

Video: Samarbej med Kina. Det er ikke fjenden.

Interview med Li Xing, PhD, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet

KØBENHAVN, 27. januar 2022 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark har gennemført et vigtigt, timelangt videointerview med Li Xing, ph.d., professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet i Danmark. Li Xing er medlem af det samfundsvidenskabelige fakultet på Institut for Politik og Samfund og leder af forskningscentret for udvikling og internationale relationer. Han er oprindeligt fra Jiaxing nær Shanghai og arbejdede i Beijing, inden han kom til Danmark i 1988 for at tage sin kandidat- og ph.d.-grad.

Det omfattende interview dækker Kinas forbindelser med USA, Europa (USA–Kina-rivalisering), Rusland (Kina ville støtte Rusland, hvis det blev smidt ud af Swift-betalingsystemet), Europa og Afrika (Kinas udviklingsprogram er en hjælp for Europa i forbindelse med flygtningeproblemet), Latinamerika (Kina har fremmet den økonomiske udvikling i USA's baghave, mens USA har været fokuseret på krige og farverevolutioner), Afghanistan (med helhjertet støtte til Operation Ibn Sina) og andre udviklingslande.

Det omfatter også, hvad professor Li Xing ville sige til præsident Biden om forbindelserne med Kina, Xi Jinpings Davos-tale, Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og Xinjiang-spørgsmålet. Han opfordrer USA og Europa til at samarbejde med Kina om deres respektive nødvendige infrastrukturudvikling, for at fremme

udviklingen af de underudviklede lande og for at droppe den geopolitiske taber-strategi. Han slutter med at rose Schiller Instituttets udviklingsprogrammer for verden.

Interviewet, der blev foretaget af Michelle Rasmussen, vil blive transskriberet til offentliggørelse i EIR og er nu tilgængeligt på Schiller Instituttets YouTube-kanal i Danmark.

Here is a pdf version published in Executive Intelligence Review, Vol. 49, No. 5 (www.larouchepub.com/eiw). We encourage you to subscribe.:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

INTERVIEW

Professor Li Xing

Cooperate with China – It Is Not the Enemy

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Prof. Li Xing, PhD, conducted on Jan. 26 by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Dr. Li is a professor of Development and International Relations at the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Aalborg University. Li Xing was born in Jiaxing, China, near Shanghai. He earned his BA at the Guangzhou Institute of Foreign Languages. He came to Denmark from Beijing in 1988 for his MA and later completed his PhD studies at Aalborg University.

Subheads have been added. A video of the interview is available here . <https://youtu.be/rulmlczmaTE>

Michelle Rasmussen: Welcome, Professor Li Xing, thank you so much for allowing me to interview you.

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you too.

Michelle Rasmussen: Li Xing, as we speak, there is an

overhanging threat of war between the United States and NATO against Russia and China, countries which the war faction in the West sees as a threat to the disintegrating, unipolar Anglo-American world dominance.

On the other hand, the Schiller Institute has led an international campaign to try to get the U.S. and Europe to cooperate with Russia and China to solve the great crises in the world, especially the pandemic, the financial and economic crises, the underdevelopment of the poor countries, and the cultural crisis in the West. Our international president, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, has stated that the U.S.-China relationship will be the most important relationship in the future.

You recently gave a lecture at the Danish Institute for International Studies about the U.S.-China rivalry. And you are a contributor to the book *The Telegram: A China Agenda for President Biden* by Sarwar Kashmiri, which was published in 2021 by the Foreign Policy Association in New York City. The book is composed of statements by the contributors of what each would say if they were granted a personal meeting with President Biden. What would your advice be to President Biden regarding China?

Advice to President Biden

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you for giving me this chance for this interview. If I had the chance to meet the President, I would say to him:

Hello, President Biden. I think that it is a pity that you didn't change Trump's China policy, especially regarding the trade war and the tariff. We can see from the current situation that in the U.S., the shortages issue, the inflation issue, these are all connected with tariff issue. Many congressmen and senators are calling for the removal of the tariffs. So, I really think that the president should give

second thoughts to continuing the trade war. Contrary to this, though, the data from 2020 and 2021 shows that the China-U.S. trade actually surged almost 30%, compared with early years. So, the trade war didn't work.

The second issue is the competition in the area of high technology areas, especially regarding the chip industry. I'd say to him:

Mr. President, the U.S. has the upper hand in that technology, and China has the largest market. I think that if the U.S. continues to use a technology sanction on Chinese chips, then the whole country and the whole nation will increase the investment on the chips. Once China has the technology, then the U.S. would both lose the market, and also lose the advantage in that technology.

So, this is the second issue, I think the president should give a thought to.

The third issue, which I think is a very touchy issue, is the Taiwan issue. I would really advise the President:

Mr. President, to play the Taiwan card needs caution, because Taiwan is the center of Chinese politics, in its historical memory, and the most important national project in the unification process. So, to play the Taiwan card really needs caution.

But still, I would also say to the President:

Mr. President, China and the U.S. have a lot of areas for cooperation. For example, climate change; for example, North Korea, Iran, Afghanistan; and last but not least, because China has great technology and skill in terms of infrastructure, so you, Mr. President, should invite China to come to the U.S. and play a role in the U.S. infrastructure construction projects. That would be an ideal situation to promote bilateral relations.

Attitude of the U.S. Toward China

Michelle Rasmussen: In your statement in the book, *The Telegram*, you address whether the United States should consider China as an enemy or as rival. What would you say to the American people about the attitude that the United States should have towards China?

Prof. Li Xing: I don't think that the U.S. should regard China as an enemy, but as a rival. I think there is a truth in that because China is obviously a rival to the United States on many, many grounds, both in materials and also in ideation. Nevertheless, it is not an enemy. China and the U.S. have so many areas of cooperation as you point out, that this bilateral relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world. Were this relationship turned into an enemy relationship, it would be a disaster for the world.

Michelle Rasmussen: On January 17, Chinese President Xi Jinping addressed the World Economic Forum in Davos. What do you think is most important for people in the West to understand about his speech?

Prof. Li Xing: Xi Jinping was invited to the World Economic Forum, and he sent some messages. In his address he admitted that economic globalization has created problems, but that this should not constitute a justification to write off everything regarding globalization, regarding international cooperation. So, he suggested that the world should adapt and guide globalization.

He also rejected the protectionist forces on the rise in the West, saying that history has proved time and time again that confrontation does not solve problems; it only invites catastrophic consequences.

President Xi also particularly mentioned protectionism, unilateralism, indirectly referring to the U.S., emphasizing that this phenomenon will only hurt the interest of others as

well as itself, meaning that the U.S. trade war, or sanctions against China, will hurt both. It's not a win-win, it's a lose-lose. President Xi delivered a message that rejects a "zero sum" approach. I think it was a very constructive message from President Xi Jinping. He totally rejects, if I interpret his address correctly, the Cold War mentality. He doesn't want to see a Cold War mentality emerge in either the U.S., or in China.

The Belt and Road Concept

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on now to the question of the Belt and Road Initiative. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Schiller Institute has worked to establish a new Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, and many of these economic principles have been coming to life through China's Belt and Road Initiative. Li Xing, in 2019 you wrote a book, Mapping China's One Belt One Road Initiative, and have lectured on this. How has the Belt and Road Initiative created economic development in the underdeveloped countries?

Prof. Li Xing: First of all, I think that we need to understand the Belt and Road concept—the historicity behind the Belt and Road; that the Belt and Road is not an international aid program. We have to keep that in mind. It is an infrastructure project attempting to link Eurasia. It has two routes. One is a land route, consisting of six corridors. Then, it has another route called the Maritime Silk Road. Globally, about 138 countries, ranging from Italy to Saudi Arabia to Cambodia, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China. Just recently another country in Latin America signed up with the Belt and Road.

The idea of the Belt and Road is founded on two basic Chinese economic strengths. One is surplus capital. China has a huge amount of surplus capital in its banks, which it can use for investments. The second is that after 40 years of

infrastructure development in China, China has huge technology and skill, particularly in the infrastructure development area. So, the Belt and Road is basically an infrastructure development project.

The driving force of China's Belt and Road is that after 40 years of economic development, China is experiencing a similar situation experienced by the advanced countries in world economic history—for example, rising wages, overproduction, overcapacity, and a lot of surplus capital.

So, China is looking for what the Marxist analytical lens calls a "spatial fix," as in its domestic market, the mass production manufacturing is getting extremely large. In looking beyond Chinese territory at Chinese neighbors, China has discovered that all the countries around China are actually very, very far behind in infrastructure development. So, it's kind of a win-win situation. The idea behind the Belt and Road is a kind of a win-win situation.

Historically, the Post World War II Marshall Plan in Europe, and the military aid to East Asia, were, you could say, like Belt and Road projects, helping those countries to enhance economic development. I recently came across a World Bank study pointing out that if the Belt and Road projects were successfully implemented, the real income level throughout the entire region would rise between two or four times. At the global level, the real income can rise between 0.7 -2.9%. So, you can say, the international financial institutions, and economic institutions like World Bank, are also very positive toward the Belt and Road.

However, the Belt and Road also has four areas which we need to be concerned about. Number one: the debt trap, which has been discussed quite a lot at the global level. Number two: transparency, whether the Belt and Road projects in different countries are transparent. This, too, is an issue for debate. Number three: corruption, whether Chinese investments in

countries creates corruption by local officials. The number four area for concern is the environmental and social cost. So, these definitely need to be taken care of, both by China and those countries.

As a whole, I think the Belt and Road project is huge. It's very constructive. But we also need to consider its potential to create bad effects. We need to tackle all these effects collectively.

'Debt Trap' Diplomacy

Michelle Rasmussen: When you spoke just now about a debt trap, our correspondent Hussein Askary, who covers the Muslim world, and also developments in Africa, has argued against the idea that China is creating a debt trap, pointing out that many of the countries owe much more money to Western powers, than they do to China, and that China has done things like forgiving debt, or transferring physical assets to those governments, because the debt trap accusation has been used as the primary argument against the Belt and Road. Do you think that this is a legitimate argument or that this is overplayed to try to just create suspicion about the Belt and Road?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I fully agree, actually, with the comment you just quoted from another study. It is true that the "debt trap" has been used by Western media, or those politicians who are against the Belt and Road, as an excuse, as a kind of a dark picture. But, according to my research, China actually understands this problem, and very often, the Chinese government uses different measures, or different policies, to tackle this problem. One is to write off the debt entirely, when the borrowing country would really suffer, if it had to repay. For example, the Chinese government announced that during the pandemic, debt service payments from some poor countries is suspended until their economic situation improves.

China is a central-government-based country. State policy plays a bigger role than in the political system of the West, where different interest groups drive their countries' policies into different directions. Therefore, the Chinese central government is able to play a bigger role than Western governments in tackling debt problems.

Michelle Rasmussen: What has this meant for the underdeveloped countries, for example, in Africa, and other poor countries in Asia, in Ibero-America? What has the Belt and Road Initiative meant for their economic development?

Prof. Li Xing: The increasing number of countries that have signed up with the Belt and Road, shows that the Belt Road project is comparatively quite welcomed. I have also followed many debates in Africa, where many African leaders were asked the question and they completely agree. They say that the situation regarding the debt of the old time, their experiences with the colonial countries, is quite different from the debt incurred with China's investment projects or development projects. So, they still have confidence in China's foreign development policies, especially in the Belt and Road project. From the many studies and reports I have read so far; they have strong confidence in that.

Infrastructure Means Development

Michelle Rasmussen: What would you say about the role of infrastructure development in China in creating this unprecedented economic growth and lifting people out of poverty? What role has infrastructure played in the incredible poverty elimination policy that China actually succeeded in achieving this year?

Prof. Li Xing: The entire 40-year history of China's economic growth and economic development, and China's prosperity, is based on the lesson that infrastructure is one of the most important factors leading to China's economic success. China

has a slogan: "If you want to get rich, build a road." Infrastructure is connected with every aspect of national economy. The raw materials industry, the metal industry, you name it. Cement industry, etc. Infrastructure is really the center of a nation's economy, which can really get different areas of the country running. So, I think this experience of China is really a good lesson, not only for China itself, but also for the rest of the world, especially for developing countries.

That's why China's Belt and Road project, identified as infrastructure projects, is really welcomed by many people, and especially President Biden. Even though his budget was not passed, because of the resistance, or even if it's shrunken, the idea about improving U.S. infrastructure, became a kind of hot spot. I think that the U.S. needs to increase its infrastructure investment as well. Definitely.

Europe-China Relations

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on to Europe and China relations. You have edited the book China-U.S. Relations at a Crossroads: "Systemic Rivalry" or "Strategic Partnership." What is your evaluation and recommendation about European-Chinese relations? When we spoke earlier, you had a comment about how the impact of African development, if there would be development or not in Africa, would impact Europe. Could you also include your idea about that?

Prof. Li Xing: EU-China relations are increasingly complex, and affected by a number of interrelated factors, such as China's rise, the growing China-U.S. rivalry, U.S. global withdrawal, especially under the Trump administration, the trans-Atlantic split, the Brexit, and at the same time, the China-Russia comprehensive alliance. Under these broad transformations of the global order, EU-China relations are also getting very complex. Right now, I feel that the EU and China are struggling to find a dynamic and durable mode of

engagement, to achieve a balance between opportunities on the one side, and challenges on the other, and also between partnership and rivalry.

For instance, China and the EU successfully reached what is called the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment treaty in December 2020. It was a joyful moment. However, in 2021, due to the Hong Kong events, the Xinjiang issue, and mutual sanctions in 2021, this investment treaty was suspended. Not abandoned but suspended. You can see that the relationship can be hurt by events. It's really difficult to find a balance between strategic partnership and systemic rivalry. "Systemic rivalry" was the official term used in a European Commission document, "EU-China—A Strategic Outlook," issued March 12, 2019. That document states that China is "simultaneously ... an economic competitor in the pursuit of technological leadership, and a systemic rival promoting alternative models of governance."

So, you can see that a systemic rival means alternative normative values. That's why it's a new term, when used in that way. It shows that China's development has both a material impact, and, also, an ideational impact—that many countries are becoming attracted by the Chinese success. For that reason, the Chinese, and the rise of China is increasingly regarded as a systemic rival.

On the other hand, the message from my book is also that the EU must, one way or another, become autonomous, and design an independent China policy. Sometimes I feel that the EU-China policy is somehow pushed around or carried by U.S. global interests, or affected by the U.S.-China competition. I really think Europe needs an independent China policy. You know, the EU is thinking of developing "defence independence." That is, it is pursuing autonomy in defense. But that's something else.

According to data from Kishore Mahbubani, a very well-known Singaporean public intellectual and professor, the Belt and

Road has special meaning for Europe in relation to Africa. This is of importance to your question about Africa.

According to his data on the demographic explosion in Africa, Africa's population in the 1950s was half of that of Europe. Today, Africa's population is 2.5 times that of Europe. By 2100, Africa's population will be 10 times of that of Europe. So, if Africa still suffers from underdevelopment, if any crisis appears, where will African refugees migrate? Europe!

From Kishore's point of view, the Belt and Road is doing Europe a "favor," so Europe should be very supportive of China's Belt and Road project. I totally agree with that. What he says is also a part of the message of my book.

A 'Differentiated' Europe

Michelle Rasmussen: You were speaking about Europe becoming more autonomous in its relations with China. Former German Chancellor Angela Merkel has stated openly that Germany should not be forced to choose between the United States and China, that Germany needs to have relations with both. Can you say more about that? Is China Europe's biggest trading partner?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, since November last year.

Michelle Rasmussen: There's differentiation inside Europe. For example, the Eastern European countries have a forum called "16+1," where 16 Eastern European countries, plus China, have a more developed Belt and Road cooperation with China, than the Western countries. And there's differentiation in the western European countries. You mentioned that some are making Hong Kong and Xinjiang into obstacles to improving European relations to China. What would you say to these concerns?

Prof. Li Xing: China-EU relations are being affected by many, many factors. One is, as you mentioned, about 16+1, but now it's 17+1, because, I think two years ago, Greece became a part of 16+1, so now it's 17+1. And the western part of the

EU, was quite worried about the 17+1 because some think that the Belt and Road plays a role in dividing Europe. Because Europe has this common policy, common strategy, and common action toward the Belt and Road, they also see the 17+1 grouping as somehow playing a divisive role. So, the EU is not very happy about that. Because you're right, the Belt and Road is more developed in the eastern part of the EU. This is one issue.

The second issue is that the EU has to make a balance between China on the one side, and the U.S. on the other. Right now, my assessment is that the EU is somehow being pushed to choose the U.S. side. It's fine with me, from my analytical point of view, that the EU, most of the countries in the West, the traditional U.S. allies—like including Denmark—if they choose the U.S., that's fine. But my position is that their choosing sides should be based on their own analysis, their own national interests, not purely on the so-called values and norms, that the U.S. and EU share norms, and therefore should have a natural alliance. I think that is not correct. I always advise Western politicians, thinktanks, and policy makers that they should study China-U.S. relations or EU-China-U.S. relations and try to find their own foreign policies. What is the correct direction? And based on their own judgment, based on their own research results, not based on what the U.S. wants them to do.

Michelle Rasmussen: One of Denmark's top former diplomats, Friis Arne Petersen, has been Denmark's ambassador to the United States, to China, and to Germany. At the Danish Institute for International Studies, he recently called for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative. Why do you think it would be in the interest of Europe and the United States to join or cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative, instead of treating it as a geopolitical threat?

Prof. Li Xing: Well, on the Belt and Road, as we have already discussed, we must first understand what it is. I fully agree

with Friis Arne Petersen. When he was Ambassador to Beijing, I met him at one of the international conferences. He was always very positive towards Denmark-China cooperation. I fully agree with his point on the Belt and Road. But we have to understand, first of all, why the West is nervous about the Belt and Road. This is very important, because the European's or the American's worry is based on two perspectives. One is geopolitics. The second is norm diffusion. Geopolitics means that through the Belt and Road, China's economic political influence will gradually expand to cover all of Eurasia, which is not in the interest of the West. This is a geopolitical rationale.

Then the second perspective is norm diffusion, which means that through the Belt and Road, the Chinese development model spreads. As I mentioned before, because of the global attraction to China, the Chinese development model will be consolidated and extended through the Belt and Road, and that is also not in the interest of the West. That's why China is a "systemic rival," because it has a norm diffusion effect. We have to understand these two aspects.

But why should Europe support the Belt and Road? I have already discussed this issue in my answer to your previous question regarding the importance of infrastructure development, and regarding why Europe should support the Belt and Road, especially in the context of Africa.

Michelle Rasmussen: And you also spoke about the need for infrastructure development in the United States. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the United States a grade point average of C- for the state of its infrastructure. Looking at high speed rail in China and in the United States, there's nothing to compare.

Prof. Li Xing: No, no.

Michelle Rasmussen: In its 14th Five-Year Plan, China has

committed itself to increase its high-speed rail lines by one third, from the present 38,000 kilometers to 50,000 kilometers by 2025. The U.S. has maybe a hundred and fifty kilometers.

Prof. Li Xing: I was told by American friends that the U.S. has not invested heavily in infrastructure for many, many decades, about half century, something like that. I was shocked to hear that. So, I think Biden's idea of infrastructure investment is great, but somehow the bill could not be agreed on by the Congress, and also the Senate, due to partisan conflict.

Michelle Rasmussen: And it was not very ambitious in any case.

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, totally.

Reordering the World Order

Michelle Rasmussen: It was a step in the right direction, but was not very ambitious.

Let's move on to Latin America, which we in the Schiller Institute call Ibero-America. That's because our members say that the Spanish language did not proceed from Latin. The Iberian Peninsula is Portugal and Spain, so Ibero-America is a better term. In any case, Li Xing, you are working on a study, China-U.S. Rivalry and Regional Reordering in Latin America. Can you please share the main idea with us?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes. I'm working on this book, together with a group of Latin American scholars from different countries in the region. The objective of the book is to provide a good conceptualization, first, of the changing world order, and the reordering process. When we talk about that the world order is changing because of the U.S.-China rivalry, at the same time, we also suggest that the world is experiencing a reordering process, that we do not know the future order, or the new order, but the world is in the process of reordering, driven by the China-U.S. rivalry.

The book will also try to convey that the U.S.-China rivalry, according to our conceptualization, is “intra-core. According to the world system theory, you have a core which is the advanced economy countries, then you have a semi-periphery, and then you have a periphery. The semi-periphery is between periphery and the core, and the periphery is the vast number of developing countries. So the China-U.S. rivalry, competition, especially in high technologies in the security areas, is between these two core countries, or is intra-core.

The China-U.S. rivalry also represents a struggle between two types of capitalism. On the one side is Chinese state capitalism, very centralized, state led, with central planning. On the other side is the U.S. free market, individual capitalist economy. Somehow the China model is gradually appearing to be more competitive. Of course, the U.S. doesn't agree with that assessment, at least from the current perspectives.

So, this rivalry must have a great impact on the whole world, especially on the developing world we call the Global South. Here we've tried to focus on the U.S.-China rivalry, and its impact on the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The message of the book is, first, that global redistribution of power is inevitable. It's still in process, and the emerging world order is likely to be dominated by more than one superpower, so the world order will likely look like a polycentric world, with a number of centripetals competing for high positions or strong positions. This is the first message.

The second message is that the situation shows that the world is in a reordering process driven by the competition between the two superpowers, and it poses opportunities, and also constraints, to different regions, especially for the Global South, such as Latin America, because Latin America is the U.S. backyard; it is the subject of American doctrines—that North America and South America, are a sphere of U.S.

influence.

The Monroe Doctrine

Michelle Rasmussen: You're talking about the Monroe Doctrine?

Prof. Li Xing: The Monroe Doctrine. Thank you very much. North America and South America have to be within the U.S. hegemonic influence. No external power is allowed to have a hand in, or interference in these two regions. You can say that China's relations with Latin America has really been increasing tremendously during the past two decades.

At the same time, the U.S. was busy with its anti-terrorism wars, and its creation of color revolutions in other parts of the world. If you look at the investment in infrastructure, and also imports of agriculture, China-Latin American trade and Chinese investment in Latin America are increasing tremendously, dramatically, which becomes a worry, a really deep worry, to the U.S.

The different scholars, the book's chapter authors, will use different countries and country cases as examples to provide empirical evidence to our "theoretical conceptualization." This book will be published around summertime by Brill, a very good publisher in Holland.

Michelle Rasmussen: Well, actually, the Monroe Doctrine was adopted in 1823, in the very early history of the United States. This is after the United States had become a republic and had freed itself from the British Empire. It was actually John Quincy Adams—

Prof. Li Xing: Exactly.

Michelle Rasmussen:—who was actually involved in the idea, which was that the United States would not allow imperialism, imperial powers to bring their great power games into Latin and South America, but that the United States would help those

countries become independent republics. So the question becomes, will Chinese policy strengthen the ability of the Ibero-American countries to be republics and enjoy economic development, or is China's intention also a kind of imperialism?

Prof. Li Xing: Based on your definitions, on your conceptualization of the Monroe Doctrine, you can say that there are two implications. One is that the U.S. should defend these two regions from imperialist intervention. The U.S. itself was not an imperial power at that time. The U.S. didn't have intentions to become a global interventionist then, but today it is a different situation.

Second, that the U.S. definitely interprets Chinese investment and infrastructure cooperation, and economic investment in Latin America as "helping," to consolidate the country's independence? No, I don't think that is the case. That would be a kind of positive-sum game. Today, unluckily, these two countries are trapped into a zero-sum game. Whatever China is doing in the South American region, is interpreted as not being good for United States. That's a very unfortunate situation.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, we in the Schiller Institute have said that if the United States were to join with China to have even better economic development in Ibero-America; that would be a win-win policy. You spoke about the immigration challenge from Africa to Europe. It's the same thing from Ibero-America to the United States. People would much rather stay in their own countries if there were jobs, if there were economic development,

Prof. Li Xing: Yes.

Michelle Rasmussen: And if the United States would join with China, then instead of—

Prof. Li Xing: —building the wall! Instead of building the

wall!

Michelle Rasmussen: Exactly, exactly.

Prof. Li Xing: Yeah, I agree with you.

Operation Ibn Sina

Michelle Rasmussen: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the President of the Schiller Institute, has stated that one very important way to lessen the war danger between the United States, Russia and China would be for these countries to join forces to save the people of Afghanistan, where there is the worst humanitarian crisis in the world now, after the war, the drought, and the freezing of Afghanistan's central bank assets by the western countries. She has proposed what she calls Operation Ibn Sina, named after the great physician and philosopher from that region, to build a modern health system in Afghanistan to save the people from disease, and as a lever to stimulate economic development.

I know that when we spoke about Afghanistan before, you also referred to very important discussions now going on in Oslo, for the first time, between the Taliban and Western governments, including in the United States.

But what do you think about this idea of China and the United States, and also Russia and other countries, joining hands to act to alleviate the terrible crisis for the people of Afghanistan?

Prof. Li Xing: It's a superb idea. This is one of the initiatives by the Schiller Institute. When I read your website, you have many development projects, and this one is a great idea. This is one of the areas I mentioned where the U.S. and China have a common interest. Unfortunately, what is happening today is the Ukraine crisis and the China-U.S. rivalry—so many battle fronts—puts Afghanistan more into the background.

Right now, the Taliban delegation is talking with the West in Oslo, and I really hope there will be a constructive result, because after the U.S. withdrew from Afghanistan, Afghanistan's Taliban government immediately went to China. And it was a Chinese interest. It was in China's fundamental interest to help Afghanistan, because if Afghanistan is safe and prosperous, then there will be no terror and terrorism coming from Afghanistan across the border. Many of the terrorists in Xinjiang actually based themselves in Afghanistan. So it is in China's national interest to help Afghanistan.

Right now, I don't know whether it is still in the U.S. interest to help Afghanistan. The U.S. might be tired of that region, because the U.S. lost two trillion dollars in the Afghanistan war, without any positive results. So, I do not know. I cannot tell the what the U.S. politicians' feelings are, but the U.S. holds \$9.5 billion of Afghanistan assets. And I think that money has to be released to help in the country's rebuilding.

And particularly, the Schiller Institute's suggestion of a health care system is the priority. When people are in good health, then people can work, and earn money. When people have a job or have a family, normally, people do not move. According to refugee studies, people normally do not move just because of a shortage. People move because of a situation devastated by war, by climate change, by various crises. Otherwise, people are relatively stable and want to stay in their homeland.

Xinjiang

Michelle Rasmussen: You mentioned Xinjiang again now. Do you have something to say about Xinjiang for people in the West?

Prof. Li Xing: I think that there are a lot of misunderstandings between the West and China, especially the

misunderstanding from the Western side concerning Xinjiang. The other day, I saw a debate at Oxford University between an American former politician and a British former politician, about whether China is a friend or a foe. The American representative put forward the claim that in Xinjiang, we are experiencing what is called genocide. But later, at the end of his discussion, he admitted that there is no genocide, but he deliberately used genocide as a kind of provocation in order to receive attention from the world. The British representative asked if this view caused such a bad misunderstanding, misperception, then why not just give it up?

Do not use genocide. You can criticize China for human rights abuses. You can criticize China for its minority policies, etc. But to deliberately defame China is not a good way. I don't think it's a good way. We also have to be fair.

On the one side, you can criticize China's policy treating problems in the minorities and others. But you have to also condemn terrorist actions because there were a lot of terrorist bomb killings in that region, especially from 2012-2015, around that time.

I was in Xinjiang as a tourist in 2011, and I was advised to not pass by some streets, because there could be some risks. You can see that it was a very tense situation because of a lot of bombings. People pointed out to me, here were some bombings, there were some bombings. You don't understand. So, the West should be fair and condemn these things, while at same time, also advising the Chinese government to develop a more constructive policy to resolve the problem, rather than using harsh policies. It has to be fair. This is the first point.

Second, is that genocide not only defames China, it's also contrary, it's opposite to the facts. Twenty years ago, 30 years ago, Xinjiang's Uighur population was about five million or eight million. But after 30 years, I think it's about 11-13

million. I do not know exactly, but there has been a growth of population. How can you claim genocide, when the local population is increasing? Do you understand my point? So, this is not a good attitude. It is not a very good way to discuss with China and it makes China much more resistant in talking with you, when China fears that it is being defamed.

When some Western sources, in particular one German scholar, use a lot of data from a Turkish scholar, who is connected to the "minority resistance" from Xinjiang, then the credibility, reliability of the source is in question. You understand my point. So, the Xinjiang issue is rather complicated, but the West and China should have a dialogue, rather than use in this specific discourse rhetoric to frame China in a way that China is the bad guy. It should be condemned. I think this is not constructive.

The SWIFT System

Michelle Rasmussen: Going back to the war danger, what do you think the impact on China and on the world economy would be, were the U.S. to force Russia out of the SWIFT international payment system, or similar draconian measures?

Prof. Li Xing: Let me tell you that Olaf Scholz, the current German Chancellor, already expressed it very well, saying that if Russia were sanctioned and pushed out of the SWIFT payment system, then Europe could not pay Russia for its gas and oil. "If we can't pay Russia, then Russia will not supply us. Then what should we do?"

I read in the news today that the U.S. said, "We could supply most of Russia's oil and gas." Then Europe began to ponder: "Well then, this war has become your war, you know—a very egoistical interest, because you actually want to replace Russia's gas and oil supply. That's why you want to instigate the war."

So, I think it's the U.S. that has to be very cautious in its

sanctions, because the only sanctions possibilities for the United States today against major powers is financial, is payment—it's the U.S. dollar. That's the intermediate currency, the SWIFT system.

And when China sees this, that only strengthened China's conclusion to develop what we call electronic currency. China is using a lot of energy today investing in electronic currency. This electronic currency is a real currency. It's just electronic. It's being implemented in some big cities in test trials.

Then, back to the SWIFT system, [if a country were thrown out] it would be rather impossible or would rather create a lot of problems in the international payment system, then the whole system will more or less collapse, because most countries watch this, and they will try to think about how they should react in the future if the U.S. uses the same system of sanctions against them. I just mentioned China, but also many other countries as well. They have to find an alternative.

One other alternative is to use currencies other than the U.S. dollar as much as possible. I just read in the news today that the Chinese yuan has surpassed the Japanese yen as the fourth international [reserve] currency. And the situation will accelerate in that direction. So, I think that the U.S. should think twice.

On China-Russia relations, I definitely think that China will help Russia in case the U.S. really implements a sanction of pushing Russia out of the SWIFT payment system. China definitely will help Russia, because both face the same pressure, the same struggle, the same robbery from the U.S.

So, it is very bad. It is extremely bad strategy from the U.S. side to fight, simultaneously, on two fronts with two superpowers. This is what Henry Kissinger had said many times during the entire Cold War period. The U.S. was able to keep

relatively stable relations between U.S. and China and between U.S. and the Soviet Union, keeping the Russia and China fighting against each other. But now it's the opposite situation. The U.S. is fighting with two big powers simultaneously. I don't know what is in the mind of the U.S. politicians. I really think that the U.S. needs to redesign its strategic foreign policy.

The Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: Yeah. We've been speaking mostly about the U.S., but the British really are an instigator in this: the British Old Empire policy of trying to drive a wedge between the United States, Russia and China. That also has a lot to do with the current situation. We spoke before about that the Schiller Institute is trying to get the United States' population to understand that the whole basis for the existence of the United States was the fight against the British Empire, and against this divide and conquer strategy, and, rather, to cooperate with Russia and China.

In conclusion, this conversation has been very wonderful. Do you have any parting words for our audience? We have many people in Europe and in the United States. Do you have any parting words of advice as to how we should look at China and what needs to be different about our policy?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I think that I want my last words, actually, to be invested in talking about the Schiller Institute. I think that some of your programs, some of your projects, and some of your applications are really interesting. The Schiller Institute has a lot of ideas. For example, you just mentioned your campaign for an Afghanistan health care system, but not only in Afghanistan. You promote these ideas for Africa, in developing countries. I really think that the Schiller Institute should continue to promote some of the ideas—a health care system in every country, especially now, considering the pandemic. The rich countries,

including China, are able to produce vaccines, but not the developing countries. The U.S. has more vaccine doses stored up than necessary [for itself]. But Africa still has only a very low percentage of people [who have been vaccinated].

Michelle Rasmussen: I think 8%.

Prof. Li Xing: And we claim the Omicron variant of the coronavirus came from Africa. That's an irony. That's an irony, because it's definite that one day, another variation will come from Latin America, or from some other part of the world.

So, it's rather important for the West, and for China, to think about some of the positive suggestions by your Institute. I'm glad that you invited me for this interview, and I expect to have more cooperation with you. Thank you very much.

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing.

**Formand Tom Gillesbergs
respons til JP's
coronavirustegning:
I stedet for Jyllands-Postens
konfliktskabende
provokationer,**

Lad os samarbejde med Kina for at forsvare menneskeheden

29. januar 2020 – Jyllands-Postens tegning af det kinesiske flag, med coronavirus i stedet for stjerner, er ikke bare dårlig smag eller manglende pli. Det er en hånlige og åbenlys tilsmudsning af det kinesiske flag, og bliver derfor af mange kinesere over hele verden betragtet som en fornærmelse mod Kina som nation og hele det kinesiske folk. Jyllands-Posten burde om nogen have lært, at hvis man laver provokerende tegninger, så er det ikke nødvendigvis en vigtig del af "en kamp for ytringsfriheden", men kan lige såvel være med til at sætte en destruktiv og konfliktskabende dagsorden, der ikke skaber noget godt, men kun ødelægger.

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

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

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

Dernæst bør de danske medier fortælle om den endnu vigtigere kamp, som Kina har indledt på menneskehedens vegne, i form af Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, også kendt som Den Nye Silkevej, hvor Kina samarbejder med indtil nu 176 andre nationer om at sikre hele verden adgang til moderne infrastruktur og en tilhørende industrialisering – et verdensomspændende projekt der allerede er mange gange større end Marshallhjælpen efter 2. verdenskrig, og som kan udrydde sult og fattigdom over hele verden, i lighed med hvad Kina allerede har gjort gennem at løfte 850 millioner ud af dyb fattigdom derhjemme – en tilgang, der også kan løse problemerne i Sydvestasien (Mellemøsten) og Afrika.

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

Med venlig hilsen

Tom Gillesberg

Formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6.
september 2018:
53 afrikanske lande kommer**

**til Beijing for at
samarbejde med Kina om at
bygge fremtiden.
Se også 2. del.: diskussion.
Klik her.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video 1. del:

Video 2. del, diskussion:

Lyd:

Xi Jinping, den æstetiske opdragelse og Afrika – og Vestens dybe moralske krise

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den 1. september 2018

Medens den politiske elite i Europa stadig er af den opfattelse, at den er i besiddelse af den eneste saliggørende visdom, hvad de "vestlige værdiers" overlegenhed angår, så har stadig flere såkaldte "almindelige borgere" for længst bemærket, at der eksisterer en stadig dybere kløft mellem politikernes og mediernes officielle fremstilling og den virkelighed, der fremtræder inden for livets forskellige områder. Mange har en anelse om, at mediernes negative

fremstilling af Kina og Den nye Silkevej måske også er Fake News. Rent faktisk har vi med de såkaldte "vestlige værdier" og konceptet om "Den nye Silkevej" at gøre med to helt forskellige værdibegreber og med helt forskellige menneskeopfattelser.

Efter at Kina for godt ti år siden, og endnu stærkere i de sidste fem år, har engageret sig i talrige infrastrukturprojekter inden for rammerne af dets silkevejs-initiativ. Blandt andet har Kina opført jernbanelinjer, industriparker, vandkraftværker og industrialiseret landbrug i Afrika. Mange afrikanske statschefer såvel som deres befolkninger er blevet grebet af en helt ny selvbevidsthed: De ser for første gang en realistisk chance for at overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling inden for en overskuelig fremtid. Takket være den kinesiske hjælp har en hel række afrikanske stater sat sig det mål, at opnå en rigtigt god levestandard for hele deres befolkning i en overskuelig fremtid.

Forud for FOCAC-topmødet (Forum on China-Africa Cooperation), hvortil 53 afrikanske stats- og regeringschefer ventes, udtrykte Ghanas ambassadør i Kina, Edward Boateng, i en kommentar i Global Times sin begejstring for den nye silkevejs ånd, som har grebet Afrika. "Kineserne er overbeviste om, at det er muligt for et land som Ghana at forvandle sig til en moderne, teknologisk udviklet økonomi inden for en halv generation." Boateng har i løbet af det år, han har tilbragt i Kina, besøgt mere end 16 provinser og mange byer for at studere følgerne af "det kinesiske økonomiske mirakel" og har draget følgende konklusion i Global Times: "Jeg tror, at Ghana kan benytte Kina som et spejl for, hvordan vi selv kan slå ind på en tilsvarende succesrig udvikling. Her fremhæver jeg især, at Kina har forvandlet sig til et betydende økonomisk og teknologisk kraftcenter, samtidig med at det har været i stand til at bevare klare aspekter af sin rige kultur." Boateng understregede, at den menneskelige kapital, en udbredt disciplin, en samvittighedsfuld måde at løse problemer på for

alle områder, utrættelig fornyelse, økonomisk vækst og udbygningen af infrastruktur har medvirket dertil. En disciplineret vilje til at løse opgaverne samt tillid til de traditionelle kulturelle og humanistiske værdier hører med til den åndsholdning, som Ghana i høj grad kan lade sig inspirere af. Han mindede om, at Ghana var det første afrikanske land, der afkastede kolonialismens åg, og at dets første præsident, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, var fader til den panafrikanisme, der har indgravet sig dybt i Afrikas og afrikanernes bevidsthed.

Vestens kolonialistiske tankegang

Selvfølgelig havde europæerne længe kunnet udvikle det afrikanske kontinents infrastruktur og industri, sådan som Kina har gjort det i de sidste ti år. Det, der hindrede dem i det, var den fortsatte kolonialistiske tankegang, sådan som den kom til udtryk i IMF's brutale lånekrav og Verdensbankens udviklingsundertrykkende politik. Medens Kina og de afrikanske stater understreger deres dybtgående gensidige venskab, synes de få europæere, der er vågnet op i anledning af de gennemgribende ændringer i Afrika, i bedste fald at bekymre sig om, hvordan Kina og andre asiatiske lande sikrer sig adgang til Afrikas råstoffer.

Den tyske udviklingsminister Müller kritiserede under sin sidste afrikarejse, der førte ham gennem syv lande, EU's og den tyske regerings afrikapolitik, der hidtil kun har bestået i at opføre mure mod flygtningene: "I de næste ti år vil der blive bygget mere i Afrika end i hele Europa i løbet af de sidste hundrede år", understregede Müller. I Mozambique så han, hvilke store ressourcer dette kontinent rummede; kineserne, Indien, Japan og amerikanerne var her allerede, kun tyskerne var her ikke, men havde ladet de mange muligheder ligge.

Forbundskansler Merkel, der på samme tid besøgte Senegal, Nigeria og Ghana, hvor hun mødte Müller, fik efter et møde med Ghanas præsident Nana Akufo-Addo en pludselig erkendelse af,

at EU kun ville kunne få en velhavende fremtid, hvis man kunne "styre" indvandringsproblemet og problemet med et partnerskab med Afrika; hun troede ikke, at EU's sammenhold kunne garanteres på nogen anden måde.

Og nu må man se, hvad denne "styring" vil sige konkret, og om den går ud over den hidtidige kyniske politik med aftaler med afrikanske regeringer om stop for indvandringen og opførsel af lejre, som allerede pave Frans har sammenlignet med koncentrationslejre. Der er ikke meget godt at vente fra det nyeste forslag fra den tyske regerings medarbejder for afrikanske anliggender, Günter Nooke, der i fuld alvor foreslår en ny form for kolonialisme (Reuters, 29.8): "Hvorfor laver man ikke særlige udviklingszoner i de lande, hvor staterne afgiver deres suverænitæt for 50 år og for eksempel giver EU lov til at fastsætte investeringsrammerne for udenlandske firmaer?"

Endnu mere uhyrlig er en artikel i Bayernkurier den 26. august "På vej mod Eurafrika", der hovedsageligt efterplapper de absolut skræmmende teser i Stephen Smiths nyeste bog 'La Ruée vers L'Europe' (Storm mod Europa: Det unge Afrika på vej mod det gamle kontinent). Afrika oplever nu den "voldsomste befolkningstilvækst" og et "ungdomsoverskud". Med deres udviklingshjælp "skyder de rige lande sig selv i benene", citeres der fra Smith, "idet de hjælper de fattige lande med at opnå den bølge af velstand, der overhovedet gør det muligt for dem at drage af sted, så de opmuntres blot til udvandringen." For "tilbagevendingen til protektoraterne" (ligesom Nooke også kræver det), som han opfatter som den eneste mulighed til at afværge "migrant-stormfloden", anbefaler han EU's begyndende aftaler med afrikanske "diktatorer". Øjensynligt finder Bayernkurier sig ikke for god til her knap syv uger før delstatsvalget at ophidse helt i Björn Höckes ånd. Altså med andre ord: Udviklingshjælp for ikke at tale om investeringer afskaffes, menneskene bør forblive fattige og dø hurtigst muligt. Og med disse

“kristelige værdier” prøver Bayernkurier altså at hjælpe CSU med valget!

Noget helt andet fremgår fra Xinhua, Kinas førende nyhedsbureau, der den 31. august som dagens vigtigste nyhed meddelte, at præsident Xi Jinping i et brev til professorerne for det kinesiske akademi for de skønne kunster (CAPA), understregede den æstetiske opdragelses betydning for ungdommens fysiske og åndelige udvikling. Den æstetiske opdragelse spiller en vigtig rolle i udformningen af en smuk ånd og en smuk sjæl. Og selv om den skinverden, som de vigtigste medier i Tyskland søger at opretholde, ikke har nogen anelse om det: Verden bevæger sig med hurtige skridt i den retning, som Lyndon LaRouche og den med ham forbundne association har stræbt at virkeliggøre i årtier. Således virkeliggør Kina nu den politik, som vi offentliggjorde allerede i 1980 om Afrikas industrialisering og siden har præsenteret på mange konferencer, blandt andet under BüSo's delstatsvalgkamp i 2009 med sloganet: “Hessens fremtid ligger i Afrika!” 1)

Og præsident Xis betoning af den æstetiske opdragelse beviser også rigtigheden af denne forfatters påstand fra en tale i New York i april 2017 om, at der er et nært slægtskab mellem menneskebilledet og den æstetiske opdragelsesmetode hos Konfucius og Friedrich Schiller 2) Forskellen består i, at Kina holder sin klassiske tradition højt, medens vi her i Tyskland har fjernet os langt fra vor klassiske humanistiske kultur. Men måske er det ikke for sent endnu – vi må lade Nikolaus af Kues, Kepler, Leibniz, Beethoven, Schiller, von Humboldt, for blot at nævne nogle få, blive levende i vore unges sjæl og ånd og lægge større vægt på deres æstetiske opdragelse end på deres karriere, på at tjene mest muligt og på at tilfredsstille alle deres lyster lige her og nu. Og dersom De, ærede læser, måtte dele denne opfattelse, så bør De blive aktiv i BüSo (Schillerinstitutet).

Bemærkninger:

1. Se <https://solidaritaet.com/neuesol/2008/52/hessen.htm>
2. Se <https://solidaritaet.com/neuesol/2017/17/hzl.htm>

NYHEDSORIENTERING AUGUST 2018:

**Skriv under! Appel for et nyt
Bretton Woods kreditsystem;
Lederne for USA, Rusland,
Kina og Indien må handle!**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Omgivet af mange farer, hold

fokus på at muliggøre et 'Nyt Bretton Woods'-system

Leder fra LaRouche PAC d. 23. august (EIRNS) – Der er mange farer i Verden lige nu. Der er den verserende økonomiske krise, som er meget værre end i 2008. Der er det forværrede forhold mellem USA og Kina, toldkonflikten taget i betragtning, og det kinesiske synspunkt, at motivationen bag konflikten er at begrænse Kinas mulighed for at blive verdens ledende inden for visse højteknologiske områder inden 2025. Og der er det fortsatte britiske angreb på det amerikanske præsidentskab med Robert Muellers Trumpgate og Russiagate.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche uddybede disse og andre farer i hendes ugentlige strategiske Schiller Institut webcast i dag, og bemærkede om de britisk skabte beskidte anti-Trump-operationer, at "den eneste gode ting er, at Trump hidtil har holdt hovedet koldt." Men alle former for udenrigspolitiske spørgsmål går i skuddermudder, og det er naturligvis en yderst farlig situation."

Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede folk til at handle og fokusere på det højeste niveau af den politik, der kræves. Hun sagde: "Det store spørgsmål er, hvordan kan man tage fat på [disse farlige processer] på en sådan måde, at hele diskussionen løftes til et højere niveau? Derfor har Schiller Instituttet udsendt en appel, der opfordrer til et Nyt Bretton Woods, og især appellerer til de fire ledere i USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – nemlig Trump, Putin, Xi Jinping og Prime Minister Modi – om, at de grundlæggende set straks enes om at løse dette problem, komme faren for et finansielt krak i forkøbet ved at gå tilbage til et Nyt Bretton Woods, fastkurssystem, og etablere et nyt kreditsystem for at formidle samarbejdet i forbindelse med det nye paradigme og samarbejdet med Bælt- og Vejinitiativet.

“Er det så realistisk? Nuvel, jeg tror det. Fordi Rusland, Kina og Indien allerede har et meget stærkt samarbejde i denne henseende. Og Trump har med sine indledende skridt i forhold til Kina og sit venskab med Xi Jinping vist, at han er i stand til at gå i denne retning, og også hans bestræbelser på at forbedre forholdet til Rusland, og især hans møde med Putin i Helsinki, viser disse muligheder. Og det er derfor, at dette vanvid fra det politiske etablissement [for at fortrænge Trump] er så utroligt hysterisk, fordi de ser dette potentiale.”

I diskussionen om ideen om et Nyt Bretton Woods i internationale kredse, er der allerede dem i Japan, som mener, at denne nation burde give sin fulde støtte til dette initiativ.

Italien bevæger sig meget dramatisk i tråd med ideen om at tilslutte sig Kina for at starte fælles udviklingsarbejde. Zepp-LaRouche beskrev dette som “en meget forfriskende udvikling, fordi den nye italienske finansminister, Giovanni Tria, har en delegation i Kina. Og der er en anden delegation ledet af Michele Geraci, vicehandelsministeren, og han annoncerede dannelsen af en sådan kinesisk arbejdsstyrke, med det formål, ikke bare passivt at se på hvad der foregår, men at holde trit med forandringen af innovation og teknologi i Asien og især Kina.” Og der er også andre lande, der er i gang.

Zepp-LaRouche opsummerede: “Jeg ved ikke hvad der vil ske længere hen ad vejen, men vi organiserer for at få alle de europæiske lande og USA til at samarbejde med det nye paradigme, og vi behøver naturligvis at få mange folk til at forstå, at menneskeheden har nået et punkt, hvor civilisationens udryddelse kan være meget tæt på, hvis vi fortsætter med det geopolitiske hysteri. Så folk skal vågne op og virkelig forstå, at der ikke er nogen grund til, at verdens største magter ikke kan eller ikke bør samarbejde om at overvinde fattigdom ved at overvinde underudvikling. Når nu

USA stadig har mange lommer med livsbetingelser som et uland – hvis man tager til Alabama eller Tennessee eller nogle af disse sydlige stater, finder man områder, der minder om Den tredje Verden! På samme måde hvis man tager Tyskland: Et såkaldt rigt land, som har 4,4 millioner fattige børn, og dette tal er stigende! I Grækenland har EU's nedskæringspolitik halveret finansieringen af sundhedsudgifter, og 25.000 arbejdspladser i sundhedssektoren blev fjernet, da Trojkaen begyndte at ødelægge dette land.

Se, sammenlign nu dette med den absolut utrolige rekord for Kina, som i 1978 havde omkring 97,8 % af alle mennesker i de fattige landdistrikter; og i de sidste 40 år, eller 39 år, er lykkedes med at få 740 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom. Den samlede fattigdomsrate i Kina for indeværende er 3,1 %, og de ønsker at udrydde fattigdommen helt og hæve levestandarden for disse mennesker inden 2020, således at der ingen fattigdom er tilbage i Kina.

Så folk burde ikke blive så absolut hysteriske, men de bør se på fakta: Måske gør Kina noget rigtigt, hvilket det neoliberale monetaristiske system gør forkert! Og Kina tilbyder nu sin egen model for økonomisk transformation og deler denne oplevelse, for eksempel med Afrika. Der kommer i starten af september en meget stor konference, der involverer Kina og, tror jeg, alle statsoverhoveder i Afrika, og det blev netop meddelt, at dette vil blive overværet af Xi Jinping. Og at han der vil bekendtgøre nye initiativer mellem Kina og Afrika; mange, mange områder af fælles videnskab, fælles uddannelse, og mange andre nye ting.

Der er to dynamikker: Den ene er udvikling og samarbejde, og den anden er konfrontation med faren for krig.”

POLITISK ORIENTERING: Den gamle verdensorden disintegrerer – BRIKS og det nye paradigme vinder frem
Se også 2. del (30 min)

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video 1. del:

Video 2. del:

Lyd:

**POLITISK ORIENTERING:
Før Trump-Putin møde:
Schiller Instituttets**

konference markerer overgang til det nye paradigme. Se også diskussionen.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video, indlæg:

Video, diskussion:

Lyd:

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:
Motsætningernes sammenfald
– Morgendagens verden.
Schiller Instituttets
Internationale
konference, 30. juni, 2018,**

Tyskland

Hvis alle europæiske nationer ville gå sammen med Kina, Indien, Japan og også USA og gøre alt dette sammen med de afrikanske stater, der ønsker at blive en del af et sådant forceret program, og annoncere det som en fælles forpligtelse, kunne vi vende flygtningekrisen omkring. Men denne fremgangsmåde kræver en passioneret kærlighed til menneskeheden; præcis, som premierminister Abiy Ahmed fra Etiopien for nylig sagde under et masse møde med en halv million mennesker, kort tid, før han blev udsat for et attentatforsøg; han sagde, »Den eneste måde at gå fremefter på, væk fra al denne historie, er tilgivelse og kærlighed. Hævn er for de svage. Og fordi etiopiere ikke er svage, har vi ikke bug for hævn. Vi vil vinde med kærlighed«.

Så lad os handle ligeså. Verden befinder sig i en utrolig oprørstilstand. Det er meget kompliceret, og jeg mener ikke, at problemerne vil blive løst ved at have en zillion delvise løsninger. Vi har brug for et højere fornuftsgrundlag, som vil forene hele menneskeheden. Jeg mener, vi har nået vejs ende for en epoke, enden på geopolitik. Og vi må nå frem til det Nye Paradigme, hvor vi tænker i banerne for coincidentia oppositorum; det, Xi Jinping har kaldt et »fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid«. Hvis Europa er villig til at overleve, vil vi organisere de europæiske lande til at gå med i denne indsats.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Store forandringer kan blive ved at komme; Trump og Xi kan løse både handel og immigration

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. juni, 2018 – Det netop afsluttede topmøde i Singapore har allerede ændret relationerne mellem nationer i Asien til det bedre og vist præsident Donald Trumps usædvanlige lederskabsevner og bør ændre europæernes og amerikanernes syn på, hvad der er muligt. Den meget reelle mulighed for et snarligt topmøde mellem præsidenterne Trump og Putin, som er absolut afgørende for, at der kan komme en afslutning af 15 års konstante krigskatastrofer i Sydvestasien og Nordafrika, vokser nu frem. Og der kan komme endnu flere »game-changers« – ingen krisesituation er i øjeblikket fastlåst, hvis borgere og ledere vil gå optimistisk frem for fred og gensidig økonomisk udvikling.

Dette er frem for alt en tid, hvor mange burde gå sammen med os i Schiller Instituttet og LaRouche Political Action Committee (i USA), begge organisationer, der i årtier, siden Berlinmurens fald (1989), har været fakkeltænder for et »nyt paradigme« for økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt og fred. Det, der finder sted i Asien gennem den Nye Silkevej og Korea-topmøderne, kan »bryde ud« i Europa og USA, hvis der findes beslutsomme ledere for samarbejde mellem stormagtssamarbejde – som præsident Trump har vist, at han er.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches appel om et EU-topmøde i næste uge, der rent faktisk løser den derværende migrantkrise – gennem, at europæere går sammen med Kina i den økonomiske udvikling af

Afrika – cirkuleres nu internationalt på mange sprog; og nu er den samme løsning blevet foreslået i den kinesiske avis *Global Times*. Zepp-LaRouches appel, »Der skrives nu historie i Asien: EU-topmødet må følge Singapores eksempel!« bør uddeles vidt og bredt for at blive det, der udløser handling, og handling nu.

USA må undgå en handelskrig med Kina, skadelig importtold på dets landbrugssektor, samt mere – det må undgå atter at blive politisk polariseret over immigration fra Latinamerika. Det er nemt nok for Demokraterne at skandalisere for at rejse midler og håbe på at vinde valg. Og det er nemt nok for Republikanere at udskyde og opføre sig oprørt i offentligheden. De ved begge, at de ikke foreslår nogen løsning, ingen duelig politik.

Men der findes en løsning, der bryder de statiske regler for partipolitik og geopolitik.

Præsidenten kan forhandle en undgåelse af handelskrig ved at aftale med Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, at de to nationer i fællesskab vil udvikle Latinamerika gennem kreditudstedelse til store, nye infrastrukturprojekter og agro-industriell udvikling. Med andre ord, gå med i, og bringe ind, Bælte & Vej. Det er det eneste grundlag for, at masse-immigration til USA, der er udløst af desperation, kan fjernes.

Men der er flere fordele: USA's eksport af højteknologi vil begynde. USA's eksport til Kina vil stige. Det multinationale forsikringsselskab ING har netop udgivet en forudsigelse, der siger, at Bælte & Vej initiativet vil øge den globale handel med 12-15 %; og endnu mere mht. handel mellem lande direkte på den Nye Silkevejs transportkorridorer. Hvem har brug for importtold?

Principperne i Helga Zepp-LaRouches appel til handling er simpelt hen principperne for Singapore-topmødet: Fortiden determinerer ikke fremtiden. »Regler for afgrænsning«, der har holdt kriser fastfrosset i årtier, gælder ikke. Og siden

præsident Trump har engageret USA i Asien, hvor der nu skabes historie, er løsninger til kriser overalt mulige.

Det, der nu er brug for, som Helga sagde, er mennesker til at gennemføre disse løsninger.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump og førstedame Melania Trump besøger Kina. 10. november, 2017. (Official White House Photo by Andrea Hanks)

Helga Zepp-LaRouches appel om et EU-Kina-Afrika-topmøde præsenteret på international akademisk Asienkonference i København

København, 18. juni, 2018 – Den 10. Asian Dynamics Initiative konference blev i dag afholdt i København. Den første hovedtaler var departementschef i Danmarks Udenrigsministerium Ulrik Vestergaard Knudsen, der talte om »Danmarks Asienpolitik«. Hans tale og den efterfølgende diskussion blev streamet live til asiatiske akademikere i hele verden. Schiller Instituttets repræsentant stillede det andet spørgsmål, som indledtes med præsident for Schiller Instituttet Helga Zepp-LaRouches erklæring om, at topmødet mellem USA og Nordkorea havde været muligt pga. den Nye Silkevejsånd. Europa befinder sig i en krise pga. flygtningene, økonomien og politikken, og vi kræver en ændring af dagsordenen for det forestående EU-topmøde til at blive et EU-Kina-topmøde, for at diskutere den økonomiske udvikling af

Afrika. Vil den danske regering støtte dette?

Efter først blot at have sagt »Nej«, og derefter spurgt, hvorfor ikke? sagde departementschef Vestergaard Knudsen [parafrase], og man ikke bare kan ændre dagsordenen for et annonceret topmøde, at der er andre muligheder for EU-Kina-forhandlinger, men, hvis du spørger, om jeg mener, at samarbejde mellem EU og Kina er en god idé, er svaret ja. Et EU-Kina-Afrika-topmøde ville være muligt, men man må sikre, at »resultater« bliver forberedt på forhånd.

Desværre talte den næste hovedtaler, den tyske professor dr. Hermann Kreutzmann, en ekspert i det bjergrige område i grænseegnen mellem Kirgisistan, Tadsjikistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan og Kina, imod Bælte & Vej Initiativet og CPEC (Kina-Pakistan økonomiske korridor) og sagde, at nationerne bliver håbløst forgældet og aldrig vil kunne tilbagebetale lånene og afviste det kinesiske argument, at infrastrukturinvesteringer kan tilbagebetales takket være den forøgede økonomiske vækst, der følger af dem. Han sagde også, at, f.eks., folk i de højtbeliggende ørkenområder sagde, de foretrak af bo i jordhytter frem for de moderne boliger, kineserne bygger til dem.

I pauserne gik Schiller Instituttets repræsentant fra bord til bord og uddelte Zepp-LaRouches erklæring til omkring 50 mennesker – næsten alle deltagerne – og debatterede den Nye Silkevejspolitik med mange af dem.

Den **danske version af Zepp-LaRouches appel** kan læses på vores hjemmeside og bliver udsendt til folketingets medlemmer og kommunalpolitikere og til vores e-mail.-liste (Nyhedsbrev) tirsdag, 19. juni.

Et ekko af Helga Zepp-LaRouches EU-topmøde-appel i Kinas Global Times

18. juni, 2018 – Den kinesiske avis *Global Times* udgav i dag en kronik, *Neocolonial Europe Behind Aquarius' Fate* (*Neokoloniale Europa bag Aquarius' skæbne*), om EU-krisen over afrikansk migration. Den italienske forfatter, Orazio Maria Gnerre, kender Lyndon og Helga LaRouches arbejde. Hans slutafsnit indeholder vigtige elementer af Helga Zepp-LaRouches appel fra 16. juni om, at et samarbejde mellem EU og Kina omkring udviklingen af de afrikanske nationaløkonomier bør være emnet på EU-topmødet 28.-29. juni – »Princippet fra Singapore-topmødet«.

Gnerre skrev, »De simple løsninger, som de to sider, regeringen og oppositionen, fremlægger, er imidlertid desværre ikke passende. Blokade af havne vil være nytteløst, hvis afrikanske lande fortsat er underudviklede i økonomiske og overstrukturelle termer og vil fortsætte med at være krigsskuepladser. Det er ikke muligt at eksportere alle Afrikas indvånere, hverken til Italien eller til Europa, i betragtning de blotte demografiske dimensioner.

Løsningen, som de europæiske vælgere og partier ikke synes at kunne få øje på, bør involvere en afslutning af Europas neokoloniale fratagelse af ejendomsret i det afrikanske område og måske komme frem til en fælles, økonomisk relation mellem selve Europa og Afrika efter den gode model, som Kina gennemfører i Centralafrika. En sådan udvikling, der ikke er aggressivt udnyttende eller politisk anmassende, kunne lægge fundamentet til fremtiden for et helt kontinent, der alt for ofte har været offer for Vestens aggressive kapitalisme.«

Gnerre har fået tilsendt Helga Zepp-LaRouches fulde

appelskrift for den Europæiske Unions topmøde af særlig karakter, og det samme har mange personer omkring den nye, italienske regering, for hvem dette er et absolut afgørende spørgsmål.

Foto: Orazio Maria Gnerre (t.h.). Foto fra 2015.