol, og skaber præcis den slags omstændigheder, som briterne søger for at sikre at Trump taber valget i november.

I denne tynde strategiske atmosfære offentliggjorde det halvofficielle kinesiske dagblad, *Global Times*, d. 31. juli, en leder, som var et tydeligt signal af en ny slags, som, hvis han ønsker at vinde valget i november, tilskynder Præsident Trump til, ikke at skyde skylden for forværringen af COVID-19 og den økonomiske krise i USA på Kina og andre, men burde i stedet konfrontere disse kriser direkte gennem et samarbejde med Kina. "Lav justeringer tidligere," skrev de, og "slutte sig sammen med Kina".

Helga Zepp-LaRouche tog tilbuddet op i går.

Hun kommenterede at "lederen i *Global Times* er perfekt. Amerikansk-kinesisk-samarbejde angående pandemien er måden hvorpå den strategiske diskussion opløftes til en fælles

tilgang. Dette må gøres for at skabe det miljø, således at et hastetopmøde mellem de fem permanente medlemmer af FN's sikkerhedsråds (P5) kan afholdes senest i september, for at diskutere nødvendigheden af en ny økonomisk og sikkerhedsarkitektur for planeten". Helga Zepp-LaRouche fortsatte ved at advare at "hvis tonen i den nuværende meningsudveksling forværres, vil vi ikke være i stand til at have et topmøde overhovedet eller, hvis vi gør, vil det ikke være en succes. Den strategiske situation løber hurtigt ud af kontrol, ikke kun hvad amerikansk-kinesiske relationer angår, men ligeså i andre relationer. Præsident Trump har ingen intention om at føre krig, men i det nuværende miljø med før-krigs-retorik, og det Britiske Imperiums hensigt om at fremprovokere konflikten, kunne enhver fejlberregning føre til krig.

Denne stilling er langt værre end de fleste mennesker er klar til emotionelt at acceptere. Vi må rette op på dette og få regeringer og befolkninger til at vågne op til den eksistentielle trussel frembragt af pandemien og chokbølgerne som kommer fra den".

Zepp-LaRouche understregede at "dette er den eneste måde hvorpå Trumps valgsejr kan sikres. Grupper for og imod Trump må i samme grad indse, at krisen må konfronteres og overvindes før valget. Vi har brug for et internationalt kor af nationer, der kræver et sådant samarbejde, særligt mellem USA og Kina. Vi har brug for et stigende antal af stemmer for et P5-hastetopmøde. Som jeg ofte har sagt kan Trump blive en af de største amerikanske præsidenter, *hvis* han tager de nødvendige skridt. Det er vores ansvar at sørge for at dette '*hvis*' rent faktisk sker".

---

# Larmende tavshed fra de 'større medier', men sandheden giver genlyd: Der var intet 'russisk hack' – overvågningsstaten afsløret

4. august (EIRNS) – De stærke afsløringer om, at der ikke var noget "russisk hack" i 2016, samt relaterede afsløringer, der er kommet frem i de sidste to ugers presse-begivenheder og webinarer, som er blevet afholdt af LaRouchePAC og Schiller Instituttet i USA, bliver stadig mødt med tordnende tavshed fra de etablerede medier (med få undtagelser inkl. Newsweek og the Washington Times), på trods af de overbevisende cv'er for Roger Stone, den mangeårige politiske konsulent for præsident Donald Trump, der ændrede straffen for Stones uretmæssige retssag i sidste måned, samt William Binney, den tidligere tekniske direktør for USA's Nationale Sikkerhedsagenturs afdeling for analyse og rapportering om globale geopolitiske og militære det amerikanskeanliggender. Ikke overraskende, selvfølgelig; men mørklægningen indtil videre viser kun den skyhøje risiko, der er forbundet med at lade nogen af disse oplysninger blive bredt anerkendt som sandfærdige.

De faktiske kendsgerninger der viser, at hele Russiagate-operationen blev brygget sammen imod det amerikanske præsidentskab og præsident Trump af Obama-relaterede efterretningskredse, der er forbundet med briterne, vil

sprænge valg i 2020 vidt åbent, og forpurre det britiske imperiums globale geopolitik. Det vil også gøre det klart hvordan, hvorfor og af hvem operationen med falske anklager mod Lyndon LaRouche blev udført, og hvorfor LaRouches navn må renses.

Betydningen af at få udbredt dette billede vidt og bredt – og så hurtigt som muligt – blev påpeget i dag ved Consortium News' offentliggørelse af et nyt memorandum, der blev udgivet den 3. august af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS) – (en organisation af tidligere efterretningsofficerer -red.). Dokumentet med titlen: "VIPS-memo til Nancy Pelosi – Hackede Rusland DNC's e-mails?" er en grundig tilbagevisning af løgnene om masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak, som blev fortalt for at retfærdiggøre krigen mod Irak og andre efter år 2001, samt løgnene om den formodede russiske hacking af DNC og John Podestas computere i 2016. Årsagen til at VIPS rettede deres dokumentation til 'Madam Speaker', formand for Repræsentanternes Hus, er at Pelosi den 31. juli udtrykte frustration over, at der i dag ikke kommer nogle detaljer ud om, hvorledes russerne påvirker valget i USA i 2020! VIPS, som inkluderer Bill Binney og andre specialister, forklarede høfligt, at de løgnere, der var involveret i 2016 (og tidligere), såsom James Clapper, James Comey, m.fl., er bekymrede for at blive sat i fængsel. De er blevet sparket ud og har grund til at frygte at skulle tilbringe tid bag tremmer. Derfor, 'Madam Speaker', "kan fraværet af de ønskede detaljer simpelthen skyldes mangelen på troværdige informationer om betydelig russisk indblanding, og fraværet af Clappers embedsmænd til at trylle dem frem. Med andre ord vil nutidens efterretningsadministratorer – i modsætning til deres forgængere – sikkert ikke kunne finde fældende beviser mod Rusland, som 'ikke rigtig var der'".

Baggrunden for disse salver af sandheder er de kombinerede kriser af pandemien, hungersnød, økonomisk sammenbrud og konflikter. På verdensplan rapporteres der officielt over 18



millioner tilfælde af COVID-19, rent faktisk yderligere mange millioner, hvilket skaber nødsituationer fra Australien til Europa. I USA skaber mønstre af 'spredning i lokalsamfund' problemer og lidelser på tværs af alle sektorer, fra skolegang til forarbejdning af fødevarer. National Governors Association har anmodet om en forlængelse af den føderale støtte til Nationalgarden, der nu tæller 25.000 i alle stater. I Det hvide Hus er der nu obligatorisk stikprøve-test af alt personale, efter at en fødevare-arbejder blev fundet SARS-CoV-2 positiv i sidste uge; og den nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, Robert O'Brien, har været i karantæne med virussen indtil i dag.

Situationen for fødevareforsyning forværres drastisk for millioner af mennesker. I slutningen af juli rejste direktør for Verdens Fødevareprogram, David Beasley, til Ecuador og besøgte deres forsyningsmæssige knudepunktet i Panama, hvorfra ikke kun mad, men også anti-pandemisk materiale sendes over hele Amerika. Den 28. juli udsendte han en advarsel om, at 16 millioner mennesker i Syd- og Mellemamerika og Caribien nu er absolut afhængige af den daglige fødevarehjælp, hvilket er en stigning i år fra 4,3 millioner. Han appellerede for nødhjælp på 328 millioner \$.

Endelig, i stedet for at fremme internationale samarbejdsrelationer vedrørende disse og indenlandske økonomiske kriser, er den britisk orienterede krigsfraktion i USA i fuld galop fremad imod konflikt. Blandt de seneste skridt mod Kina blev der annonceret endnu flere sanktioner fra udenrigs- og finansministeriet den 3. august, denne gang rettet mod virksomheder og enkeltpersoner i Xinjiang, hvor de anklages for krænkelser af uighurernes menneskerettigheder. En gruppering i Kongressen udsendte også denne uge en frist til de store amerikanske universiteter, Harvard, Penn, Yale og mange andre, om at de har en frist indtil mandag 10. august til at fremlægge dokumentation for, om de får finansiering fra "fjendtligt indstillede" udenlandske nationer. Hvad disse træk

indebærer, er krig, hvad enten de involverede er bevidste om det eller ej. Denne risiko blev beskrevet i en erklæring fra det russiske udenrigsministerium i dag, på den første årsdag for USA's tilbagetrækning fra INF-traktaten om mellemdistance-atomraketter. Erklæringen advarede om, at den amerikanske udvidelse af landbaserede missiler mod Rusland og andre krigsførende handlinger tvinger Rusland til modforanstaltninger. Erklæringen gentog imidlertid, at politiske og diplomatiske forbindelser stadig er et alternativ.

Dette alternativ er nedfældet i forslaget fra den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin om et P5-topmøde meget snart (med de fem permanente medlemslande i FN's sikkerhedsråd). Præsident Trump og Putin har talt om en dagsorden for mødet. En sådan samling af statsoverhoveder er presserende – det ville være vigtigt allerede inden september. For at fremme dette perspektiv, og for at stoppe kupplanerne mod Trump og det amerikanske præsidentskab, udsendte LaRouchePAC i dag et nyt dokument. Ligesom med topmødet er der ingen tid at spille. Ingen grund til at vente til valget i november! Spred budskabet: "LaRouchePAC's 2020 Terms of Battle: Secure the American Revolution, Crush the British Empire"

---

## **Den 'store løgn' kan forårsage atomkrig**

Den 26. maj (EIRNS) – Amerikanerne (og verden) husker godt G.W. Bush-administrationens 'store løgn', da Bush og hans kontrollør, Tony Blair, bryggede den store løgn om masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak, og slap en række folkemorderiske regimeskifte-krige løs, der ødelagde

Mellemøsten og drev millioner af flygtninge til Europa og andre steder. Præsident Donald Trump identificerede korrekt denne løgn som årsagen til Amerikas værste fejltagelse i moderne historie, måske i hele dens historie. EIR afslørede denne særlige løgn på det tidspunkt det skete, og behøvede ikke de empiriske beviser, der fremkom efter invasionen. Se "The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's Deadly Iraq War," April 18, 2003 ('De uværdige løgnere bag Bush' dødelige Irak-krig')

Den næste 'store løgn', også udspringende fra britisk efterretningstjeneste, er nu også blevet afsløret – den med 'Rusland-Trumps aftalte spil' og 'det russiske hack af Demokraternes computere'. Frigivelsen af kongreshøringerne vedrørende 'Russiagate' har bevist hvad EIR demonstrerede fra begyndelsen – der var intet aftalt spil, og der var intet russisk hack. Mange af de ansvarlige står nu næsten helt sikkert over for kriminelle anklager for deres forræderiske samarbejde med MI6 og GCHQ i et kupforsøg mod USA. Atter engang, ved hjælp af kompetent efterretningsanalyse vidste læsere af EIR dette længe før 'den rygende pistol' viste sig. Se "Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him," Sept. 27, 2017 (Robert Mueller er en amoralsk juridisk snigmorder: Han vil udføre sit job, hvis I tillader det).

Så nu har vi så 'den store løgn' nummer tre – fra nøjagtigt den samme bande løgnere og forrædere – med en smule variation: "Kina forårsagede pandemien, Kina sendte smittede mennesker rundt i verden for at ødelægge økonomier og dræbe mennesker, Kina vil tage verden fra os"! De samme britiske kilder, pligtskyldigst bakket op af den amerikanske presse, den amerikanske kongres og krigshøgene inden for Trump-administrationen, kræver, at præsidenten falder til patten eller står over for en "vred befolkning", der vil stemme ham ud af embedet – hvilket i sig selv er endnu en løgn. Igen advarede EIR nationen: Se "End the McCarthyite Witch Hunt against China and President Trump," November 2019 ('Stop den

McCarthy-agtige heksejagt på Kina og præsident Trump')

Niveauet for informationskrigsførelse i Chinagate er feberagtig. Det er blot nødvendigt for befolkningen at tage fat på den kendsgerning, at en krig med Kina, eller endog bare en "afkobling" fra Kina, ikke vil løse noget. LaRouchePAC har nu offentliggjort en rapport "The LaRouche Plan To Reopen the U.S. Economy: The World Needs 1.5 Billion New, Productive Jobs," ('LaRouche-planen for genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har brug for 1.5 milliard nye produktive arbejdspladser'), som giver en reel løsning, én der begrebsmæssigt blev præsenteret af Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange i løbet af de sidste 50 år, men som ikke længere kan udsættes. Vilkår som under en mørk tidsalder er allerede ved at feje hen over Sydamerika, Afrika og endda dele af USA og Europa. En kamp med et usynligt virus og det lige så dødbringende spekulative virus, der spreder sig fra de tåbelige bestræbelser på at dække over det fallerede vestlige finanssystem, kræver den samme form for samarbejde, som blev organiseret af Franklin Roosevelt for 80 år siden for at besejre fascismen. Samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og USA var afgørende for at vinde den krig, lige som det er for at vinde slaget med COVID-19 og det økonomiske sammenbrud.

Hvad LaRouchePAC-rapporten gør klart er, at der ikke vil komme nogen økonomisk genopretning i USA, med mindre verden bringes ud af britisk imperialistisk dominans – dvs. der må skabes 1,5 milliarder arbejdspladser over hele verden for endelig at opbygge de tidligere koloniale lande til moderne industrilande.

Ikke flere løgne. Udbred LaRouchePAC-rapporten overalt og afslør og bekæmp krigspartiet, så præsidenten kan vende tilbage til sin oprindelige hensigt om at være venner med Rusland og Kina og fuldende et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden.

---

# At vende nedbrydningen af selve samfundets struktur

Den 16. april (EIRNS) – I løbet af de sidste 15 dage, siden 1. april, er det samlede antal mennesker der er smittet med coronavirus fordoblet, steget fra 1 million den 1. april til over 2 millioner i dag. I disse to uger seksdobledes de amerikanske dødsfald som følge af COVID-19, fra 5.100 den 1. april til over 30.000 i dag, den 16. april.

I de sidste dage af marts meddelte den amerikanske finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, at centralbanken ville kanalisere mindst 4 billioner dollars til at redde det bankerotte transatlantiske finanssystem på skatteydernes regning. Denne redningspakke er allerede en størrelsesorden større end den katastrofale redningspakke til det finansielle system i 2008 – og en størrelsesorden farligere og skørere. I 2008 blev den amerikanske Kongres afpresset til at revidere deres oprindelige afvisning af TARP-hjælpepakken, da Wall Street og City of London fortalte dem, at hvis de ikke godkendte det, ville det efterfølgende kaos kræve en undtagelsestilstand.

Hvilken pistol-mod-panden-taktik bruger det britiske imperium denne gang for at få deres vilje? Hvordan har de for eksempel "oversvømmet zonen" omkring præsident Donald Trump? – som den tidligere britiske ambassadør i Washington tidligere så malerisk har udtrykt det.

I løbet af de samme to første uger i april har briterne og deres amerikanske kriminelle kumpaner kraftigt optrappet deres fremstød for at udløse krig mellem USA og Kina – netop de to nationer hvis nære samarbejde er nødvendigt for at tackle



"Der er en syg verden, der skal genopbygges. I denne verden – der er karakteriseret ved de modbydelige lingvistiske sprogfolk – plages vi af flokke af humørløse, ukreative, nævenyttige lømler, der bedst kan beskrives kort og godt som en undertrykkende grå farve, der tenderer imod en ildevarslende gul. Ellers er den generelle befolkning psykologisk duknakket med en byrde af voksende frygt – frygt, hvis nøjagtige karakter og former disse personer foretrækker ikke at kende – hver især trasker miserabelt fra det ene velkendte, grå sted til det næste, 'og på bedste beskub forsøger at tage sig af sit eget personlige forehavende'. I mellemtiden vokser stormene... Der er storme af udbrudte og truende regionale krige, og overordnet truslen om generel kombineret atom-, biologisk og kemisk krigsførelse på verdensplan. I mellemtiden breder syge rotter sig, og de dødbringende nye bølger af ødelæggende epidemier spredt sig mod mennesker, dyr og plantevækst.

Vi må ryste dette af os, og opbygge verden, da det står så umiddelbart og forunderligt i vor magt at gøre det. Vi må i mellemtiden vække videnskaben, feje affaldet væk, og ellers blive en generation som fremtiden vil se tilbage på med varm stolthed over forfædrene. Mens vi gør dette, må vi le en hjertelig latter, latter hovedsagelig på grund af spændingen, som vi med rette får ud af vores bedrifter. Lad der være musik til."

---

**Pressemeddelelse: Anti-Kina-hysteri er meget farligt, og**

# meget dumt

15. april (EIRNS) – Dette er en pressemeddelelse fra Schiller Instituttet:

I dag offentliggjorde Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, følgende erklæring angående den modbydelige anti-Kina-kampagne, som udbredes i Vesten, specielt i USA. Det er et uddrag fra hendes internationale webcast den 15. april 2020.:

Jeg mener, at denne anti-Kina-kampagne kommer fra en dybtliggende geopolitisk opfattelse af, at Kinas opstigning nødvendigvis betyder en tilbagegang for USA, og Vesten generelt. Kina har på intet tidspunkt truet med at erstatte USA som den førende magt. De har tilbudt et samarbejde på grundlag af et "win-win"-samarbejde. De har tilbudt USA et særligt stormagtsforhold. Og det er en fuldstændig absurd idé, at man skulle kunne forhindre et land med 1,4 milliarder mennesker, som har besluttet, at det ønsker at gå frem ad fremskridtets videnskabelige og teknologiske vej – og har bevist at denne metode fungerer ved at løfte 850 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, og dernæst er begyndt at tilbyde fordelene ved en sådan tilgang til andre gennem Bælte-ogVejinitiativet – at man kan stoppe dette på nogen anden måde end med atomkrig! Og det er åbenbart, desværre, hvad nogle personer er villige til at sysle med.

Kina er ikke en aggressiv magt. Men de truer idéen om en enpolet verdensorden, som nogle neokonservative og britiske grupperinger har forsøgt at gennemtvinge i perioden efter Sovjetunionens fald, gennem interventionskrige. Bush-administrationen, og dernæst Obama, førte alle disse interventionskrige, ved brug af idéerne om regimeskifte og farvede revolutioner, og det har skabt den krise vi nu har i Sydvestasien, samt flygtningekrisen.



Men idéen om at man bliver nødt til at stoppe Kinas opstigning er meget farlig. Og vi ser lige nu, at denne kampagne bliver anført af den britiske efterretningstjeneste. Efter at Præsident Trump, desværre, annullerede USA's støtte til Verdenssundhedsorganisationen (WHO), ved at bebrejde dem for at være ansvarlige for mange dødsfald, fordi de misinformede USA – jeg ønsker ikke engang at kommentere dette, fordi det faktisk simpelthen ikke er korrekt – da trådte den tidligere chef for MI6 i går faktisk frem og sagde, at Trump ikke skulle have fokuseret på WHO, men på Kina. Og Henry Jackson-Selskabet, som er 100 % neokonservativ og en af de værste reaktionære institutioner man kan forestille sig, fremlagde et forslag om, at Vesten burde sagsøge Kina, således at Kina ville være nødsaget til at betale for alle omkostninger, som hidrører fra pandemien!

Det faktum at den tyske frokostavis, Bildzeitung, i dag bringer denne ide på side 2, med hele historien, hvor de citerer Henry Jackson-Selskabet, med en lang liste af foreslåede regninger – hvad var omkostningerne for taxachauffører, hotelejerere – i alt 20 kategorier – som Kina burde betale? Og efter i går, hvor de på side 3 havde Pompeo opføre en liste over alle argumenterne mod Kina – det er det endelige bevis for, at denne frokostavis, Bild, er en del af Integrity Initiative, den britiske efterretningsoperation, som kontrollerer den vestlige presse. Officielt eller ej, det er jeg ligeglad med – men de spreder i realiteten propaganda for det britiske imperium. De har lige bevist dette i de sidste par dage, hvis et sådant bevis stadig var nødvendigt.

Men de forsøger at opildne befolkningen mod Kina, og det er faktisk, absolut forkert! Jeg vil bare lige citere et par tal, fordi når de siger, at Kina "skjulte" information om virusset, er det faktisk forkert:

- De første tilfælde af en ny, ukendt sygdom blev registreret i Wuhan den 23. december, 2019.

- Dernæst, 30. december, rapporterede de om et mistænksomt antal af mennesker, som havde fået lungebetændelse.
- Dernæst, 3. januar, fremlagde den Kinesiske Nationale Sundhedskommission retningslinjer for, hvordan disse tilfælde burde håndteres.
- Og allerede den 4. januar kontaktede det medicinske personale i Wuhan deres amerikanske kolleger samt WHO og informerede dem om dette.
- Dernæst, kun tre dage senere, 7. januar, var videnskabsfolk i medicinalbranchen i stand til, for første gang, at isolere coronavirusets genetiske kode. Den ekstraordinære hastighed hvormed de succesfuldt isolerede den nye genetiske kode blev lovprist af hele det internationale medicinske samfund.

Så, jeg tror, at det er en rekord. Jeg husker dette, fordi vi fulgte det nøje, da det skete.

Allerede på dette tidspunkt, i betragtning af det faktum at man kendte til SARS og MERS fra tidligere, kunne vestlige regeringer absolut have påbegyndt fremstillingen af masker, respiratorer, hospitalssenge, og så videre; men det gjorde de ikke! I stedet, blev de uge efter uge ved med at gentage: "Nej, masker er til ingen verdens nytte." Den tyske sundhedsminister Jens Spahn sagde: "Åh, virusset vil aldrig komme til Tyskland". Han fortsatte med at gentage dette helt ind i februar, og sagde at det tyske sundhedsvæsen var perfekt forberedt til alle eventualiteter. De tog det virkelig ikke seriøst, helt indtil marts, da hele situationen brød ud med en hastighed, som efterlod alle målløse. Og selv på dette tidspunkt blev de ved med at sige, at man ikke havde brug for masker. De sagde ikke: Vi har brug for masker, vi har brug for massetestninger, lad os producere alt, som er nødvendigt. I stedet blev de ved med at justere kravene for hvad der var nødvendigt, til hvad deres magre ressourcer var. Og det er et faktum. Det kan siges om alle europæiske lande, og det

fortsætter stadig, til en vis grad, nu.

Så jeg mener, at angrebet på Kina er den mest tåbelige, mest amoralske løgnagtige operation, for hvis der er et land, som havde succes, i det mindste indtil videre – fordi det er en pandemi, ved man aldrig hvad der sker fremover – men de var i stand til at kontrollere og uskadeliggøre virusset i kriseområderne i Hubei-provinsen og i byen Wuhan. Og i stedet for at tænke: måske var det centraliserede system, som Kina har, grunden til, at de kunne agere så hurtigt, og øge produktionen i hele landet; og måske var det vestens ekstreme liberalisme, som var grunden til, at dette ikke var muligt; måske kunne det tænkes, at det liberale/neoliberale system har nogle iboende mangler. I stedet for at diskutere dette, foretager man denne afvigelse og angriber Kina.

Jeg mener det er meget farligt, og at det er meget dumt. Og jeg synes, at det skal stoppe, og folk skulle virkelig ikke lade sig tages ved næsen af disse løgnagtige massemedier, som intet har at gøre med journalistik. De er virkelig kun efterretningstjenesternes fortrop, der forsøger at sprede propaganda for at fremme sine mål. Men det har intet med ærlig journalistik at gøre, overhovedet.

---

**Schiller                      Instituttet  
intervenerer med opfordring  
til topmøde mellem Trump,  
Putin og Xi Jinping**

# på DIIS seminar om Kina og Europa

6. februar 2020 – I går blev et seminar med titlen "Hvad er det næste skridt for Kina og Europa?" afholdt af det Danske Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS). Talerne var fra DIIS ("Danmarks Kina-udfordring"); det tyske Mercator Institut for Kina-studier ("Søgen efter Europas Kina-strategi"); det tyske Globale Offentlige Politiske Institut ("Tyskland og Huawei-debatten") angående 5G; og det britiske Internationale Institut for Strategiske Studier ("Kina, EU's forsvar og sikkerhed, og nyopstående teknologier"). Seminarets hovedindhold handlede om Kinas (angivelige) trussel mod Europa, og de europæiske politikeres modvilje mod at udfordre dette af frygt for at miste deres handel med kineserne.

I løbet af spørgerunden intervenerede en repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet. Efter at have tilkendegivet hvor hun kom fra, sagde hun, at talerne havde modstillet økonomisk samarbejde på den ene side, og geopolitik og strategiske interesser på den anden, men vi har en anden forestilling. Efter mordet på den iranske general opfordrede Schiller Instituttets leder til et omgående topmøde mellem Xi Jinping, Trump og Putin, hvorefter Putin havde udvidet dette til at inkludere Storbritannien og Frankrig for at forhindre en geopolitisk konfrontation. Økonomisk udvikling må være en del af dette, inklusive mere europæisk samarbejde med Bælte- og Vejinitiativet samt økonomisk udvikling i Mellemøsten og Afrika. Hvad med økonomisk udvikling som en måde at mindske strategiske konflikter på, og dermed skabe en håbefuldst fremtid gennem økonomisk samarbejde?

Taleren fra MERICS, som har spillet en negativ rolle i Kina-debatten i Tyskland, indledte sine bemærkninger med at sige, at hun gerne ville vide mere om Schiller Instituttets arbejde om og med Kina. Men selvom handelsrelationer vil fortsætte,

hvilket vi ønsker, så begyndte vi i 2016 at se de geopolitiske konsekvenser af Kinas investeringer i Europa, da Grækenland og Ungarn udvandede EU's kritiske erklæring om Kinas opførsel i det Sydkinesiske Hav, fordi de ikke ønskede at ophidse Kina; og visse Bælte- og Vejprojekter her havde ikke overholdt EU's spilleregler.

Seminaret blev sendt live, og en video kan ses på: <https://www.diis.dk/node/15207>, så flere personer end dem tilstede i lokalet har hørt udvekslingen. Schiller Instituttets spørgsmål begynder efter 2 timer og 35 minutter.

Schiller Instituttets danske nyhedsbrev, som indeholder Helga Zepp-LaRouches opfordring til topmødet, blev uddelt, og en række kontakter blev etableret.

---

**Formand Tom Gillesbergs  
respons til JP's  
coronavirustegning:  
I stedet for Jyllands-Postens  
konfliktskabende  
provokationer,  
lad os samarbejde med Kina  
for at forsvare menneskeheden**

29. januar 2020 – Jyllands-Postens tegning af det kinesiske flag, med coronavirus i stedet for stjerner, er ikke bare

dårlig smag eller manglende pli. Det er en hånlig og åbenlys tilsmudsning af det kinesiske flag, og bliver derfor af mange kinesere over hele verden betragtet som en fornærmelse mod Kina som nation og hele det kinesiske folk. Jyllands-Posten burde om nogen have lært, at hvis man laver provokerende tegninger, så er det ikke nødvendigvis en vigtig del af "en kamp for ytringsfriheden", men kan lige såvel være med til at sætte en destruktiv og konfliktskabende dagsorden, der ikke skaber noget godt, men kun ødelægger.

På et tidspunkt, hvor menneskeheden er under angreb fra en coronavirus, der, hvis den ikke besejres, kan være en ny spansk syge, der slukker millioner af menneskeliv, er det ikke blot en tåbelighed, men en decideret menneskefjendsk handling.

Jyllands-Postens tegning er da også blot den seneste dråbe i en vedvarende kampagne fra konfliktsøgende kræfter, deriblandt efterretningstjenester, i den vestlige verden, der ønsker at forpurre et samarbejde mellem Danmark, Europa, USA og Kina, på samme måde som man længe har gjort det imod Rusland.

Kinas regering har indtil nu reageret meget resolut på udbruddet af en ny coronavirus, uden at lade sig holde tilbage af de meget store menneskelige og økonomiske ofre som Kina må betale, for at være menneskehedens bolværk imod denne dødelige virus. Man har med uhørt hastighed delt al tilgængelig information med resten af verden, så verden bedst muligt kunne beskytte sig imod virussen, og Danmark burde være med i kapløbet om at få skabt en vaccine hurtigst muligt. Det er den virkelige historie Jyllands-Posten bør bringe – efter at have undskyldt, at man bragte en så tåbelig og destruktiv tegning.

Dernæst bør de danske medier fortælle om den endnu vigtigere kamp, som Kina har indledt på menneskehedens vegne, i form af Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, også kendt som Den Nye Silkevej, hvor Kina samarbejder med indtil nu 176 andre nationer om at sikre hele verden adgang til moderne infrastruktur og en tilhørende industrialisering – et verdensomspændende projekt

der allerede er mange gange større end Marshallhjælpen efter 2. verdenskrig, og som kan udrydde sult og fattigdom over hele verden, i lighed med hvad Kina allerede har gjort gennem at løfte 850 millioner ud af dyb fattigdom derhjemme – en tilgang, der også kan løse problemerne i Sydvestasien (Mellemøsten) og Afrika.

Danmark bør ikke blot støtte Kina på alle måder i den livsvigtige kamp for at besejre den seneste coronavirus, men bør også strække hånden ud til et fremtidigt tæt og venskabeligt samarbejde, der bør inkludere en meget mere aktiv dansk deltagelse i Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og andre tiltag, der tjener hele menneskehedens interesse.

Med venlig hilsen

Tom Gillesberg

Formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

---

## **Tiden er inde til at fjerne fattigdom og give vore børn en fremtid**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 28. feb., 2018* – I dag anfører *New York Times* den flok hyæner i det vestlige pressekorps, som misbilliger den kinesiske beslutning om at fjerne tidsbegrænsning for deres præsidenter og vicepræsidenter. »Xi sætter Kina på kollisionskurs med historien«, hylér *Times'* overskrift og citerer ingen anden en taberen Hillary Clinton, der udtalte, at Kina er på »en taberkurs og forsøger at opretholde et regeringssystem, der ikke kan overleve i den

moderne verden«.

Kesha Rogers, den uafhængige kandidat til Kongressen for Texas (9. Kongresdistrikt), og som støttes af LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite, responderede til dette hysteri imod Kina ved at minde vore borgere om Martin Luther Kings ord (som, ulig Hillary, var *kvalificeret* til at være præsident), der sagde: »Tiden er inde for os at blive civiliserede ved totalt, direkte og omgående at afskaffe fattigdom.« Det er selvfølgelig det, Kina er ved at opnå, både for sine egne borgere (frem til år 2020) og for verden, gennem sit historiske Bælte & Vej Initiativ. Hvilken nation eksemplificerer den »civiliserede verden« i dag?

*Global Times*, det Kinesiske Kommunistpartis avis, skriver i dag, at »de vestlige medier begyndte at tale dårligt om Kina på deres sædvanlige og forskellige måder« efter meddelelsen om, at Kina ville afslutte begrænsede embedsperioder. »Den vigtigste grund til alt dette«, fortsætter lederartiklen, »er, at Kinas fremvækst har nået et afgørende punkt, hvor nogle vesterlændinge rent psykologisk ikke kan holde det ud længere. De ønsker at se en ulykke ramme landet. Selv, hvis det skulle skade deres egne interesser, så er de villige til først at se Kina smuldre«. De skriver fortsat, »I årenes løb er både Kinas Kommunistiske Partis Centralkomites myndighed og vort kinesiske samfunds fremgang vokset. Centralkomiteens myndighed er den mest fremragende del af Kinas konkurrencedygtighed. Den er kilden til landets effektivitet og evne til at mobilisere folk og foretage tilpasninger. Det er den ting, som den omgivende verden mest misunder Kina, og det er målet for vestlig, antikinesisk retorik.«

Mange i Vesten responderer, at, på trods af det store fremskridt i Kina, er det kinesiske folk ikke frit, har ikke basale menneskerettigheder, som om retten til et anstændigt levebrød, frihed fra fattigdom og frihed til at bidrage til nationens og menneskehedens fremtid, ikke skulle være den mest fundamentale af menneskerettighederne.



Men vi må også stille spørgsmålet, hvad er tilstanden for menneskerettighederne i USA? Hvad gør man mod vore børn, af hvilke millioner er blevet nægtet ethvert håb om en produktiv fremtid, og som i stedet tilbydes »friheden« til at tage narkotiske stoffer, til at blive »underholdt« af film og videospil og popmusik, der lærer dem at umenneskeliggøre deres medmennesker gennem vold og pornografi, og som nægtes enhver uddannelse med hensyn til den klassiske, vestlige kulturs skønhed, for slet ikke at tale om den klassiske kinesiske kulturs skønhed, eller skønheden i nogen af de andre, store kulturer i menneskets historie? Der bør ikke herske tvivl om, hvorfor hundredevis af vore børn bliver forvandlet til mordere. Der bør heller ikke herske nogen tvivl om, at hele økonomien og hele kulturen må transformeres for at denne rædsel skal stoppe, og for at verden kan gå ind i et nyt paradigme, baseret på menneskeligt fremskridt og menneskelig værdighed.

Præsident Trump vækkede et håb i det amerikanske folk, hvor han lovede at genopbygge nationens industrielle grundlag og den kollapsende infrastruktur, at afslutte narkosvøben, mindede folk om Alexander Hamiltons »Amerikanske System« og lovede at afslutte den nytteløse og farlige konfrontation med Rusland og Kina. Det er de spørgsmål, som Lyndon LaRouche har kæmpet for i et halvt århundrede, alt imens det politiske lederskab har været i færd med at transformere nationen til en postindustriell skrotbunke og en permanent krigsmaskine på vegne af Det britiske Imperium.

Håbet om at genoprette Amerikas storhed må nu fuldbyrdes på den eneste, mulige måde – ikke stykkevist, ikke med små skridt, men gennem den fulde og hele genindførelse af det Amerikanske System gennem LaRouches program, og ved fuldt og helt at vedtage den Nye Silkevejsånd, som Kinas Bælte & Vej har lanceret. Det er, hvad et civiliseret samfund må gøre.

*Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump og præsident Xi Jinping møder børn, der vifter med kinesiske og amerikanske flag under*

*velkomstceremonier uden for Folkets Store Hal, 9. nov., 2017, i Beijing, Folkerepublikken Kina. (WH Photo Shealah Craighead)*

---

# **Kina til Vesten: I stedet for at være misundelig på Bælte & Vej – Så gå med!**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 20. feb., 2018* – En artikel i dagens udgave af den kinesiske avis *Global Times* kommer med den nyttige gentagelse af det, der har været den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings konstante budskab til Vesten: Gå sammen med os i Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og alle parter vil vinde!

*Global Times'* kronik afviser de endeløse bagvaskelser af Kina for dets rolle i at hjælpe Afrika med at udvikle sig gennem Bælte & Vej Initiativet, som værende »næret af misundelse«. Og artiklen foreslår, at »tiden måske er inde til, at de vestlige lande øger indsatsen« og går med i udviklingen af Afrika – og implicit, i hele verden.

I betragtning af denne indlysende kendsgerning – at alle parter står til at drage fordel af et Nyt Paradigme for samarbejde og fælles udviklingsinitiativer – så klør kvalificerede iagttagere i Kina og andre Bælte & Vej-lande sig i hovedet i vantro over det systemiske, selvmorderiske vanvid, der synes at feje hen over Vesten. Denne, det Gamle Paradigmes manglende evne til at konfrontere virkeligheden, blev udstillet i fuld technicolor på den nylige München Sikkerhedskonference; i de endeløse bagvaskelser imod Rusland og Kina og truslerne om at »begrænse« dem; i de fortsatte

krigsprovokationer omkring Syrien og Koreahalvøen; i Tysklands manglende evne til at frembringe en ny, levedygtig regering, og frem for alt, i det britiskførte Russiagate-cirkus, der fortsætter med at dominere de vestlige medier.

Journalisten Finian Cunningham, der skriver i RT om München Sikkerhedskonferencen, indfangede kernen i det: »At denne overfladiske og spinkle sag [de 13 anklageskrifter for indblanding i valget] af amerikanske politikere bliver holdt frem som en 'krigshandling' fra Rusland mod USA, er latterligt. Vanvid har i sandhed overtaget den gængse, amerikanske debat.« Cunningham fortsatte, at »mange alternative, rationelle iagttagere i USA og Europa kan se, at Russiagate-narrativen er ved at kollapse som følge af manglende beviser.«

Det er korrekt. Det står klart, at den britiske Mueller-operation er i opløsning, og at den stadig kæmper for at komme sig over den afsløring, som LaRouche-bevægelsen stod i spidsen for med sit Mueller-dossier. Kongresmedlem Devin Nunes, der ikke venter på, at Mueller et al. skal tage initiativet på ny, har netop åbnet en ny flanke: han har udstedt et brev til et dusin eller flere unavngivne, nuværende og tidligere folkevalgte, som instruerer dem til at besvare 10 højst ubehagelige og kompromitterende spørgsmål om, hvornår de kendte til Steele-dossieret, hvem, de cirkulerede det til, og så videre – i modsat fald vil de blive indstævnet til at gøre det.

Men, nyttige, som disse træfninger er, så er de ikke tilstrækkelige. De gør det ikke ud for en vinderstrategi for fuldt og helt at gøre en ende på geopolitik i 2018 og i stedet skabe et Nyt Paradigme, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentagne gange har erklæret, må ske. Denne strategi fordrer, at vi vinder en krig om ideer, som modvægt til selve den hypotese, der ligger under den geopolitiske nulsumsspils-verdensanskuelse, med samt dens bestialske menneskebegreb. Det er disse ideer, der har ført os til flere verdenskrige og til den nuværende trussel om

en ny, denne gang endegyldig, verdenskrig.

Lyndon LaRouche adresserede denne underliggende, mest fundamentale af alle kampe i sin banebrydende artikel fra juli 1994, »Hvordan Bertrand Russell blev en ond mand«[1], som han skrev for Schiller Instituttets *Fidelio*-magasin blot få måneder efter sin løsladelse fra fængsel, efter fem års indespærring for hænderne af det samme britiske Mueller-apparat, der nu er rettet mod at få ram på præsident Trump. LaRouche skrev:

»Storbritanniens Lord Bertrand Russell har, uden for enhver tvivl, været den mest onde, offentlige person i det nu udrindende [20.] århundrede ... Der er intet væsentligt hos Russell, som ikke er en gentagelse af det, der blev skrevet af [Lord Shelburnes lakaj] grundlæggeren af britisk udenrigs-efterretningstjeneste, Jeremy Bentham, for nu mere end to hundrede år siden ...

[Dette er] den britiske, filosofiske radikalisme fra Shelburnes lakajer, og fra Huxley-familien og senere fra Russell. Bertrand Russell var, mens han levede, en raceret venetiansk køter af denne Shelburne-type ... Forstå dette, og du forstår, hvem Russell er. Forstå Russell på denne måde, og du vil begynde at forstå de seneste 600 års europæiske historie, og verdenshistorie. Så begynder du at forstå de vigtige træk af det nu udrindende, nuværende århundrede.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche påpegede i dag: »Med denne galskab med Muellergate og Russiagate, med dæmoniseringen af Rusland og Kina, er dette kursen mod Tredje Verdenskrig. Den eneste måde at stoppe det på er gennem et Nyt Paradigme i den måde, mennesker tænker på. Og det er, hvad vi bør diskutere med dem. Vi har løsningen med Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, som er en bydende hastesag, fordi det næste finanskrak kunne indtræffe, hvornår, det skal være. Og vi må optrappe debatten for, at USA skal gå med i Bælte & Vej Initiativet, ikke kun for at genopbygge infrastrukturen i USA, men for at gøre det, som

*Global Times* i dag sagde: Gøre fælles sag med Kina i Afrika, for at bygge dette kontinent.«

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump deltager i et erhvervsarrangement med præsident Xi Jinping i Folkets Store Hal, 9. nov., 2017, i Beijing, Folkerepublikken Kina. (Official White House Photo by Shealah Craighead)

[1]

[https://www.schillerinstitute.org/fid\\_91-96/943a\\_russell\\_lhl.html](https://www.schillerinstitute.org/fid_91-96/943a_russell_lhl.html)

---

**Muellers efterforskning er  
kriminalitet for  
åbent tæppe: Tiden er kommet  
til at gøre en  
ende på geopolitik.**

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i  
Schiller Institut**

**Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 21.  
dec., 2017.**

**Dansk Udskrift.**

*Jeg mener, dette simpelt hen kræver en fortsættelse af vores mobilisering. Jeg ved, vore kolleger i USA fra LaRouche PAC*

har produceret en ny brochure med krav om at gennemføre min mand, Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, og om, hvorfor USA må gå sammen med Kina om opbygning af den Nye Silkevej, både hjemme og internationalt. Brochuren [»LaRouche's Four Laws & America's Future on the New Silk Road«] [1] er udgivet. Jeg vil opfordre vore seere og lyttere til at få fat i dette dokument: Læs det, for det indeholder alle løsningerne, de korrekte økonomiske koncepter for USA og resten af verden for at komme ud af den nuværende krise.

Det er en presserende hastesag, for vi kunne få en nedsmeltning af systemet, hvornår, det skal være. For lige at nævne det ganske kort, så minder denne bitcoin-mani, der nu finder sted, virkelig om tulipanboblen [i 1637] før den brast. Kina har erkendt denne fare og forbyder grundlæggende set spekulation i bitcoins. Alle disse tossestreger gør det klart, at det er presserende nødvendigt at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, og alle hr. LaRouches Fire Love, der især omfatter en massiv forøgelse af arbejdsstyrkens produktivitet gennem et forceret program for fusionsteknologi, samarbejde om rumforskning og højteknologiske investeringer generelt; og med mindre, man gør dette, inkl. højteknologisk infrastruktur – og den nylige Amtrak-ulykke i staten Washington understreger blot, at dette er absolut nødvendigt – med mindre man gør dette som en samlet pakke, tror jeg ikke, verden vil komme ud af denne krise.

[1] <https://larouchepac.com/20170225/four-laws-pamphlet>

Download (PDF, Unknown)