

NYHEDSORIENTERING MAJ-JUNI 2022:

**Dansk-svensk videokonference
d. 25. maj 2022:**

**For en ny sikkerheds- og
udviklingsarkitektur for alle
nationer,**

**ikke en styrkelse af
geopolitiske blokke.**

**NEJ til at afskaffe
forsvarsforbeholdet**

**NEJ til Sverige og Finland i
NATO**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Hvorfor Danmark bør afstå fra

et intensiveret geopolitisk militært engagement, af næstformand Michelle Rasmussen:

Fra videokonferencen den 25. maj 2022.

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

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

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

arbejde for at ændre USA's politik.

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

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

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

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

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

For det, Schiller Instituttet siger, er, at nøglen til en mere fredelig verden ikke er at øge militariseringen, men at

etablere en ny arkitektur for sikkerhed og økonomisk udvikling, hvor man kan undgå krigsudbrud. Som Jan Øberg påpegede, kan man have konflikter, men hvordan sikrer vi, at de ikke fører til krig? Hvordan kan vi løse disse konflikter på en fredelig måde?

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

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

In English:

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

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

One of the opt-outs was that Denmark would not participate in the joint European EU military activities. We think that people should vote NO. This would be a way, not only to prevent Denmark from increasing its military activity with the EU, but would also put a stop to a process of militarization that has been going on, especially since 2001. Personally, I'm

an American citizen, and recently, I also became a Danish citizen. And I would say that Denmark, my adopted country, ought to, instead of just following along with the policies of the United States, my native country, that Denmark should, instead, work to change the policies of the United States.

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

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

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

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

The other thing is that it's not enough to vote NO in the

referendum. That will not solve the problems. But it will be a way of of stemming the tide of this step by step by step militarization.

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

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

The answer will come soon.

Næstformand Michelle Rasmussen på LaRouche-organisationens videoprogram den 29. maj 2022, om Schiller Instituttets danske-svenske videokonference for en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur

Næstformand Michelle Rasmussen fortalte, hvorfor vi tog initiativ til at holde videokonferencen den 25. maj 2022 og om organiseringsprocessen.

Michelle Rasmussens indlæg begynder 57 min. inde i videoen.

Bagefter er der spørgsmål og svar fra Michelle og medpanelist Richard A. Black, Schiller Instituttets repræsentant i FN, som talte om den første Eurasiske Økonomiske Forum i Kyrgyzstan den 26. maj 2022. Der var også spørgsmål om kultur og om at komponere klassisk musik.

Se konferencen her:

Vi behøver en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle nationer,

ikke en styrkelse af geopolitiske blokke;

NEJ ved den danske folkeafstemning den 1. juni om afskaffelse af EU's forsvarsforbehold

NEJ til Sveriges og Finlands optagelse i NATO.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Baggrunden for krigen mellem Ukraine-NATO og Rusland. Background of the war between Ukraine-NATO and Russia. Speech at the Schiller Institute's seminar May 25, 2022.

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

Mange tak for invitationen. Jeg synes, at denne konference er meget aktuel og yderst relevant, for jeg har levet i mange år – man kan se på farven på mit hår – og man kan være sikker på, at jeg har levet i flere årtier. Jeg kan ikke huske, at vi i alle disse år efter Anden Verdenskrig har befundet os i en situation, som den vi befinder os i nu. Jeg var en lille dreng under Cuba-krisen i 1962 og vidste ikke særlig meget om den, men erindrer, at mine forældre og alle voksne var meget nervøse over situationen. Men alligevel vil jeg sige, at jeg nogle gange ser tilbage på denne tid under Den kolde Krig, og finder at tingene var meget bedre på dette tidspunkt. Jeg havde aldrig troet, at det skulle komme til dette punkt. Nogle gange vågner jeg op om morgenen og håber, at alting var et

mareridt, men er bange for, at det ikke er tilfældet. Er bange for at være i live, og sover ikke, drømmer ikke; det er virkeligheden lige nu. Jeg vil blot sige om Cuba-krisen, at Khrusjtjov og Kennedy fandt et fælles sprog, som man siger på russisk [sætning på russisk 57:01], og de kom godt ud af det sammen, og de fandt en løsning ret hurtigt. De respekterede på en eller anden måde hinanden. Tænk på Nixon og Brezhnev; deres forhold var – selvfølgelig var de modstandere, konkurrenter – selvfølgelig var de det, men de havde en vis respekt for hinanden. Det samme gælder for Reagan og Gorbatsjov osv. Så derfor mener jeg, at tiden lige nu er forfærdelig, fordi vi ikke har denne respekt. Hvis man ser på, hvordan de beskriver Putin i alle medierne, og det har de gjort i de 15, næsten 20 år, så er det som nedgørelse, åbent had, foragt og den slags ting. Jeg synes, det er et meget dårligt varsel, det er et meget dårligt tegn på, at vi går nogle meget besværlige tider i møde.

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

Jeg vil behandle disse to spørgsmål. Hvordan nåede vi dertil? Jeg tror, Jan Øberg vil tale lidt mere om, hvad vi skal gøre, eller måske snarere, hvad vi ikke skal gøre. Jeg har været med i næsten 30 år, faktisk også i denne årrække hvor jeg arbejdede i Rusland, jeg arbejdede på nogle ambassader i de tidligere sovjetrepublikker, og begyndte at lære det russiske sprog allerede før det. For det andet blev jeg gift med en russer for 30 år siden, i 1992. Vi havde håb om en ny verden,

vi havde lige forladt Den kolde Krig, og vi havde håb om, at vi skulle leve i en fredelig verden. Og her er vi så, 30 år senere. Men der er noget håb; vi er ikke blevet skilt, vi har ikke planer om at blive skilt, så der er lidt håb, vil jeg mene.

Tilbage til det, der er sket. I 1991, da Sovjetunionen blev opløst, og Warszawa-pagten blev opløst, rejste jeg meget i Rusland. Jeg var meget i Rusland, og jeg havde russiske venner. De var alle entusiastiske, de var alle optimistiske. "Nu går vi ind i en ny verden. Nu har vi en harmonisk verden præget af harmoni og fred og udvikling og den slags ting." De sagde, at de udtrykkeligt ønskede at være en del af Vesten; de ønskede at dele vores værdier og den slags ting. Hvis man har dette billede i begyndelsen af 1990'erne, var det meget svært at leve i Rusland, fordi alt brød sammen, og der var kaos. Men de ønskede at være en del af Vesten. Så det interessante spørgsmål er, hvad skete der egentlig? Hvorfor gik det ikke sådan? Der er flere trædesten i dette, vil jeg sige, for allerede i begyndelsen af 1990'erne kom Bill Clinton til magten i USA. Han støttede først en plan om, at de østeuropæiske lande skulle blive en del af NATO og lade Rusland stå udenfor. På den måde vil jeg påstå, at han afviste Gorbatsjovs forslag om at opbygge et europæisk hus. Der var faktisk en plan om at opbygge et europæisk hus, men det var et europæisk hus baseret på militæret, og Rusland stod udenfor. På dette tidspunkt advarede mange folk i FN, selv i Europa, om, at det ikke ville fungere; det ville helt sikkert ikke fungere, for selv de liberale i Rusland, og mange af disse pro-vestlige liberale sagde: "Det er en meget dårlig idé".

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

Så på dette tidspunkt var jeg journalist. Jeg talte med en masse mennesker. Jeg talte med Sakharovs enke, Jelena Bonner; jeg talte med alle de liberale – hvem talte jeg ikke med på

dette tidspunkt? Og alle var meget skarpt imod dette. På dette tidspunkt, jeg tror, hvis man skal sætte et årstal, var det 1999, et år hvor splittelsen faktisk begyndte; måske begyndte den lidt tidligere, men på dette tidspunkt var den åbenlys. Så kom Putin ind i billedet; han skabte ikke denne situation. Mange mennesker tror, at russerne var liberale, og at den onde Putin kom til. Nej! Det er den anden vej rundt. Faktisk fulgte Putin det russiske folks dagsorden, og endda ikke kun det, for sjovt nok var Putin meget ivrig efter at komme med i NATO. Det er meget interessant at tale om dette i dag. Han ønskede, at Rusland skulle tilslutte sig NATO, det sagde han i hvert fald i et interview med BBC i 2000, da han først blev præsident.

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

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

af Ukraine mente noget andet, nemlig at de skulle tilslutte sig NATO og EU. Så det er på mange måder et splittet land.

I det mindste blev Ukraine på dette tidspunkt i 2008 inviteret [til at blive medlem af NATO]. Det er interessant nok, at 17 % af den ukrainske befolkning ønskede at tilslutte sig NATO, mens 66 % ikke ønskede at tilslutte sig NATO. Jeg synes, at det er meget interessante tal, for det siger alt om, hvordan USA havde en dagsorden om at trække Ukraine ud af den russiske sfære, og de skjulte det ikke engang. Zbigniew Brzezinski, som var national sikkerhedsrådgiver, skrev en bog om "det store skakbræt" {Grand Chessboard}: han skrev åbent, ja, vi ønsker at rive Ukraine ud af Ruslands område. Så hvor meget stabilitet kan man opbygge der? Og tingene blev endnu værre.

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

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

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

Herefter startede krigen: Den ukrainske hær begyndte at

angribe de republikker, der havde erklæret sig uafhængige. For man kan sige ud fra et juridisk synspunkt, at hvis man kan lave et kup i Kiev, kan man også lave et kup i Donetsk. I Donetsk og Lugansk havde de i det mindste folkeafstemninger. De valgte nye regeringspartier i disse to republikker. Så, sanktionsregimet begyndte allerede der, og der skete en endnu kraftigere forværring af forholdet mellem NATO og Rusland, meget voldsommere. På dette tidspunkt var der faktisk en reel krig i gang i Donbass, den østlige del af Donbass, som er en region i Ukraine.

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

Dette er altså noget, der foregår i Rusland og i det mindste i en del af det opdeltede land, Ukraine. I februar 2015 var der en meget interessant konference i Minsk, og Lukashenko var vært. Der blev indgået en aftale mellem Frankrig, Tyskland, Rusland og Ukraine og også disse to republikker. De underskrev en aftale, ifølge hvilken Ukraine skulle have direkte forhandlinger med lederne af de to republikker – Donetsk og Lugansk – med disse to republikker. Ideen var, at Ukraine skulle ændre sin forfatning for at tillade autonome enheder i Ukraine. Tanken var, at Donetsk og Lugansk skulle være autonome enheder i Ukraine, der skulle bestemme, hvilket sprog der skulle være, og som også skulle bestemme, om de skulle

have vetoret i spørgsmål om militærpolitik og lignende forhold. Jeg tror faktisk, at det var det bedste, man kunne opnå, og jeg vil gerne rose Merkel, fordi hun indgik denne aftale uden USA's umiddelbare støtte. Hun gjorde det på egen hånd; hun tog Hollande fra Frankrig med sig og indgik denne aftale, som var det bedste, man kunne opnå på det tidspunkt.

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

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

Nu kan jeg se, at jeg er ved at løbe tør for tid. Jeg vil blot sige, at hvis man går lidt længere frem, kom Zelenskij til magten – 70 % af den ukrainske befolkning støttede ham. Hvorfor? Fordi han sagde, at han var for fred; han ville gerne have en aftale med Rusland; han vil løse deres problemer med forhandlinger i Donbass, med Lugansk og Donetsk. Men han blev også truet, og han veg tilbage fra denne politik. I stedet inviterede han endnu mere [militær støtte fra USA] fra

2017-18, det var under Donald Trump. Ukraine blev bevæbnet mere og mere, og de begyndte at have fælles militærøvelser. De installerede også militær teknik i den østlige del, og også i Ukraine. Så man kan sige, at selv om Ukraine ikke var en del af NATO, så var NATO selvfølgelig i Ukraine. Jeg vil gå endnu længere og sige, at der sidste år, i 2021, var flere interessante ting. For et år siden, eller endnu tidligere, det var i marts sidste år, hævdede Zelenskij, at han var nødt til at erklære krig. Han sagde, at han gerne ville tage Krim og Donbass tilbage med militæret og støttet af NATO, ikke med NATO-soldater, men med NATO-udstyr, NATO-træning og lignende ting.

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

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

i Ukraine i det sidste år, i hvert fald fra marts 2021 til februar 2022, hvis man ser på, hvad der skete der, hvis man sidder i Rusland og ser på, hvad der sker der, er det meget, meget tydeligt, at der er intentioner om at tage det tilbage.

Dette er en rød linje for Rusland. Det har de sagt. Der er ingen tvivl om, at Rusland har en rød linje, og på en eller anden måde er man nødt til at agere på den. Jeg siger ikke, at det er det rigtige at gøre, men at sige at Putin er en galning, at han bare er blevet skør eller noget, det synes jeg ikke er relevant. Jeg siger ikke, at han har truffet den rigtige beslutning, men han er ikke gal. Han ser faktisk på verden fra en anden vinkel.

English: Jens Jørgen Nielsen, degrees in the history of ideas and communication, a Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s, author of several books about Russia and Ukraine, a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization, and an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark.

English:

Thank you very much for the invitation. I think this conference is both very timely and very relevant, because I have lived for many years – you can look at the color of my hair – you can be sure that I have lived for several decades. I don't remember during all these years after the Second World War, we are in a situation like we are in now. I was a small boy during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. I didn't know very much about it, but I remember my parents and all adults were very nervous about it. But still, I would say now I sometimes look back at this time of the Cold War, and I think things were much better at this time. I never thought I should come to this point. Sometimes I wake up in the morning and hope everything was a nightmare, but I'm afraid it is not. I'm afraid I'm alive and I'm not sleeping, I'm not dreaming; it is reality right now. I'll just say about the Cuban Missile Crisis, Khrushchev and Kennedy, they found common language like they say in Russian [phrase in Russian 57:01], and they got along and they found a solution pretty quickly. They

somehow respected each other. Think of Nixon and Brezhnev; their relationship was – of course they were opponents, competitors – of course they were, but they had some respect for each other. Same goes for Reagan and Gorbachev and so on. So, that's why I think that the time right now is awful, because we don't have this respect. If you look at how they describe Putin in all the media, and have been doing so for I would say 15, almost 20 years, it's like denigration, open hatred, scorn and such kinds of things. I think it's a very bad omen, it's a very bad sign that we are in for some very troublesome times.

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

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

Back to what has happened. In 1991, when the Soviet Union was dissolved, and the Warsaw Pact was dissolved, I travelled a

lot in Russia. I was very much in Russia, I had Russian friends. They were all enthusiastic, they were all optimistic. "Now we are entering a new world. Now we have a harmonious world marked by harmony and peace and development, and things like that." They said they emphatically wanted to be part of the West; they wanted to share our values and things like that. If you have this picture in the beginning of the 1990s, it was very difficult to live in Russia because everything broke down and there was chaos. But they wanted to be part of the West. So, the good question is, what actually happened? Why didn't it turn out this way? There are several step stones in this, I would say, because already in the beginning of the 1990s, Bill Clinton came to power in the United States. He first endorsed a plan of the Eastern European countries becoming part of NATO, leaving Russia outside. In this way, I would say he declined the proposal of Mr. Gorbachev to build a European house. There was actually a plan to build a European house, but it was a European house based on military, and with Russia being outside. At this time in the United Nations, even in Europe, many people warned that it would not work; it definitely would not work, because even the liberals in Russia, and many of those pro-Western liberals said, "It's a very bad idea."

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

So, at this time, I was a journalist. I talked to a lot of people. I talked to Sakharov's widow, Yelena Bonner; I talked to all the liberals—who didn't I talk to at this time? And everyone was very sharply opposed to this. At this time, I think if you should put a year, it was 1999, a year when the split actually began; maybe it started a little earlier, but at this time it was obvious. And then, Putin came into this situation; he didn't create this situation. Many people think that the Russians were liberals and that the evil Putin came along. No! It's the other way around. Actually, Putin took the

agenda of the Russian people, and even not that, because funny enough, Putin was very eager to join NATO. It's very interesting to talk about this today. He wanted Russia to join NATO, at least he said so in an interview with BBC in 2000, when he first became President.

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

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

But at least at this point in 2008, Ukraine was invited [to join NATO]. Interestingly enough, 17% of the Ukrainian population wanted to join NATO; 66% did not want to join NATO.

I think those are very interesting figures, because it says everything about how America had an agenda to pull Ukraine out of the Russian orbit, and they didn't even hide it. Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was National Security Advisor, wrote a book about the {Grand Chessboard}: he openly wrote, yes, we want to tear Ukraine out of the orbit of Russia. So, how much stability could you build there? And things got even in worse.

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

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

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

So, then the war started: The Ukrainian Army started to attack the republics that had declared themselves independent. Because you can say from a legal point of view, if you can make a coup in Kyiv, you can also make a coup in Donetsk. At least in Donetsk and Lugansk they had referendums. They elected new government parties in these two republics. So, at

least there, the sanctions regime started and even much more deterioration between NATO and Russia, much more. At this time, it was actually a real war going on in Donbass, which is the eastern part of Donbass, which is a region of Ukraine.

Many people in Denmark, I would now discuss these matters with my fellow Danes, and I say "maybe you know that 14,000 people have been killed in this war?" "What? No, it's Russian propaganda." Well, it's definitely not, because it's the assessment of the OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I think is probably the only source we have for these kinds of figures. At least some thousands of this 14,000 are civilian people, and among those, many children. But the Russians can also see we don't cry for these children, we don't raise Russian flags for these children in our countries in the West. So, many Russians tend to think "OK, then, if we want to secure the security of Russian speakers, it should be Russia because the European Union is not at all interested." The Ukrainian government is certainly not interested in protecting human rights for those people who wanted to keep their language or have some normal relations to Russia.

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

you could achieve at the time.

But, very soon, it became clear that Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko was not the master in his own house, as we say, because he wanted to get it through in the Parliament. What happened? Some of these right-wing groups that Helga also talked about, exploded. Members of the Parliament, three people were killed at this point. They threatened Poroshenko, and said that if he would even go on and realize these provisions in the Minsk II Agreement, he would be killed in a basement. He didn't want to be killed in a basement, so he stopped it. Later on, Zelenskyy, the same goes for him. He said when he ran for President that he wanted to make peace. He wanted also to fulfill the agreements of Minsk II, and what happened? He was threatened too, and nothing happened. Both Poroshenko and later Zelenskyy said that we will not fulfill this agreement. It's clear speech, you would say.

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

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

go even further, and say that last year, in 2021, there were several interesting things. One year ago, or even more, it was in March last year, Zelenskyy claimed that he had to declare war. He said he would like to take back Crimea and Donbass with the military, and supported by NATO, not with NATO soldiers, but NATO equipment, NATO training, and things like that.

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

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

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

RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much, Jens Jørgen.

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

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

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

Welcome to this seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institutes in Denmark and Sweden, which is also being live streamed on YouTube. The title is, "We Need a New International Security and Development Architecture, Not a Strengthening of Geopolitical Blocs. NO in the Danish June 1 referendum about abolishing the EU Defense opt-out, and NO to Sweden and Finland joining NATO." I am Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, and I will be the moderator today.

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

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

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

We have called this meeting to discuss:

- What caused the current extremely dangerous military, and economic crisis.
- Why strengthening the EU military arm with Danish participation, and Sweden and Finland joining NATO would only exacerbate geopolitical conflict, and
- What are the principles upon which we can create a new security and development architecture, for the benefit of all nations and people.

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote

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

The video is available here:

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hello, good day, Ladies and Gentlemen: As

Michelle just said, I have stated that we are facing the most dangerous crisis in the history of mankind. Now, why am I saying that? Obviously, that includes two world wars in the 20th century, the Cuban Missile Crisis, so it's a big order. Well, the first reason is the most obvious, for the very first time, we are facing the real danger of a global nuclear war, and if it would ever come to that, it for sure would mean the annihilation of the human species.

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

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

The second reason why I am saying we are in the worst crisis ever, is that we experience a civilizational breakdown, the end of an entire system. Now, this has many elements. We have an immediate danger of an escalation of the war, as a result of the present chicken-game policies conducted by NATO against Russia. We are facing a hyperinflationary blowout of the Western neoliberal financial system, which was long in process, even before the war in Ukraine started. We are looking at a world famine, which according to the United

Nations is threatening 1.7 billion people with starvation. That is 20% of the entire human species. The pandemic is not over, and all of this is threatening social chaos as a result, and that chaos, all by itself, could threaten to plunge the world into a war.

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

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

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

of the BRICS, which is most of the Global South.

In frantic trips, Blinken is running around the world, trying to convince people to join the faction of the “democracies.” President Biden right now is in Asia, doing the same thing. Chancellor Scholz just went to Africa, von der Leyen to India, all in an effort to isolate Russia and China, but it’s not working: Because India, Indonesia, Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, and many others do not want to be pulled into a geopolitical confrontation between the two sides. And what we are actually experiencing is a real renaissance of the Non-Aligned Movement.

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

Chalmers discusses how Russia could be forced into a nuclear confrontation, by sending evermore sophisticated weapons to Ukraine, from which it would ultimately back down. Chalmers describes NATO’s strategy over the last three months as that of “boiling the Russian frog.” You all remember the

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

“Precisely because of the peril inherent in such a situation, a nuclear crisis of this sort could make it easier for leaders to make difficult compromises. Provided that the war was ended and the blockade of Odesa lifted, Ukraine's leaders might be willing to postpone a settlement of the Crimea question. For Putin, the failure of the invasion, and the subsequent success of the Ukrainian counteroffensive, would have been a massive

humiliation. But he would at least be able to argue that the might of the Russian strategic arsenal had, at a moment of great national weakness, successfully deterred NATO's designs for dismembering Russia. This could be enough for both sides to avoid the worst outcome of all."

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

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

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

Then you had the Iraq War in 2003, about which Nancy Pelosi

admitted publicly that all responsible people knew ahead of time that there were no weapons of mass destruction. You had Libya. Hillary Clinton, during the Durham investigation in the United States, had to admit that the entire basis of Russiagate were all lies. Did one see anything about that in the mainstream media? Absolutely not! At least not in Europe. Then there was Syria. Then you had the 2014 Maidan coup, about which Victoria Nuland bragged, \$5 billion were spent by the State Department on NGOs, and, let's not forget, the Azov Battalion, which media in the West are now saying, there are no Nazis in Ukraine—but it is a documented fact that there are.

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

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

One has to take this insane policy of causing a Crimea Cuban Missile Crisis, together with another British policy, which was exposed in a paper by the Henry Jackson Society in 2020, which they put again on the front page of the Henry Jackson Society website, which means it's ongoing policy of that think tank. It is a report outlining a strategy to use the infamous

“Five Eyes” alliance—U.K., U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand—as the instrument to force through the decoupling of the West from China. This rabidly anti-Russia, anti-China neocon think tank is run by British intelligence, through among others, the former MI6 Chief Sir Richard Dearlove, who is the main brain of Russiagate, which was completely discredited as a lie; and he was one of the founders of the Henry Jackson Society and is one of its principals today.

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

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

President Biden is currently championing these precisely

British strategies on his current trip to Asia. Fresh from celebrating the expansion of NATO, Biden is to unveil a grandiose Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) during his stop in Japan as the highlight of the trip. National Security Adviser Jake Sullivan stated bluntly on Wednesday, May 18, that the message of the IPEF is that “democracies and open societies of the world stand together to shape the rules of the road. We think that message will be heard everywhere. We think it will be heard in Beijing.”

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

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

What is the source of this incredible story? The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, one of the leading newspapers in Germany, says, all the photos and data have been made available through Adrian Zenz, a German anthropologist, and longtime Xinjiang

observer. Now, this Mr. Adrian Zenz claims that he got all of that from an “unnamed source” who had access to cyber, cyberwar spying and whatnot. Well, that’s a very dubious observation. But Adrian Zenz is not an unknown entity: The blog, The Grayzone, and the very respected investigative journalist Ajit Singh and Max Blumenthal already wrote articles in 2019, after he had come up with a similar story about genocide in Xinjiang, that Mr. Zenz is a “far-right fundamentalist Christian who opposes homosexuality and gender equality, supports ‘scriptural spanking’ of children, and believes he is ‘led by God’ on a ‘mission’ against China.,” because the end-times are near and the rise of the anti-Christ is also coming. He is on a complete rampage, saying that [there is genocide in] Xinjiang because of a collapse of the demographic curve of the Uighurs, and Lyle Goldstein, who is professor at the Naval War College in the United States, says that such a statement is “ridiculous to the point of being inciting to those who lost relatives in the Holocaust.”

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

Zenz’s so-called testimony comes from Uighur exiles who are cultivated by the U.S. State Department. Zenz served as a fellow at the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation in Washington, D.C., which is a right-wing lobbying group born out of the National Captive Nations Committee. Now, that is a very, very interesting connection, because that was founded by Ukrainian nationalist Lev Dobriansky, who is heading this institution whose co-chairman was Yaroslav Stetsko, who was a leader of the OUN-B militia, which is the Nazi group that

fought along with German Nazis during the occupation of Ukraine in World War II. Stetsko and his wife had a residence in Munich during the entire postwar period, and led from there the "Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations." After he died, Mrs. Stetsko went to Ukraine and rebuilt the OUN-B, the Bandera organization, in the tradition of the ideas of Stepan Bandera. Now, that is a direct connection to that apparatus, which was heavily led by the Western secret services—Bandera himself joined the MI6 in 1947, and the BND in Munich had a close, at least "knowledge" about these people (to say the least).

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

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

At the Schiller conference on April 9, we presented a completely different approach: There is an alternative to the complete decoupling between the so-called "democracies" and the Global South on the other side. The new system is already emerging rapidly. There are many countries which at the recent foreign ministers' meeting of the BRICS, want to be part of: Argentina, Indonesia, Egypt, Nigeria and many others. You have the BRICS enlarged, you have the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, almost all organizations of the Global South that want to be part of a new international security and development architecture, which basically is the combination

of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, together with two other proposals by President Xi Jinping: The Global Development Initiative and the Global Security Initiative, which is actively being implemented.

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

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

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

Every country must have a National Bank to make credit generation again the question of the sovereign government, and not that of private bankers, in the tradition of Alexander

Hamilton. Then, these National Banks must be connected through a credit system which provides long-term, low-interest credit for real investment in the physical economy.

Also, the Fourth Law is that we must have a crash program for fusion technology, which in the recent period has made tremendous progress, and the commercial use of it is visibly on the horizon. Because we need a massive increase in the productivity of the world economy because just the fact that 1.7 billion people are threatened with starvation, that 2 billion have no clean water, is the proof that the present level of productivity has fallen way below the level of maintaining the present world population of 8 billion people.

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

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

This is absolutely possible, and this is the vision of how the world will look in a few years, anyway, if we avoid the present danger of nuclear war. The development of infrastructure connecting all continents is the natural way how infrastructure development will continue, provided there

is peace. So I think that is something we need to put on the agenda for discussion, and the reason why, despite the incredible danger, one can be optimistic, is because we are the human species, we are capable of reason, and we are not barbarians.

Thank you.

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

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

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

of NATO has also dramatically changed, in the last 30 years, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In the time of the Soviet Union, it was a defensive apparatus against the Warsaw Pact. But in the recent period, it has turned into a completely anti-Russian Russophobic alliance, and therefore, when, in November 2013, when the Ukraine government under Viktor Yanukovich refused to join the EU Association Agreement, it was clear that if Ukraine would join the EU, it would give NATO access to the Black Sea, and that is why he opted out in the last moment.

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

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

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

Elena: Thank you so much. I find everything that Madam Helga

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

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

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

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

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

Zepp-LaRouche: I would say, absolutely yes. And I just should say something, because right now, when you say "Communist," some people fall completely into a coma and have hysterical outbursts. I mean, the Communist Party of China is, in my

view—and I don't even think that they would agree with that—but I think they're 90% Confucian, in the tradition of the ancient Chinese traditions and philosophy, which influenced Chinese policy for more than two millennia. And naturally, there is an element of Marxism and communism, but it's a meritocracy.

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

Deng Xiaoping coined the term “judging truth from facts.” And if you look at the facts of the gigantic development of China in the last 40 years, in particular, then this Communist Party has done something right. And if you travel to China, and study Chinese history, and meet people in all ranks of life, professors, students, people living in the countryside, other professions, you go to restaurants, and you see how people live, you find a population which is primarily content. They're optimistic: They're not like the Europeans and they're for sure not like the Germans, who are completely pessimistic, and think nothing can function and you can't do anything anyway. No. That is not the view in China. They are optimistic; they have, to a very large extent, trust in the government. And I think that the Chinese model, which the West is now regarding as a big competitor and threat, the Chinese

model is doing something right, which the West is not doing right! And rather than opposing it, we should go to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and say: We should respect each other, even if the other one has a different social system, and even if the other one has a different way of doing things, according to their history, and their tradition. And I think then, we can absolutely peacefully live together. And that is my stated view, and I think all the slanders about China are really absolutely unfounded, and in particular, this present campaign by this very dubious Adrian Zenz, we should squash before it really takes hold.

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

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17.
maj 2022:
Meld dig til vores sikkerheds
videokonference fra Danmark
og Sverige den 25. maj kl.
13.30-16.30**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Videokonference invitation:

**Invitation til at deltage i et gratis internationalt
onlineseminar arrangeret af**

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og Sverige:

**Vi behøver en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur
for alle nationer,
ikke en styrkelse af geopolitiske blokke**

Schiller Institutet anbefaler:

***NEJ ved den danske folkeafstemning den 1. juni om afskaffelse
af EU's forsvarsforbehold***

NEJ til Sveriges og Finlands optagelse i NATO

Dato: Onsdag den 25. maj 2022

Tid: 13:30-16:30 dansk tid (CEST)

Online via Zoom

Gratis adgang

Seminaret vil blive afholdt på engelsk.

**Tilmeldelse kan ske til si@schillerinstitut.dk, +45 53 57 00
51**

På seminaret hos Schiller Institutet vil følgende emner blive drøftet:

* Hvad er årsagen til den nuværende ekstremt farlige militære og økonomiske krise?

* Hvorfor en styrkelse af EU's militære enhed med dansk deltagelse og Sveriges og Finlands optagelse i NATO blot vil forværre de geopolitiske konflikter.

* Hvilke principper kan vi anvende til at skabe en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur til gavn for alle nationer

og befolkninger?

Program:

*** Verden har brug for en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur.**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident.

*** Baggrunden for krigen mellem Ukraine-NATO og Rusland.**

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

*** Hvorfor vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur?**

Jan Øberg, ph.d., freds- og fremtidsforsker og kunstholog, ph.d. i sociologi, gæsteprofessor i freds- og konfliktstudier i Japan, Spanien, Østrig og Schweiz, medstifter og direktør for det uafhængige TFF, Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research, i Lund, Sverige, og forfatter.

*** Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings forslag af 21. april 2022 om en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur.**

Professor Li Xing, ph.d., professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Institut for Politik og Samfund, Det Humanistiske og Samfundsvidenskabelige Fakultet, Aalborg Universitet, og forfatter.

*** Hvorfor Danmark bør afstå fra et intensiveret geopolitisk militært engagement.**

Tom Gillesberg, formand, Schiller Institutet i Danmark

*** Hvorfor Sverige og Finland ikke bør tilslutte sig NATO.**

Ulf Sandmark, formand, Schiller Institutet i Sverige

Information: si@schillerinstitut.dk. +45 53 57 00 51

Som baggrund er her uddrag af en tale, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlæggeren og præsidenten for Schiller Institutet, holdt på en online-konference med unge den 7. maj 2022. Hele talen kan læses nedenunder.

“Vi faktisk befinder os i et utroligt farligt øjeblik. Men der er også håb.... Det er kun muligt, hvis vi overvinder idéen om geopolitik.

Geopolitik er den idé, at der altid vil være en blok af nationer eller en nation, som vil definere eller er nødt til at definere sine interesser over for en anden blok af nationer, og at der altid vil være en dødbringende kontrovers, hvor enten den ene eller den anden vinder, og det hele vil være et nulsumsspil. Det er netop hvad der må og kan overvindes.

Det vi skal gøre er at etablere en international orden, hvor det princip, som denne orden grundlæggende er baseret på, er tanken om, at hver nation har ret til, og mulighed for, at udvikle alle deres borgeres potentialer. Vi befinder os i en situation, hvor vi har brug for en systemisk ændring: En fuldstændig fornyelse af systemet. Grunden til, at jeg nævner dette, er, at situationen er meget presserende.

Flere og flere analytikere og eksperter er enige om, at faren for Tredje Verdenskrig er akut, at situationen er farligere

end på højdepunktet af Den kolde Krig...

Så vi er et hårsbred fra den menneskelige civilisations udslettelse.... Hvis den nuværende politik fortsættes, kan denne verden nemlig ende meget pludseligt om få minutter, om få dage, uger eller måneder, og krigen i Ukraine er naturligvis et brændpunkt. Men hele denne krise handler ikke om Ukraine. Den handler om, hvilken slags verdensorden der skal eksistere: Skal det være en unipolær verden, domineret af en eller to nationer? Skal det være en "regelbaseret orden", hvor en lille klub af nationer udstikker reglerne? Eller skal den være multipolær, og skal den være baseret på folkeretten, som den er udtrykt i FN-pagten?...

Jeg tror, at det er det, der er udgangspunktet: Kun hvis man gør det klart for sig selv, at atomkrig mellem de to største atommagter, USA og Rusland, betyder udslettelse af menneskeheden, og derefter mobiliserer for, at krigen skal stoppe, og kæmper for et alternativ, som skal starte med tanken om, at krigen skal stoppe; diplomati og forhandlinger skal straks starte for at finde en løsning, der er acceptabel for alle parter...

Nu skal vi gøre os klart, og det er holdningen hos alle, der arbejder med Schiller Institutet, at krig ikke kan være en metode til konfliktløsning i en tid med atomvåben; og jeg siger ikke, at denne krig skulle have fundet sted, men man er nødt til at forstå årsagerne til, at den fandt sted."

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, "Det hele startede i forbindelse med den tyske genforening, da Berlinmuren faldt, og den amerikanske udenrigsminister James Baker III lovede Gorbatsjov, at NATO ikke ville flytte sig en tomme mod øst.

En pensioneret tysk general ved navn Harald Kujat, som havde været formand for NATO's militærkomité i 2002-2005, har netop givet et interview til et tysk tidsskrift, hvori han sagde, at hovedvægten ikke længere ligger på at beskytte og bistå

Ukraine i dets forsvarskamp mod et russisk angreb, hvilket er i strid med folkeretten, men på at svække Rusland som strategisk rival på lang sigt..."

[Nationer med] 2,2 milliarder mennesker, de nægter alle at blive trukket ind i en geopolitisk konfrontation mellem USA og NATO på den ene side og Rusland og Kina på den anden side.

Samtlige af disse lande holder fast ved idéen om alliancefrihed, og det tror jeg er nøglen til fred lige nu. Fordi principperne for den alliancefri bevægelse, som var principperne i FN-pagten, Bandung-konferencen, de fem principper for fredelig sameksistens, som er suverænitet, ikke-indblanding i det andet lands indre anliggender, accept af det andet samfundssystem...

Jeg mener, at vi i traditionen fra Den Westfalske Fred, som afsluttede 150 års krig i Europa, har brug for en sikkerhedsarkitektur, som først og fremmest tager hensyn til udviklingslandenes interesser; der skal ske en forøgelse af levestandarden for hvert enkelt individ, både i Europa, USA, Rusland og Kina. Jeg mener, at det er afgørende for, om menneskeheden kan overleve. Det betyder, at vi har brug for et nyt paradigme i vores tænkning, nemlig idéen om, at hver nation har ret til at udvikle sit fulde potentiale. Hvert barn, alle børn, der fødes, uanset i hvilken nation i verden, har ret til at udvikle sit fulde potentiale, hvilket betyder, at det skal have en universel uddannelse...

Vi har aldrig været på et vigtigere tidspunkt i historien, og farerne har aldrig været så store, men potentialet for at skabe en helt ny verden har aldrig været så tæt på: At gøre en ende på kolonialismen, at skabe en økonomi baseret på termonuklear fusion, hvilket ville betyde, at vi har energi og råstof sikkerhed for alle nationer, at vi kan få et internationalt samarbejde om udnyttelse af rummet, at menneskeheden bliver voksen, og at geopolitiske krige bliver et spørgsmål fra fortiden."

Vi håber inderligt, at du vil have mulighed for at deltage i denne vigtige begivenhed, og at du vil dele denne invitation og opfordre andre mennesker til at deltage.

Hjemmesider:

Danish: Schiller Instituttet

Swedish: Schillerinstitutet

English: The Schiller Institute | A New Paradigm for the Survival of Civilization

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 28.
april 2022:**

**Vesten har startet den nye
verdenskrig.**

**Kan den stoppes inden det
bliver en atomkrig?**

Klik her for lydfilen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/tg-28.4.22.mp3>

Resumé:

Mødet på den amerikanske luftbase i Ramstein, Tyskland, hvor Morten Bødskov deltog, var NATO ++. Ud over NATO-medlemmer og Ukraine var også Israel, Japan, Sydkorea og andre af USA's partnere til stede for at aftale massiv militær støtte til Ukraine og fortsat udvidet militært samarbejde. Tysklands kansler Scholz gav efter for presset til at levere tanks og tunge våben til Ukraine. NATO er i total krig mod Rusland via sin proxy Ukraine. Ukraines præsident Zelenskij er blot en skuespiller, der læser de manuskripter op, der er skrevet i London og Washington.

USA, NATO og EU lyver om at lave sanktioner for at stoppe krigen. Man har på intet tidspunkt forsøgt at stoppe krigen i Ukraine, men har tværtimod skabt den for at bruge den til at ødelægge Rusland, som en uafhængig magt. Se analysen fra den amerikanske tidligere militærmand og senator Richard Black og læs de rystende fakta fra den schweiziske tidligere FN og NATO-militærrådgiver Jaques Baud. Det var ikke Rusland der startede krigen den 24. februar. De reagerede blot på den igangværende planlagte militære operation, som Vesten har haft i gang i Ukraine siden kuppet i Kiev i 2014. Der har aldrig været en massiv russisk militær overlegenhed. 130.000 russiske kombatanter har stået over for 250.000 på den ukrainske side. Rusland havde aldrig opbygget den 3-1 fordel, en angriber gerne skal have, for det var aldrig Rusland, der ønskede krigen. Man handlede i desperation for at imødegå det planlagte vestligt støttede ukrainske angreb imod Donbas og Krim.

Der er masser af krigsforbrydelser i krigen, men i modsætning til den ukrainske (britisk iscenesatte) ukrainske propaganda er det ikke russerne, der er unødigt brutale, men de ukrainske ideologiserede specialstyrker. Se interviewet med Richard Black. Var der nogen der troede på, at videoen med nyvaskede smilende blonde børn virkelig var indspillet efter to måneders mareridt i jorden under stålværket i Mariupol? Eller var det blot endnu en iscenesat propagandafilm. Er der 50 franske

militærmænd gemt i værkets underjordiske gange, der var ansvarlige for sænkningen af Ruslands flagskib Moskva?

I lighed med Tyskland og de andre europæiske vasalstater har Danmark opgivet sin suverænitet og parerer blot ordrer fra USA (EU) og NATO. Stem nej til ophævelsen af forsvarsforbeholdet, men det er ikke nok til at stoppe krig. Der skal også være et massivt nej til fortsættelsen af verdenskrigen imod Rusland og andre (som f.eks. Kina), der nægter at opgive sin suverænitet. Ellers får vi atomkrig.

Den fortsatte krig i Ukraine og sanktionerne imod Rusland vil medføre global fødevaremangel der kan true over en milliard mennesker på livet, men hvem hører stemmer i Vesten bekymre sig om det? Kun Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre ikke-vestlige nationer har iværksat tiltag for at undgå det. Vil Indien indgå i en alliance sammen med Rusland og Kina for at opretholde sin suverænitet? Ruslands lukning af gassen for Polen og Bulgarien er blot et skud over boven. Tyskland og Italien er langt mere afhængige af russisk gas, der ikke kan erstattes med andet i løbet af flere år. Hvis EU fortsætter konfrontationen vil man påføre Tysklands og Europas økonomi og levestandard ubodelig skade.

Det vestligt ledede globale finanssystem er allerede i nedsmeltning pga. kæmpe gæld, stigende inflation og eksploderende renter. De vedvarende paniske aktioner for at skade Rusland og andre, der ikke makker ret, trækker tæppet væk under det vestlige system og den vestlige globale magt. Vil Vesten forstå sin fejltagelse inden alt forsvinder i atomkrig?

Det er ikke Rusland imod verden men Vesten imod det meste af Verden. Schiller Instituttets konference fra den 9. april om en ny global sikkerhedsarkitektur viser vejen ud. Kinas Xi Jinping har svaret med en opfordring til et globalt sikkerhedsinitiativ. Kan vi få folk i Vesten til at hæve deres stemmer og sige fra over for selvmordspolitikken?

Bliv aktiv. Gå med i Schiller Institutts kampagne. Skab historie. Stop katastrofen og skab en fredsorden og en global renæssance.

Baggrund:

Col. Richard Black: U.S. Leading World to Nuclear War

Jacques Baud: The Military Situation In The Ukraine – Update

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 24.
marts 2022:**

**Mobilisér for Schiller
Institutts videokonference
den 9. april
om en ny sikkerheds- og
udviklingsarkitektur.
Klik her for lydfilen.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/tg-24.3.22.mp3>

Seminar om Ukraine i DIIS: Schiller Instituttet udbreder ideen om en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur

Den 22. marts 2020 (EIRNS) – I går afholdt Dansk institut for internationale Studier (DIIS) to seminarer om krigen i Ukraine (se det første på engelsk her). Forud for mødet omdelte Schiller Instituttet sit seneste nyhedsbrev “For en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur” og underskriftsindsamlingen med samme titel, hvori de første prominente underskrivere indgik, og de blev modtaget af de fleste fremmødte. En del af seminaret omfattede indlæg med titlerne: “The Ukraine War and the Prospect of Nuclear War” af Rens van Munster og “China, India, and a European conflict in an Asian Century” af Luke Patey, begge DIIS-forskere. Ud over de ca. 150 personer, der var til stede, blev arrangementet live-streamet, så det er tilgængeligt efterfølgende. En repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet fik mulighed for at stille det indledende spørgsmål.

Hun annoncerede Schiller Instituttets kommende internationale videokonference den 9. april og foreslog, at på samme måde som der er forhandlinger mellem Rusland og Ukraine, så burde vi vel også oprette en international mekanisme til at løse landenes sikkerhedsproblemer, inden det kommer til krig. Selv om vi f.eks. er imod krigen, må vi også erkende, at vi er nødt til at se på den rolle, som NATO's udvidelse mod øst spillede, og andre problemstillinger. Hun spurgte derefter talerne i de ovennævnte indlæg, om vi på grund af faren for atomkrig ikke burde oprette en mekanisme til at tage fat på alle nationers sikkerhedsmæssige og økonomiske bekymringer?

Luke Patey svarede, at FN's Sikkerhedsråd ikke var så aktivt,

som man kunne håbe på, for at forhindre krigen, og at en reform af FN's Sikkerhedsråd er på dagsordenen. Tanken om at NATO's udvidelse mod øst var skyld i konflikten, som nogle i USA og kineserne har hævdet, fratager ukrainerne ansvaret – ved at påstå at det kun var USA's handlinger, der var afgørende.

Res van Munster sagde, at han kunne kommentere på den nukleare side af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, og at det ikke ser godt ud. Den nuværende "nye Kolde Krig" har ikke engang de atomaftaler, der var i kraft under den sidste Kolde Krig, bortset fra START-aftalen (begrænsning af strategiske atomvåben), som Biden forlængede med fem år. Dens fortsættelse afhænger af USA's kommende præsident. Vi ville have brug for en ny rammebetingelse for atomvåben, men lige nu er aftalerne ved at forsvinde eller blive udhulet.

Spørgsmålet fra Schiller Institutet er ved 1 time 59 minutter på videoen her: Ukraine-krigen: Baggrund og konsekvenser | DIIS

Svarene er hos Luke ved 2:07 og Res ved 2:15

Det andet seminar, på dansk her, var med DIIS' Rusland-forsker Flemming Splidsboel Hansen (ikke livestreamet eller arkiveret). Schiller Institutet fik også mulighed for at stille et spørgsmål, hvor vi oplyste, at Schiller Institutet før krigen afholdt en videokonference og offentliggjorde artikler, der fastslog, at vi var 100 sekunder inden midnat til en atomkrig, og at vi opfordrede til en ny sikkerhedsmæssig og økonomisk arkitektur. Havde vi ikke en chance i 1991 for at etablere en ny arkitektur, som også ville have omfattet Rusland? Hvad ville det kræve at etablere en ny sikkerhedsmæssig og økonomisk arkitektur nu?

Splidsboel sagde, at det i dag ville kræve et meget anderledes Rusland. Kunne det have været anderledes i 1991? Måske. Der er ingen tvivl om, at vi begik fejl. De var skuffede over, at de

ikke fik en Marshall-plan, men der var også store problemer i Rusland med menneskerettigheder og krigen i Tjetjenien. Hvis vi skulle "få" et nyt Rusland nu, var det vigtigt, at vi ikke begår fejl denne gang.

Schiller Instituttets repræsentanter diskuterede med deltagerne i pausen og skabte kontakter efterfølgende. En person kom endog ud med sin underskrift på underskriftsindsamlingen.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. marts 2022:

Vil falsk kemisk angreb bringe Nato i åben krig med Rusland?

Klik her for lydfilen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/tg-11.3.22.mp3>

Resumé:

Det ser ud til at vestlige efterretningstjenester planlægger et falsk kemisk angreb, som det man lavede i Syrien i som fik Trump til at bombe Syrien i 2017. Vil man få Nato i åben krig

med Rusland? Faren for en atomkrig har aldrig været større. Der er to krige: Den i Ukraine og den større økonomiske krig USA og Vesten har iværksat imod Rusland. Man forsøger at få russisk kapitulation men trækker også tæppet væk under økonomien, særligt Europas. Hvor længe varer det inden at vi ser konkurser pga. af Ruslands manglende betalinger? De vestlige tiltag som man siger skyldes "Putins krig", var noget USA længe har presset på for, både 2 % af BNP til militær og stop for køb af russisk gas. Nato har længe sendt våben og trænet Ukraines hær, også de åbent fascistiske elementer i den, for at Ukraine kunne påføre Rusland maksimal skade. Skaden på Ukraine betyder lige så meget for Vesten, som man bekymrer sig om befolkningen i Afghanistan.

Vestens økonomiske atombombe imod Rusland, udelukkelsen fra SWIFT og indefrysningen af Rusland formue i udenlandske banker vil medføre at ingen kan vide sig sikker, hvis pengene står i vestlige banker der handler på politiske ordrer. Dollarens og euroens rolle som reservevaluta vil blive kraftigt udfordret. En russisk statsbankerot og manglende russiske betalinger kan vælte meget.

Uden russisk gas, olie og kul står Europa stille. Energipriserne himmelflugt gør stor økonomisk skade. Fødevareforsyning og fødevarepriser rammes også af mangel på kunstgødning og evt. dårlig høst i Ukraine og Rusland. Og fiskere som bliver hjemme fordi det er for dyrt at sejle. Andre ting, som f.eks. produktion af mikrochips kan også blive hårdt ramt. Vestens sanktioner vil gøre stor skade på økonomien. Rusland vil nok nationalisere eller tvangsovertage vestligt ejede virksomheder som McDonalds og JYSK der har lukket ned for aktiviteten. Hvad med Carlsberg?

Rusland siger, at de aldrig igen vil være afhængige af Vesten. Fokus bliver på Kina og Asien. Man satser på den verdensorden, som Rusland og Kina fremlagde den 4. februar. Kina vil støtte Rusland for de ved, at hvis Rusland knækker, så er det deres tur bagefter.

Globalt økonomisk kaos truer pga. Vestens sanktioner imod Rusland. Ifølge UNICEF og Verdensfødevareprogrammet er 1 million børn under 5 år på vej til at dø af sult i Afghanistan. 8 millioner børn og 22 millioner mennesker er i fare, og de kan kun hjælpe 12 millioner. Vesten gør ingenting.

Vi behøver en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur som alle, også Rusland, Kina og Indien, kan se sig selv i og vi behøver den nu. Skriv under på Schiller Instituttets appel. Rejs debatten. Gør noget, før det er for sent.

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

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

Den danske forsvarsminister Morten Bødskov besvarede {EIR}s spørgsmål, i selskab med den britiske forsvarsminister Ben Wallace og den svenske forsvarsminister Peter Hultqvist. Pressekonferencen blev transmitteret direkte og er arkiveret

på dansk TV2. Der var filmhold og reportere fra andre danske medier, Sverige, Storbritannien (BBC), Agence France-Presse (AFP) og muligvis også andre lande, hvor det muligvis er blevet transmitteret.

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

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



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

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

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

Under eftermiddagens pressekonference var {EIR} den anden

journalist i rækken, der stillede et spørgsmål, forud for en national dansk TV2-journalist, der sendte direkte, og som stillede fire spørgsmål om, hvorvidt denne Joint Expeditionary Force-øvelse risikerer at eskalere den nuværende krise. Svaret fra den danske minister var bl.a., at vi er nødt til at trække en streg i sandet over for Putin og sikre friheden i Østersøområdet. {EIR} vil udsende endnu en video med denne udveksling på dansk, efterfulgt af {EIR}'s spørgsmål og svar.

English:

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

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

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

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

Danish Defense Minister Morten Bødskov: There is only one

comment, that the JEF (Joint Expeditionary Force) cooperation that we have made here is the way forward. We stand together here, today, to confirm our values, our cooperation, and that's the way forward for the region that we are in now, and I'm glad that our British colleague and my Swedish colleague are here today."

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

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

**Poul Villaume den 14. januar
2022:**

Efter 1989 lovede vesten, at Europa skulle have en "ny sikkerhedsstruktur". Skal vi ikke bygge den nu – sammen med Rusland?

Følgende er to citater fra Poul Villaums debat artikel i Ræson den 14, januar 2022:

Titlen: Poul Villaume: Efter 1989 lovede vesten, at Europa skulle have en "ny sikkerhedsstruktur". Skal vi ikke bygge den nu – sammen med Rusland?

Poul Villaume (f.1950) er dr.phil. og professor emeritus i samtidshistorie, Saxo-Instituttet, KU.

»Det er i denne forbindelse også værd at minde om, at både NATO selv (London-erklæringen, juli 1990) og alle CSCE-lande (Paris-charteret, november 1990) ved Den Kolde Krigs afslutning lovede sig selv og hinanden, at der nu skulle opbygges nye sikkerhedspolitiske mekanismer og institutioner og en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur i et helet og helt Europa, som naturligt også skulle omfatte både Nordamerika og Rusland. Man talte også om et sikkerhedsfælleskab, som skulle strække sig "fra Vancouver til Vladivostok". Men efter at Sovjetunionen brød sammen under sin egen (død)vægt i 1991, blev NATO kastet ud i en stille, eksistentiel krise, som man først gradvist overvandt med vedtagelsen af NATOs udvidelsesprogram mod øst i 1993-94 ("expand or die", lød parolen internt). Der blev dermed, som Vestens yndlings-russer i 1990erne, Boris Jeltsin, fortroligt advarede Bill Clinton om i 1994 og 1995, i praksis tale om, at den tilbageblevne koldkrigsalliance blev dominerende i Europa på bekostning af et sikkerhedspolitisk

marginaliseret, isoleret og ydmyget Rusland...«

»En anden vigtig erfaring fra Den Kolde Krig er, at uanset hvor skarpt modsætningerne mellem parterne er trukket op, er det altid godt, at der er dialog, forhandlinger og personlige kontakter – gerne suppleret af fortrolige 'bagkanaler' mellem parterne på højst muligt niveau, og med gensidig respekt for modpartens bekymringer, uanset alle politiske og værdimæssige forskelle. Det var på den måde, afspændingsepoken under Den Kolde Krig blev igangsat i 1960'erne og 1970'erne, og det var sådan, den, især på europæisk plan, overlevede selv det stærkt forværrede supermagtsforhold i begyndelsen af 1980'erne. Det er derfor farligt at bagatellisere dét, at der alene finder forhandlinger sted, som måske nytteløs "bla-bla-bla"; det er under alle omstændigheder bedre end "bang-bang-bang" (eller som Churchill formulerede det i 1954, da han ihærdigt søgte at stable et topmøde mellem Øst og Vest på benene: "To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war"). Og en sidste påmindelse, også formuleret midt under Den Kolde Krig, og af gyldighed også i den aktuelle situation mellem Rusland og Vesten, fremsagt af den respekterede britiske militærskribent Sir Basil Lidell Hart i 1960: "Fasthold styrke, om muligt. Under alle omstændigheder, hold hovedet koldt. Hav ubegrænset tålmodighed. Træng aldrig en modstander op i hjørnet, og hjælp ham altid med at redde ansigt. Sæt dig selv i hans sted – for at se tingene gennem hans øjne. Undgå selvretfærdighed som djævlens – intet gør mere blind."«

Læs hele artiklen i Ræson her.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 23. februar 2022: Rusland gør oprør imod USA med støtte fra Kina. Vil Europa ødelægge sig selv for at skade Rusland?

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lydfil:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/tg-23.2.22.mp3>

**POLITISK ORIENTERING i går den 23. februar 2022:
Rusland gør oprør imod USA med støtte fra Kina.
Vil Europa ødelægge sig selv for at skade Rusland?**

Der findes et alternativ til krig og kaos.

Læs, cirkulér og debatér Schiller Instituttets nye udtalelse.

Resumé:

Rusland bryder med det "moderne britiske imperium", den internationale regelbaserede (USA dikterede) verdensorden i lighed med den amerikanske uafhængighedserklæring imod det britiske imperium. Det er ikke en beslutning, det er truffet letsindigt, men fordi man ikke føler, man har et valg, hvis Rusland skal have sin frihed i fremtiden og undgå at være en vasalstat, som landene i EU og Nato tydeligvis er.

Rusland har fuldstændig rygdækning fra Kina på det grundlag, som er fremlagt i Beijing-erklæringen fra Putin og Xi Jinping

den 4. februar, hvor man gør op med den unipolære USA-kontrollerede verdensorden og erklærede starten på en ny multipolær verdensorden.

Anerkendelsen af Lugansk- og Donetsk-republikkerne er kun første skridt. Indtil Rusland får de sikkerhedspolitiske indrømmelser, som man har krævet – en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur der også imødekommer deres bekymringer – så vil man skridt for skridt eskalere konflikten. Begyndende med indtagelsen af det fulde territorium af republikkerne Donetsk og Lugansk.

Rusland er klar over, at USA vil iværksætte massive sanktioner, som frem for alt vil ramme ikke blot Rusland, men også Europa. Det har briterne og USA det fint med. De ødelægger gerne Tyskland og kontinentaleuropa og frygter mest af alt et samarbejde mellem EU (med Tyskland i centrum) og Rusland. Både første og anden verdenskrig blev støttet af Det britiske Imperium for at forhindre et sådant tysk-russisk samarbejde.

At eskaleringen kom nu var ikke Ruslands valg, men konsekvensen af den vestlige finansielle nedsmeltning der er i gang, som har sat ekstra tryk på den vestlige offensiv imod Rusland i blandt andet Ukraine. Rusland følte sig tvunget til at sige fra nu (så snart vinter-OL i Beijing var overstået).

Kina vil bakke Rusland fuldstændigt op, fordi det ved, at hvis man knækker Rusland, så vil man rette alle sine kræfter imod at knække Kina. Se videoen og erklæringen fra 4. februar om den nye russisk-kinesisk lancerede verdensorden på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside.

Der er en vej ud af den ellers langvarige spændte og konfliktfyldte situation vi er inde i, hvis Vesten (USA) er villige til at tænke om og acceptere en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, der også tager hensyn til Rusland og Kina. Ellers vil tingene blive ved med at eskalere og faren for en atomkrig, bevidst eller ved en fejl, vil vokse. Der er ikke noget kvik-fix inden for den gamle vestligt-fastlagte

verdensorden. De gode gamle dage kommer ikke tilbage.

Forslaget om en ny militær-aftale mellem USA og Danmark, der giver amerikanske soldater og materiel fri adgang til Danmark uden dansk kontrol, vil bekræfte, at Danmark ikke er en suveræn nation men blot en amerikansk vasalstat, der vil blive brugt i det amerikanske militære spil i Europa – med ubehagelige og potentielt fatale konsekvenser for Danmark. Danmark må have en selvstændig dansk strategi, vi må kunne tænke selv.

Oven i Ukraine-krisen kommer den igangværende finansielle nedsmeltning, som kan kraftigt forværres af de planlagte sanktioner imod Rusland.

Forbered Danmark til at håndtere dette gennem iværksættelsen af LaRouches 4 økonomiske love. Studér LaRouches økonomiske arbejde.

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

februar 2022

Jan Øberg, ph.d., er freds- og fremtidsforsker og kunstfotograf,

Direktør, The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research, TFF, Sverige, <https://transnational.live>

Jan Øberg kan kontaktes her: oberg@transnational.org

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

Lydfil:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what was written down by people personally in their notebooks, etc.

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

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

Ukraine.

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. In your article, you actually quote from the head of NATO, the general secretary of NATO, back in 1990, one year before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Manfred Wörner, where you say that in these documents released by the U.S. National Security Archive, that you just referred to, “Manfred Wörner gave a well-regarded speech in Brussels in May 1990, in which he argued ‘The principal task of the next decade will be to build a new European security structure to include the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. The Soviet Union will have an important role to play in the construction of such a system.’ And the next year, in the middle of 1991, according to a memorandum from the Russian delegation who met with Wörner. He responded to the Russians by saying that he personally and the NATO council, were both against expansion “13 out of 16 NATO members share this point of view,” and “Wörner said that he would speak against Poland's and Romania's membership in NATO to those countries leaders, as he had already done with leaders of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And he emphasized that we should not allow the isolation of USSR from the European community,” and this was even while the U.S.S.R. was still alive. So it must have been even more the case after the U.S.S.R. collapsed, and Russia emerged.

Jan Oberg: Well, if I may put in a little point here, you see, with that quotation of a former NATO secretary general, compare that with the present secretary general of NATO.

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

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

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

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

Jan Oberg: Well, it's not the rest, it's the beginning of the story. You see, people who write about these things, and it's

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

And it's well known from one of those who were there, and participated, namely the assistant secretary of State for European Affairs, Mrs. Nuland, and she's given a speech in the U.S. where, if I remember correctly, she says that the US has pumped \$5 billion into Ukraine over the years, to support democracy and human rights, et cetera, and training courses for young NGOs, et cetera. And it's obvious that that operation, that ousting of the president, he had to flee to Russia, and the taking over, partly by neo-Nazis and fascists who were present and who probably did the beginning of the shooting and the killing of people, that all this had to do with the promise that was given to Ukraine years before that it would be integrated into the Euro-Atlantic framework. And then it was kind of stopping and saying, we don't want that anyhow. We will negotiate something else, and we will look into what Putin has to offer, etc.

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

Ukraine, then he would look at a Russian base, either being lost or you would have a Russian military naval base in a NATO country.

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

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

So I'm just saying, if I put it on a more general level, if we look at today's ability to understand, describe, analyze issues as conflicts, we are heading for zero understanding. There is nobody in the press, and nobody in politics who are able, intellectually, to see these things as conflicts, that is, as a problem standing between two or more parties that has to be analyzed. And conflict resolution is about finding solutions that the parties we have defined as parties, and there certainly are many more than two in this very complex conflict, can live with in the future. What we are down to in banalization is that there is no conflict. There's only one party, Russia, that does everything bad and evil and terrible, while we are sitting in the receiving end, being the good guys who've done nothing wrong in history. Who could never rethink what we did or say, we're sorry, or change our policies, because we are right. There's only one problem. That's them.

We're down now to the level in which these things, also the last three months, the accusations about Russia invading Ukraine, has nothing to do with conflict analysis. It is purely focusing on one party, and one party, by definition, is not a conflict.

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: I want to just ask you shortly about the third lie, and then we'll get into what you see as the solution. The third lie you, you pointed out, was that "NATO always has an open door to new members. It never tries to invite or drag them in does not seek expansion. It just happens because Eastern European countries since 1989 to 1990

have wanted to join without any pressure from NATO's side, and this also applies to Ukraine." And in this section, you also document that Putin actually asked for Russia to join NATO. Can you shortly, please explain your most important point about this third lie?

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

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

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

And that was why I argued at the time thirty years ago that with the demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the only reasonable thing was to close down NATO. And instead, as

I said with Clinton and onwards, the whole interpretation was we have won. The Western system, the neoliberal democratic NATO system has won. We have nothing to learn from that. There's nothing to change now. We just expand even more.

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

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

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

into something else, such as a common security organization for Europe.

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

Jan Oberg: Well, first of all, the question you are raising is a little bit like the seventh doctor who is trying to operate on a patient who is bleeding to death and then saying, "What should we do now?" What I have suggested over 30 years is something that should have been done to avoid the situation today, and nobody listened, as is clear, because you don't listen to researchers anymore who say something else that state-financed researchers do. So it's not an easy question you are raising, of course. I would say, of course, in the immediate situation, the Minsk agreements, which have not been upheld, particularly by Ukraine in establishing some kind of autonomy for the Donbass area. Now that is something we could work with, autonomous solutions. We could work with confederations, we could work with cantonization, if you will. Lots of what happened, and happens, in the eastern republics of Ukraine. It reminds me of a country I know very well, and partly educated in and worked in during the dissolution, namely Yugoslavia. So much so that it resembles Granica. Ukraine and Granica in Croatia, both mean border areas.

Granica means border, and there's so much that could have been a 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 I would build something inspired by the United Nations Security Council. All Europe, representatives for all countries, including NGOs, and not just government representatives. I would have an early warning mechanism where the moment there is something like a conflict coming up, we would have reporters and we would have investigations we would look into, not conflict prevention.

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

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

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

The only legitimate weapons there are in this world are

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

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Yeah, and also, as you mentioned at the beginning, it has also something to do with the unwillingness in part of certain of the Western elites to accept that we do

not have an Anglo-American unipolar world, but that there are other countries that need to be listened to and respected.

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

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

Jan Oberg: I'm against it because it's a break of 70 years of sensible policies. We do not accept foreign weapons and we do not accept foreign troops, and we do not accept nuclear

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

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

In terms of substance, there is no doubt that any place where there would be American facilities based in sites, so whenever you'd call it, weapon stored will be the first targets in a war, seen as such in a war, under the best circumstances, seen by Russia. Russia's first targets will be to eliminate the

Americans everywhere they can in Europe, because those are the strongest and most dangerous forces.

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

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

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

And secondly, in a world where you are going to want multipolarity, a stronger Asia, stronger Africa, another Russia from the one we have known the last 30 years, etc., and

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

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

China and Xinjiang

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

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

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

paid for, have formerly had positions somewhere else in that system, or are known for having hawkish views on China, Russia and everybody else outside the western sphere.

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

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

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

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

one A4 page with the documentation.

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

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

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

And so I made a little pastime, I wrote a very diplomatic letter to people at CNN, BBC, Reuters, etc. Danish and Norwegian, and Swedish media, those who write this opinion journalism about Xinjiang, and a couple of other things, and I

sent the all our report, which is online, so it's just a link, and I said kindly read this one, and I look forward to hearing from you. I've done this in about 50 or 60 cases, individually dug up their email addresses, et cetera. There is not one who has responded with anything. The strategy when you lie, or when you deceive, or when you have a political man, is don't go into any dialogue with somebody who knows more or it's critical of what you do.

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen: President Lincoln

Jan Oberg: Yeah. So the long story short is this is not good. This deceives people. And of course, some people, at some point, people will be very upset about that. They have been lied to. And also don't make this reference anymore to free and state media. Viewers may like to hear that may not like it, but should know it, the US has just passed a law – They

have three laws against China – How to intervene in all kinds of Chinese things, such as, for instance, trying to influence who will become the successor to Dalai Lama, and things like that. They are not finished at all about how to influence Taiwan, and all that, things they have nothing to do with, and which they decided between Nixon and Zhou Enlai that America accepted the One-China policy and would not mix themselves into Taiwanese issues. But that is another broken promise. These media are state media in the U.S. If you take Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia, they are those, particularly the latter, who have disseminated most of these Xinjiang genocide stories, which then bounce back to BBC, etc. These are state media. As an agency for that in 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.

NYHEDSORIENTERING den 4. februar 2022: Mette Frederiksens problem: Arrogance + Ignorance = Katastrofe. Video, lyd og resumé..

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

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

Resumé:

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

Mette Frederiksens pressemøde på Marienborg, hvor hun annoncerede at Danmark nu er i frontlinjen imod Rusland og

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

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

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

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

Nedsmeltningen af det transatlantiske finansielle system er i gang. Siden 2008 er det blevet opbygget gigantiske finansbolser under 13 år med negative renter og kvantitative lempelser. Inflationen i USA er nu 7 % og den er over 5 % i EU. Det er kun begyndelsen. Den kæmpe gæld der er opbygget skal der nu betales renter på og det er der ikke råd til. Der skal betales mere og værdierne er langt mindre værd. Det kan kun gå galt.

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

Hvedebrødsdagene er måske ovre for den danske regering. Kan

ikke længere gemme sig bag COVID-19. Se på verden med friske øjne inden det er for sent. Gå med i Schiller Institutet.

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20. januar 2022:

Vil Vesten have krig eller fred med Rusland og Kina?

Finanskollaps på vej. FE-skandaler m.m.

Video, lyd og resumé.

med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/tg-20.1.22.mp3>

Resumé:

USA's og Ruslands udenrigsministre mødes i morgen. Er USA og NATO villige til at give Rusland de nødvendige sikkerhedsgarantier på skrift eller går man

konfrontationsvejen? Rusland bakker ikke ned. Man gør op med årtiers svigt fra Vesten, hvor Vesten har ført krig imod Rusland og dets interesser med farvede revolutioner m.m. Nu er Rusland militært og økonomisk stærk mens Vesten er svag. Rusland og Kina kan klare sig uden Vesten, men Europa kan ikke klare sig uden russisk gas og kinesiske varer.

Eksperter advarer at hvis USA og NATO overskrider Ruslands røde linjer kan Rusland angribe fra Hviderusland og Kaliningrad med SS-26 Skander kortdistance atommissiler i hele Østeuropa. USA kan trues med ubådsbaserede Zircon atommissiler, der flyver 5-10 gange lydens hastighed, som USA ikke kan forsvare sig imod. Hvis det bliver krig mellem Rusland og USA vil Kina indtage Taiwan og Nordkorea angribe Sydkorea uden at USA kan gøre noget. Få derfor langsigtede fredsaftaler med Rusland og Kina, som alle kan leve med i stedet for konfrontation og krig. Rusland deltager i militærøvelser i Hviderusland fra den 9. februar så tag snakken med Rusland, evt. med et topmøde mellem Biden og Putin, inden de Olympiske Vinterlege i Beijing fra den 4.-20. februar er afsluttet og scenen sat for eskalation og mulig krig.

USA's inflation på 7 % og USA's Federal Reserve bliver tvunget til at hæve renten. Resultatet vil være en nedsmeltning på de finansielle markeder. Nedflyvningen er startet så spænd sikkerhedsbælterne. Europa er ikke bedre stillet. Forbered implementering af LaRouches fire økonomiske love så realøkonomien og samfundet kan beskyttes imod konsekvenserne af nedsmeltningen.

COVID-19: Pga. den høje vacinetilslutning er Omikron-variantens indtog en gamechanger på trods af sin meget større smitbarhed. Største problem for sundhedsvæsenet er ikke Coronapatienter men hjemsendelse og karantæne for ikke-syge ansatte. Vi må reducere karantænetiden, men vente en uge eller to inden vi sætter fuld fart på genåbningen, til vi har set konsekvenserne af at der er 4 gange så mange daglige smittede

som for en måned siden.

FE-skandalen viser i lighed med mink-skandalen en stor villighed hos regeringen til at ville bestemme, men en dårlig evne til at sikre sig den fornødne rådgivning og ekspertise inden man træffer drastiske beslutninger med store og vidtrækkende konsekvenser. Efter hybris kommer nemesis. Det kan true regeringens fremtid. Det er ikke kun regeringens medlemmer der handler hurtigt og overilet, uden tanke på de langsigtede konsekvenser, men hele den nuværende regerende elite. Husk at hovmod står for fald.

Grib ind i historien. Vær med til at sikre et globalt sundhedssystem. Lad os samarbejde om at stoppe sultkatastrofen i Afghanistan og få opbygget hele verdens økonomiske sundhed. Gå med i Schiller Instituttets kampagne. Tænk som LaRouche.

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

Schiller Institut i Danmark

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

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

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

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

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

tilbage fra randen af krig.

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

Nogle højdepunkter:

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

"Faktisk havde jeg en lang snak med Mikhail Gorbatsjov, den tidligere leder af Sovjetunionen, i 1989, lige da NATO begyndte at bombe Serbien, og da de indlemmede Polen, Tjekkiet og Ungarn i NATO. Man bør huske på at Gorbatsjov er en meget rar person. Han er en meget livlig person, med godt humør og en erfaren person. Men da vi begyndte at snakke, spurgte jeg ham om NATO-udvidelsen, som foregik præcis den dag, hvor vi snakkede. Han blev meget dystert, meget trist, fordi han sagde: Altså, jeg talte med James Baker, Helmut Kohl fra Tyskland og flere andre personer, og de lovede mig alle ikke at flytte en tomme mod øst, hvis Sovjetunionen ville lade Tyskland forene DDR (Østtyskland) og Vesttyskland, for at blive ét land, og komme til at blive medlem af NATO, men ikke bevæge sig en tomme mod øst.'... Det stod ikke skrevet, for, som han sagde, "Jeg troede på dem. Jeg kan se, at jeg var naiv."

Et andet vigtigt afsnit er, hvad Jens Jørgen Nielsen ville sige til Biden, og andre NATO-statschefer, i en privat diskussion før de kommende forhandlinger mellem USA/NATO og Rusland. "Jeg ville sige, 'Se, Joe, jeg forstår dine bekymringer. Jeg forstår, at du ser dig selv som en forkæmper for frihed i verden, ... men ser du, det spil, du nu spiller med

Rusland, er et meget, meget farligt spil. Og russerne, som et meget stolt folk, man kan ikke tvinge dem', angående USA's og nogle europæiske landes politik, til at skifte Putin ud med en anden præsident. "Jeg kan forsikre dig, Joe Biden, vær sikker på, at hvis det lykkes, eller hvis Putin dør i morgen, eller de på en eller anden måde får en ny præsident, kan jeg forsikre dig om, at den nye præsident vil være lige så hård som Putin, måske endda hårdere... Jeg tror,□□det ville være klogt for dig, lige nu, at støtte Putin, eller at handle med Putin, engagere sig med Putin og lave noget diplomati, fordi alternativet er en mulighed for krig, og du burde ikke gå over i historien som den amerikanske præsident, der sikrede menneskehedens udryddelse. Det ville være et dårligt, meget dårligt eftermæle for dig.'

Han forholder sig til den reelle mulighed for, at vi søvngængeragtigt går ind i atomkrig, som før 1. Verdenskrig, som svar på Schiller Instituttets memorandum Er vi søvngængeragtigt på vej til atomkrig 3. verdenskrig? den 24. december 2021.

"[Man] kan forestille sig, hvad der vil ske, hvis Kina, Iran og Rusland havde en militær alliance, der gik ind i Mexico, Canada, Cuba, måske også opstillede missiler dér... [T]anken om en atomkrig er forfærdelig for os alle, og det er derfor jeg synes, at politikere må komme til fornuft... for milliarder vil dø i dette. Og det er et spørgsmål, om menneskeheden vil overleve. Så det er et meget, meget alvorligt spørgsmål. Og jeg tror vi bør spørge om Ukraines ret til at have NATO-medlemskab, som dets egen befolkning egentlig ikke ønsker, er det virkelig værd at risikere en atomkrig for? Sådan vil jeg sige det."

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 15.
december 2021:**

**Kun samarbejde kan besejre
pandemien og forhindre
atomkrig**

Se også 2. del: 3 min.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

2. del: 3 min.

lyd:

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

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

Vej-Initiativet og lære om infrastrukturøkonomi fra Kina

There is an English version below.

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

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

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

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

Først forklarede Lars Erslev Andersen, en DIIS-

forsker, Halford Mackinders idé om britisk geopolitik og det eurasiske kerneland (11:50 minutter inde). Han stillede spørgsmålet, hvad det betyder for Europa, at Kina investerer i det centralasiatiske kerneland – er det geopolitik eller geoøkonomi?

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

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

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

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

Manglen på strategiske visioner indenfor infrastruktur i USA og Europa: Han kritiserede USA's program med kvantitative lempelser, siden Obama og fremefter, for ikke at investere i de nyeste transportteknologier ligesom Kina, der byggede et højhastighedstognet på tusindvis af

kilometer. Han henviste til Los Angeles' forældede havn og transportinfrastruktur som den medvirkende årsag til den nuværende forsyningskrise.

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

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

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

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

flyveblade og sagde, at videokonferencen denne uge vil besvare nogle af disse spørgsmål.

Hun stillede to relaterede spørgsmål. Det første var, hvordan vi kan få USA og Europa til at holde op med at betragte Kina, og særligt BRI, som en trussel, og i stedet se fordelene ved et økonomisk samarbejde. Vores motto er Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling, fordi fortsættelsen af at betragte Kina og Rusland som trusler, og forfølgelsen af en konfrontationspolitik, fører til faren for krig.

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

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

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

På den ene side har Kina, med sine 14 nabolande, en større strategisk udfordring end USA, men Kina ser altid disse nabolande som muligheder, ligesom det som BRI for eksempel kunne opnå i Afghanistan. USA og Vesten har en meget klar interesse i at Afghanistans naboer, som for

eksempel Kina, Pakistan og Indien, forsøger at tage vare på deres region, fordi de muligvis kan gøre dette bedre, end vi gjorde det i løbet af de sidste 20 år.

English:

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

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

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

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

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

Central Asian heartland, is it geopolitics or geoeconomics?

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

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

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

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

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

Europe: Friis Arne Petersen told an anecdote about the time SF's chairman Pia Olsen Dyhr met with the Chinese transportation minister while Friis Arne Petersen was ambassador. The Chinese minister asked her about the newly negotiated (very unambitious) Danish train plan, and he replied, "Well, that's a beginning, but we are experimenting

with trains that can run 5-600 miles per hour.” The Danish Embassy in China gradually started to understand transportation economics. Germany was a negative example for refusing to help Denmark build the Fehmarnbelt tunnel (between Denmark and Germany).

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

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

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

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

The other question is what you think about integrating Afghanistan into the BRI – the Chinese are ready to do that. Wouldn't it be important for the U.S. and Europe, especially

the countries in the war, to deal with this terrible economic crisis in Afghanistan, through cooperating with China?

Friis Arne Petersen said that there are too many division lines, talk of rivalry, or the many uncertainties that lie in the advance of Asia. At the same time that there is an increase of western trade with Asia, for example, the U.S. buying so many Chinese products now after the pandemic, we are totally obsessive about political confrontation, and systemic challenges.

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

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6. september 2021:

Efter Afghanistan: Kollaps af Vestens vrangforestillinger kan være begyndelsen på en bedre verden

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Afghanistan kommentar: Korthiset falder af Jens Jørgen Nielsen, Rusland ekspert, forfatter, lektor

20. august 2021 – (Facebook post) 20 års militær indsats i Afghanistan, trillioner af Dollars, 43 danske soldaters liv og mange tusinder dræbte, flygtningestrømme m.m. Det er bare lidt af det, som egentlig skulle være kronen på værket, nemlig en bæredygtig afghansk stat med en moderne hær. På uger har det vist sig at være en illusion. Det hele væltede, som var det et korthis. Situationen minder påfaldende om situationen i Vietnam i 1975.

Diskussionen i medierne har handlet om, hvordan man får reddet mennesker ud af Kabul og om, hvorvidt Taliban er blevet mere moderat og moderne. Fint og relevant. Men vi skal vel have en debat om de store linjer, om hvordan vi i Vesten overhovedet

agerer uden for vores kulturkreds. Vi mangler i den grad svar på de store spørgsmål. Hvorfor faldt den afghanske hær totalt fra hinanden, den bestod af ca. 300.000 soldater med alt moderne militært udstyr? Hvorfor har de afghanske soldater eller befolkningen ikke lyst til at kæmpe for den afghanske stat? Og hvorfor flygtede præsidenten, Ashraf Ghani? Og hvorfor støtter en stor del af befolkningen tilsyneladende Taliban?

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

Hvorfor har Taliban tilsyneladende ret stor opbakning i landet? Ikke i Kabul naturligvis, hvor der bor mange moderne og pro-vestlige afghanere. Men omkring 80 % af de 38 millioner indbyggere i landet er fattige bønder, som ser anderledes på det. Da Sovjetunionen invaderede Afghanistan i 1979, begyndte USA straks at støtte mujahedin bevægelsen, den kom fra hele

Mellemøsten, ikke mindst fra Saudi Arabien og andre arabiske lande plus Pakistan o.a. De fik mange våben fra USA, og en af lederne var Osama bin Laden. Mujahedin'erne begyndte senere at kæmpe indbyrdes. Taliban var en ren afghansk, især pashtun bevægelse, som begyndte at skabe en vis form for orden i landet. Meget tyder på, at bønderne satte pris på, at udenlandske styrker blev jaget ud. Nej, jeg mener ikke, at Taliban var søde, men vi skal vide hvorfor en del afghanere støtter dem. Taliban sad ved magten indtil terrorangrebet i 2001 med islamistiske regler for kvinder om tildækning m.m. Men det var mange af bønderne formentlig ligeglade med. Så kom NATO landene med den hidtil største militæroperation. Opgaven var til at begynde med at finde Osama bin Laden, som angiveligt skulle befinde sig i Afghanistan. Taliban accepterede Osama bin Laden, men havde ikke noget med terrorangrebet at gøre. NATO-landene skulle fange og uskadeliggøre Osama bin Laden.

Men hvad skulle vores opgave ellers bestå i – i Afghanistan? I 2011 fandt amerikanerne Osama bin Laden, og dræbte ham. Vel at mærke i Pakistan. Hvad skulle vi så? Skulle vi indføre demokrati, sikre kvinders rettigheder, skulle vi yde humanitær bistand? Eller ville amerikanerne sikre, at der ikke kom en pro-russisk eller en pro-kinesisk leder til magten i Afghanistan? Eller var Danmark i Afghanistan, fordi vi ville vise solidaritet med USA, og fordi det var vigtigt for os, at være afholdt i Washington? Hvis vi skulle opbygge et normalt demokratisk samfund, hvor var så projekterne, vejene, infrastrukturen, hospitalerne? Og hvor var analytikerne, efterretningsvæsenerne, som kunne give en nøgtern ikke-ideologisk vurdering af situationen i stedet for komiske Ali beretninger? Og hvorfor har det amerikanske efterretningsvæsen i øvrigt ikke delt sin viden om Talibans hurtige fremmarch med sine allierede?

Rækken af spørgsmål er lang. Jeg er ikke sikker på, at vi får svar på dem alle. Men det er blevet tid for refleksion over

dels, hvorfor det gik galt og dels, hvordan vi skal ændre vores adfærd fremadrettet. For det første kunne man godt få den tanke, at det ville være en god idé for Danmark og andre NATO allierede at foretage egne vurderinger og ikke blindt tro på alt, hvad USA kommer med. Danmark og andre NATO-lande kommer til at fremstå som underdanige vasalstater.

For det andet kunne det være, at en gang for alle skulle lægge 1990'ernes fremherskende ideologi på hylden. Efter Sovjetunionens fald blev det en udbredt opfattelse i vestlige politiske kredse, at den vestlige liberale ideologi og tolkning var den eneste rigtige og universelle tilgang. Alle verdens lande skulle følge den angelsaksiske model og blive demokrater på samme måde. I og med, at Sovjetunionen var væk som ideologisk og militær stormagt var vejen banet for en verden i USA's billede. Grundlæggende var det en arrogant opfattelse, som ignorerer forskelle i kultur og historie. Hvad værre er, når man gennemfører dette projekt at eksportere demokrati med militær, går det som regel fundamentalt galt, ja disse aktioner fremmer i virkeligheden det de vil forhindre. Det er vanskeligt at komme til andre konklusioner efter Talibans lyn-sejr. Den vestlige ideologi gør os blind for virkeligheden i et land som Afghanistan. Mange af dem, NATO-alliancen støttede i Afghanistan, var i virkeligheden dybt korrupte narkosmuglere, som udnyttede bønderne. Ja selv den amerikanske hær har formentlig været en del af narke-business. Det flød med penge til latterlige formål, og mange vestlige firmaer og også militærfolk har haft snablen nede i disse kasser. Hvordan kan det være anderledes, når der vælter penge ind over et fattigt land? Enkeltstående isolerede pigeskoler som prestigeprojekter gør ikke nogen forskel, hvis samfundet ellers er korrupt, og der mangler strukturer, som kan støtte op om det.

Jeg har venner, som har været udstationeret, ligesom jeg har undervist soldater, der skulle udstationeret i Afghanistan. Jeg er imponeret over deres beredvillighed til at kæmpe for

det gode, selv med livet som indsats. I mange tilfælde har de opsøgt dialog med lokale og støttet projekter i overensstemmelse med vores nationale værdier. Men deres opgave har været principielt umulig. Og det er politikernes ansvar, ikke soldaternes.

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

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

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

'Rapport siger, at Danmark hjalp USA med at udspionere Merkel og europæiske allierede'.

China Plus-interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Interview i *China Plus World Today* med Helga Zepp-LaRouche (*China Plus* er det officielle engelske websted for *China Radio International*.)

Mandag 31. maj 2021

WORLD TODAY: Du lytter til World Today. Danmarks efterretningstjeneste hjalp USA med at udspionere europæiske politikere, herunder den tyske kansler Angela Merkel fra 2012-2014, rapporterer danske medier. Ifølge en rapport fra Danmarks Radio samarbejdede Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste med det amerikanske NSA for at indsamle informationer, og efterretninger blev indsamlet om andre embedsmænd fra Tyskland, Frankrig, Sverige og Norge. Lignende beskyldninger dukkede op i 2013. Dengang afslørede hemmeligheder lækket af den amerikanske whistleblower Edward Snowden, at NSA havde aflyttet den tyske kanslers telefon.

For yderligere oplysninger har vi nu Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, en tyskbaseret politisk og økonomisk tænketank, på linjen.

Tak fordi du er med os, Dr. LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Ja, goddag.

WORLD TODAY: Kunne du først fortælle os mere om, hvad de danske medier har fundet?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Det er i grunden en sjov historie, fordi al denne information i det væsentlige var kendt i 2015, nemlig at NSA benytter sig af det faktum, at man i Danmark har transatlantiske kabler, hvorved man kan udspionere alt hvad der foregår i østblokken, men også internationalt. Alt dette kom frem i 2015, men der skete egentlig ikke noget. Merkel sagde på det tidspunkt "Åh, at udspionere sine allierede – det går virkelig ikke an", men derefter skete der absolut intet! Sidste år lækkede den samme historie atter, og igen skete der intet.

Så der er tilsyneladende en eller flere whistleblowers i den danske efterretningstjeneste, der siger, at dette bare er for meget. Det sætter spørgsmålstegn ved Danmarks suverænitet, det danske folks interesser. Så de lækkede vedvarende de samme oplysninger, og nu er det blevet taget op af et helt netværk af europæiske mediekredse – Le Monde og tysk tv, norsk og svensk tv – og de har fået adgang til de interne dokumenter fra den danske efterretningstjeneste, og det er således, at nyheden opstod.

WORLD TODAY: Tror du, at Angela Merkel måske vil reagere anderledes denne gang? Og hvad har reaktionen på denne rapport hidtil været i Tyskland og måske andre dele af Europa?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg tror, at denne whistleblower, fordi han ser, at der ikke har været nogen reaktion, har til hensigt at fortsætte med at lække oplysningerne for at opbygge trykket. Så nu har [Peer] Steinbrück, der er tidligere [SPD] kanslerkandidat, sagt, at dette er en skandale. De norske og svenske ministre sagde, at de nu kræver en efterforskning. Vi er nødt til at se, hvad der sker, for alt dette fandt allerede

sted sidste år, og jeg tror, det helt afhænger af, at befolkningen siger, at hvis disse regeringer tillader, at alle bliver udspioneret, forsvarer disse regeringer naturligvis ikke deres respektive befolknings interesser. Så jeg tror, vi bliver nødt til at se, hvordan dette udvikler sig.

WORLD TODAY: Og efter nyheden om rapporten søndag beskyldte Edward Snowden den amerikanske præsident Joe Biden for i første omgang at være dybt involveret i denne skandale. Hvorfor siger han det?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: [ler] Fordi det er sandt! Det er velkendt for alle, der har lyttet til Edward Snowden, og der er en hel gruppe af amerikanske whistleblowers, der har sagt lignende ting, nemlig at NSA udspionerer alt – alt hvad der foregår i verden. De spionerer på e-mails, bærbare computere, telefonopkald, og de samler alt dette i gigantiske lagerfaciliteter. Og de samler ikke blot oplysninger på en enkelt person eller et emne, de samler alt. Og når de først har det, kan de senere gå tilbage med søgeord og fremkalde specifikke ting, de ønsker.

I virkeligheden er denne NSA-operation blevet til en verdensomspændende overvågningsstat. De laver jo en masse ståhej om overvågning i Kina og Rusland og så videre, men virkeligheden er, at den britiske GCHQ, der svarer til NSA, samt NSA bare indsamler det hele. Og jeg synes naturligvis, at Biden, både i sin egenskab af vicepræsident og nu som præsident, står i spidsen for det.

WORLD TODAY: OK, men hvorfor ville USA udspionere sine allierede?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Fordi de tror, at de kan forsvare en unipolær verden, og for dem giver det ikke mening at der kan være noget galt med det. For dem er det helt normalt og selvindlysende, at de skal gøre det.

Jeg mener jo, USA, desværre – og jeg tror, at nogle embedsmænd

i Kina er opmærksomme på det – at USA har vendt sig væk fra deres oprindelige værdier fra Den amerikanske Frihedskrig, hvor det blev grundlagt som en republik, og i de seneste år – faktisk årtier kan man sige – har allieret sig med det britiske imperium, der styrer verden på basis af 'the special relationship', hvorved de tror, at hvis de opfører sig som det britiske imperiums muskelkraft, så er det sådan, de håber på at kunne regere en unipolær verden.

WORLD TODAY: Men tror du, at dette vil have en indvirkning på Amerikas forhold til dets vigtigste allierede, fordi Joe Biden søger at genopbygge alliancer?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Det spørgsmål, som jeg og mange andre mennesker stiller sig selv, er: Hvorfor kom der ingen reaktion, efter at disse historier kom frem i 2015, i 2020? Jeg mener, danskerne vidste tydeligt hvad de lavede, men de ville ikke gøre noget vrøvl over det. De ville ikke lave brok i foretagendet. Det er næsten som om de foretrækker at være slaver for den store herremand, frem for at blive smidt ud af klubben! Det er jo en komplet skandale: Det sætter spørgsmålstegn ved hele dette spørgsmål om "vestlige værdier", de store vestlige demokratier, menneskerettighederne, alle disse ting. Hvorledes beskyttes de europæiske borgeres menneskerettigheder af deres regeringer?

Jeg håber, at der vil blive stillet nogle meget klare spørgsmål til præsident Biden, når han deltager i G7-mødet. Jeg mener, jeg tvivler på det, fordi disse ledere har ikke udvist... de vil hellere være en del af "Five Eyes" og "Seven Eyes" og alt det der, snarere end at forsvare deres egne borgere

WORLD TODAY: Tak, til Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, en tyskbaseret politisk og økonomisk tænketank. Du lytter til World Today.

Billede: NSA: U.S. government, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons, FE: By Skjoldbro – Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0,

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

Lyd:

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 4. marts 2021: Det er ikke i Israel, men i samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, at COVID-19 og andre problemer løses

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

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

Formand Tom Gillesbergs blev interviewet på DR P4, om at stille op som løsgænger, den 23. februar 2021

3 minutter:

Schiller Instituttet · Tom Gillesberg På P4 23.2.21

København, 23. februar 2021 (Schiller Instituttet i Danmark) – I dag blev Tom Gillesberg interviewet af DR's populære

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

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

Tom Gillesberg: Tak.

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

Gillesberg: Fordi hele min idé var at ændre hele den politiske diskussion – at tage de virkelig store spørgsmål op, der bestemmer, hvordan fremtiden se ud, og så inddrage befolkningen i dem. Og det er ikke, hvad de politiske partier gør, så min platform har ikke været, at jeg skal have en politisk karriere. Siden jeg mødte Lyndon LaRouche og blev politisk aktiv, var det, at få de store spørgsmål, der bestemmer fremtiden, sat på dagsorden. Og det at stille op som løsgænger eller til kommunalvalget har været en måde for mig at komme ud med de visioner og idéer.

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

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

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

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

Gillesberg: Det gør jeg ved – vi har, lige i den her uge, faktisk tre nationer, som netop er kommet til Mars. Og når jeg tidligere har snakket om Mars, og at vi skal ud i rummet, så siger folk, "Hvad er det for noget mærkelig fremtidsmusik?" Men det sker. Spørgsmålet er: Kina gør det her. Kina kommer til at tage helium-3 ned fra Månen til fusionsenergi på Jorden. Så det kommer til at ske. Spørgsmålet er så, om vi her i Danmark og vi her i Vesten, skal være med til det? Om vi skal være en del af den spændende fremtid, eller vi bare bliver sådan et eller andet museum, hvor folk kan komme og danse folkedans, og se hvordan man levede i gamle dage.

P4: Tak skal du have, Tom Gillesberg.