

# Transnational Foundations udtalelse om folkemordet i Gaza

Nedenstående er oversat af Schiller Institutet.

**Transnational Foundation for Freds- og Fremtidsforsknings  
(TFF) udtalelse om folkedrabet i Gaza.**

**TFF-associerede**

Lund, Sverige – 17. december 2023

**Linket til udtalelse på TFF's hjemmeside.**

Mens den brutale nedslagtning i Gaza udfolder sig i stadig mere forfærdende omfang, føler vi, som en erfaren forskningsfond for fredelig konfliktløsning og fredsskabelse siden 1986, trang til at bidrage med vores analytiske pointer, synspunkter og konstruktive ideer til konfliktløsning.

TFF ønsker desuden at stå frem med denne erklæring, så historikerne, når de ser tilbage på denne moralske katastrofe, kan se, hvem der stod sammen med hvem, og hvem der opfordrede til fred i stedet for det igangværende folkemord.

Drabene må stoppe, og vi opfordrer sammen med FN og utallige andre til en øjeblikkelig og betingelsesløs våbenhvile.

Hamas' forfærdelige angreb den 7. oktober 2023, hvor over 1100 mennesker blev dræbt, kan ikke forsvares. Der er ingen undskyldning for drab på helt uskyldige mennesker. Selvom der er en smertefuld historie med 75 års brutal besættelse og apartheidregime mod det palæstinensiske folk, er der ingen retfærdiggørelse for en sådan meningsløs voldshandling.

Men Israels reaktion kan på ingen måde ses som udøvelse af retten til selvforsvar. Det er en massakre på civile,

hovedsageligt kvinder og børn, helt ude af proportioner, udført af militæret i den mest totalitære og racistiske regering, Israel nogensinde har haft, siden det blev etableret. Det er en morderisk hævn uden fortilfælde. Det er folkedrab.

På trods af den stærkeste fordømmelse fra FN, på trods af generalsekretærens hidtil usete opfordringer, fortsætter Israel med sin systematiske, højteknologiske nedslagtning, og de vestlige regeringer forholder sig tavse eller erklærer, som Tyskland, deres "urokkelige støtte til Israel". EU's ledere erklærede straks, at "Europa" "står sammen med Israel." USA stemte imod en våbenhvile.

Det er hjerteskrærende og smertefuldt ud over alle grænser at hjælpeløst se denne massakre udfolde sig.

Efter to måneder er dette fakta:

> 7.900 børn bombet sønder og sammen, hundredvis af dem fanget under murbrokkerne, tusindvis af børn lemlæstet, en hel ung generation traumatiseret på livstid.

> 17.500 døde. Grædende læger på fuldstændigt dysfunktionelle hospitaler, der opererer uden bedøvelse.

> Titusindvis af menneskers hjem i ruiner, 24 ud af 36 hospitaler, skoler, moskeer, biblioteker, det smukke universitet i Gaza – ødelagt, jævnet med jorden.

> 1,9 millioner ud af 2,2 millioner mennesker tvunget ud af deres hjem og ud på gaden, bevidst udsultet for mad, vand og lægehjælp, fanget under tiltagende bombardementer uden nogen mulighed for at flygte – det er en krigsforbrydelse af uhyrlige proportioner.

> Mere end 100 FN-medarbejdere og over 60 journalister og mediefolk er blevet dræbt, 54 af dem palæstinensere.

Men selvom store dele af Israel og mange af de vestlige

regeringer synes at være forblændet af tanken om jødernes og Israels evige offerrolle, kan det ikke bruges som en lige så evig undskyldning for enhver grusomhed. Heldigvis viser hundredtusinder af jøder i og uden for Israel i utvetydige vendinger, at dette ikke foregår på deres vegne.

Hundredvis af jøder med kippaer fyldte New York Central Station allerede tre uger efter begyndelsen af den tvungne udvandring af 1 million palæstinensere og den efterfølgende nedslagning og blokerede hele stationen i timevis, alle i sorte t-shirts med store bogstaver "Denne jøde er for øjeblikkelig våbenhvile". Og de bliver ved med at protestere.

35 jødisk-palæstinensiske organisationer i Israel opfordrer til en betingelsesløs våbenhvile, og International Jewish Voice for Peace hæver sine stemmer overalt i verden.

Hundredvis af rabbinere over hele verden, også i Israel, har fordømt de uhørte drab og opfordrer til en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile.

Det er ikke meget, man læser om det i de vestlige massemedier, og heller ikke om de millioner af andre mennesker verden over, som viser deres solidaritet med det palæstinensiske folk.

Amnesty International fordømte Israel i utvetydige vendinger, og Sikkerhedsrådet opfordrede næsten enstemmigt til en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile – hvilket kun USA skamfuldt nedlagde veto imod.

WHO kritiserede Israel og opfordrede til en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile.

I mellemtiden siger premierminister Netanyahu gentagne gange, at han ikke vil lade sig rokke: "krigen mod Hamas" (de vestlige mediers vildledende fortælling om folkemordet) vil fortsætte. Palæstina eksisterede ikke på det kort over det nye Mellemøsten, som han viste i FN.

Den israelske regering bør med alle til rådighed stående midler isoleres, indtil den stopper folkemordet. Dens politiske og militære ledere skal stilles til ansvar for de forfærdelige forbrydelser mod menneskeheden og bringes for retten. Det, der er på spil, er styrken af international lov, flere konventioner og FN's charter.

Alle lande, der har leveret og fortsat leverer de militære midler, der muliggør denne umoralske, ulovlige og barbariske politik, skal ses som medskyldige og ligeledes stilles til ansvar. Uden den fortsatte militære og politiske støtte fra USA og de vestlige stater, især Tyskland – som har tidoblet sine våbenleverancer siden den 23. oktober – ville denne forfærdelige krig og ulovlige besættelse snart være ophørt.

Der er ingen tvivl om, at dette vil give bagslag for Israel og Vesten.

Hele verden ser med rædsel og afsky på de vestlige staters nedslagtning og samarbejde. De "førende nationers" arrogance og deres påstand om at handle i demokratiets, frihedens og menneskerettighedernes navn – såvel som deres "regelbaserede internationale orden" – er hurtigt ved at falde fra hinanden.

Hvordan kan vi bevæge os i retning af langsigtet fred?

– Vi tror stadig på, at jøder og palæstinensere kan leve sammen – og det gør mange af dem også selv. Selv under chokerende forhold insisterer folk og organisationer på begge sider stadig på, at deres liv er uløseligt forbundet, og at fredelig sameksistens er mulig.

Det vil være en lang og smertefuld vej at få dette til at ske – og det vil kun være muligt med lige rettigheder for alle.

Og det vil kræve et enormt pres udefra og en ikke-voldelig revolution indefra at ændre Israel til et retfærdigt, menneskerettigheds- og lovrespekterende sandt demokrati.

– Vi er nødt til at se på hele Mellemøsten som en region – vi har brug for dens tætte netværk af økonomiske, kulturelle og politiske bånd til at oprette en konfliktløsningsmekanisme for hele regionen i stil med OSCE. På den måde kan alle parter over flere år føre en dialog om noget, de kan leve med på lang sigt.

Der er mange mulige elementer – bind fred sammen med økonomiske og politiske mekanismer og relationer; tænk på kantoner og autonomier; tænk på gensidigt fordelagtig/samarbejdende brug af territorier; tænk på relationerne mellem det hele og resten af verden, herunder det Globale Syd. Bind det sammen med Kinas Bælte- og Vej-initiativ, BRI.

Krigsførelse kræver hverken intellekt eller kreativitet; fredsskabelse kræver begge dele.

– Volden må ophøre, hvis vi skal bevæge os i retning af en sådan civiliseret proces. Vi har brug for en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile.

Ideelt set har vi brug for en omfattende FN-mission til at afvæbne Israel og Hamas i en sådan grad, at ingen af dem kan genstarte en krig. Herefter skal alle de gode kræfter rundt om i verden, statslige, men i endnu højere grad ikke-statslige, hjælpe med at mægle, rådgive og føre dialog om alle detaljer: Hvad frygter de mange parter, og hvad ønsker de?

Og så – til sidst, efter år med en sådan fredsskabende proces – ville parterne komme til et endeligt forhandlingsbord og derefter underskrive en aftale om fredelig sameksistens med alle dens civile og militære modaliteter.

– Konfliktløsning betyder at løse problemer, der står mellem parterne. Det kan ikke lykkes ved hjælp af vold, ved at se tilbage på fortiden eller ved at give igen for det, der blev gjort i går.

Det er i stedet ét stort, komplekst og langt fredsværksted, hvor bedre fremtider/visioner/scenarier bringes på banen, evalueres og sorteres – og ender med at kombinere de bedste elementer i et omfattende fremtidigt arrangement.

Man kan ikke ændre fortiden, men man kan ændre fremtiden. Og – nej – alle bliver ikke lykkelige, men alle kan være tilfredse med noget – og se en bedre fremtid for deres børn.

Og det er også her, sandheds- og forsoningskommissioner kommer ind i billedet – den healing og tilgivelse, der findes i alle religioner.

Fred er stadig mulig.

**Der er et bilag om begrebet folkemordet nedenunder underskrifterne.**

**Signed by TFF Associates:**

*Christina Spännar* – PhD in sociology, founder, Sweden.

*Jan Oberg* – PhD in sociology, founder and director, Sweden.

*Annette Schiffmann* – Veteran peace activist & organiser of numerous international conferences on alternatives to war and violence: Iraq, Death Penalty, Israel/Palestine, Mumia Abu-Jamal, Heidelberg, Germany.

*David Swanson* – Co-Founder, Executive Director, and a Board Member of World Beyond War, author, activist, journalist, and radio host, the United States.

*Liu Jian* – Co-founder of Ichi Foundation, Beijing, China.

*Erni Friholt* – Secretary, the Orust Peace Movement, Orust, Sweden.

*Claus Kold* – PhD, senior researcher, director of TurningPoints, Denmark.

*Biljana Vanskovska* – Professor, Head of the Global Changes Center, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia.

*Farhang Jahanpour* – Retired professor and Editor for Middle East and North Africa at BBC Monitoring, England.

*Radmila Nakarada* – Professor, Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade, Distinguished Fellow, New South Institute, Johannesburg, Belgrade, Serbia.

*Ola Friholt* – Chairman, the Orust Peace Movement, Orust, Sweden.

*Richard Falk* – Professor Emeritus, Princeton University, public intellectual and former UN Rapporteur for the Occupied Territories, US/Turkey.

*Elaheh Pooyandeh* – MA in peace studies, peace educator and mediator, Tehran, Iran.

*Ina Curic* – Sociologist, M.A. in Gender Studies as well as Peace and Conflict Studies; former TFF project coordinator in Burundi, creator of Imagine Creatively story-telling for peace, Romania.

*David Loy* – Retired professor of Buddhist and comparative philosophy, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Zen tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism.

*Chantal Mutamuriza* – Former TFF project coordinator in Burundi, human rights advocate and humanitarian worker, Switzerland and Ethiopia.

*Chaiwat Satha-Anand* – Professor emeritus, Faculty of Political Science, Thammasat University and prolific writer on Islam and nonviolence, Bangkok, Thailand.

*Brajna Greenhalgh* – PhD Researcher; MSc in psychology, licensed counsellor, Bangor University, Wales.

*Mairead Maguire* – Nobel peace laureate, co-founder of Peace People, Northern Ireland, Kilcief County Down.

*Gareth Porter* – historian, independent investigative journalist, author and policy analyst specializing in U.S. national security issues, the United States.

*Shastri Ramachandaran* – Independent Journalist, editor, writer, publication & media consultant, New Delhi, India.

*Peter Peverelli* – Retired professor, School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam and lifelong expert on China, The Netherlands.

*Neelakanta Radhakrishnan* – Dr., The Gandhi Peace Mission, India; former Director of Gandhi Darshan and International Centre of Gandhian Studies in New Delhi, India.

*Jorgen Johansen* – Editor at Irene Publishing, independent peace researcher and writer, Sweden.

*Majken Sorensen* – Associate Professor of Social Science at Østfold University College and Karlstad University, Sweden.

*Jake Lynch* – Associate Professor in the Department of Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia. He also writes, reports and broadcasts regularly as a journalist working in peace journalism, as well as making documentary films.

*Fredrik S. Heffermehl* – Lawyer (Oslo and NYU) and author, a world expert on the Nobel Peace Prize. Just published *The Real Nobel Peace Prize*, a study of Alfred Nobel's vision of peace by disarmament that also presents the 115 persons who should have won the Prize had Nobel's intention been respected, Norway.

**\* Appendix: Why we use the word "genocide."**

The use of the word 'genocide' is controversial in many

circles and may evoke emotional reactions. We are also aware that it has been used by some for political purposes to denigrate some other country or people.

But we do not use the term lightly or for political purposes. Given the links we provide below to trustworthy sites and organisations, legal documents such as the Genocide Convention, as well as expert opinion, we believe this is the term that best summarises what has unfolded in Gaza and subjected the Palestinians to unspeakable, unprecedented suffering as a people.

One central criterion is *intentionality* – that there is a deliberate intention to harm, eradicate, humiliate, displace or make life impossible for a nation – in part or, over time, in whole.

Most of the links provided by professor John Mearsheimer here, in which various Israeli leaders are on record, make it abundantly clear that the suffering cannot be explained merely by 'collateral damage,' i.e. civilian casualties caused by unintended consequences of bombings and other warfare activities.

Furthermore, according to the Genocide Convention of 1948 – “Article 2 of the Convention defines genocide as ... “*any* of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

1. Killing members of the group;
2. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
3. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
4. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

5. Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

All these criteria do not have to be present – as the word “any” indicates. In the case of Gaza, it should be abundantly clear that the Israeli government’s activity falls within criteria a, b and c.

To that can be added a multi-decade occupation (since 1967), apartheid, humiliation and other elements that, in and of themselves, do not constitute genocide.

Finally, it is extraordinarily important to note that – as pointed out by UN experts:

“The international community has an obligation to prevent atrocity crimes, including genocide, and should immediately consider all diplomatic, political and economic measures to that end.”

We believe that this *obligation* does place the West’s complicity in the genocide – thanks to arms and ammunition export and political side-taking statements – in a particularly tragical light.

## **Links on genocide**

### **The Convention**

The Convention

[Wikipedia about the Convention](#)

### **Arguments and judgements**

Oct. 12, 2023

Gaza: UN experts decry bombing of hospitals and schools as crimes against humanity, call for prevention of genocide

Oct. 15, 2023

Public Statement: Scholars Warn of Potential Genocide in Gaza

On 15 October 2023, over 800 scholars and practitioners of international law, conflict studies and genocide studies signed a public statement warning of the possibility of genocide being perpetrated by Israeli forces against Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.

Oct. 20, 2023

Genocide Scholars and 100 Palestinian and International Civil Society Organisations Call on Prosecutor Khan to Issue Arrest Warrants, Investigate Israeli Crimes and Intervene to Deter Incitement to Commit Genocide in Gaza

Oct. 24, 2023

The Guardian: Israel is clear about its intentions in Gaza – world leaders cannot plead ignorance of what is coming

Nov. 7, 2023

Washington Post – Israel's war in Gaza and the spectre of 'genocide.'

Nov. 12, 2023

Aljazeera – Genocide in Gaza: A call to urgent global action. What is happening in Gaza fits the definition of genocide.

Nov. 13, 2023

Center for Constitutional Rights

Stop the Genocide: United States Complicity and Failure to Prevent the Israeli Government's Unfolding Genocide of Palestinians

Nov. 14, 2023

Time

Is what is happening in Gaza a genocide. Experts weigh in.

Nov. 16, 2023

United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, OHCHR

Gaza: UN experts call on international community to prevent genocide on the Palestinian people

Dec. 1, 2023

Aljazeera – Former ICC chief prosecutor: Israel's siege of Gaza is a 'genocide'

Luis Moreno Ocampo discusses accusations of war crimes and genocide against both Hamas and Israel.

Dec. 6, 2023

As part of its genocide in Gaza, Israel escalates its targeting of schools housing displaced people

Dec. 11, 2023

'Time for Action to Prevent Genocide Is Now':

The 56 scholars said in their open letter that Palestinians in the West Bank and those who are citizens of Israel also faced "grave danger" if Israel's attack on Gaza were to continue and escalate.

Dec. 12, 2023

International Middle East Media Center, IMEMC

Euro-Med Monitor: "In Gaza, Israel's Army Replicates the Crimes Committed by Zionist Gangs in 1948."

Finally, another statement, "*Declaration of Conscience and Concern of Global Intellectuals on Gaza Genocide*," drafted by world-renowned Princeton University Professor Emeritus of International Law and TFF Associate *Richard Falk*, together with former Turkish Prime Minister and Foreign Minister *Ahmet Davutoglu*, determines that the word 'genocide' describes the situation in Gaza. It is signed by many scholars, diplomats, former ministers, etc. and addresses the world community, including the UN (forthcoming).

Foto: UNICEF/Mohammad Ajjour

---

# Inden Gaza forsvinder: Kan amerikansk underkastelse til britisk imperial politik ændres?

15. december 2023 (EIRNS)—...Hvorfor er “Perfidious Albion” – det Britiske Imperium – mere ansvarlig end USA selv for den amerikanske udenrigspolitik fiasko? Lav en liste over de amerikanske militærfolk, der for nylig er blevet slået til riddere af den britiske krone. Generalerne Brent Scowcroft, Colin Powell, Tommy Franks, Martin Dempsey, Joseph Dunford, Norman Schwarzkopf... Undersøg derefter de krige, de udkæmpede, deres omkostninger, menneskelige og materielle, og deres udfald. Sammenlign de involverede nationers skæbne med nationernes skæbne i Anden Verdenskrig. Hvad oplevede efterkrigstidens Tyskland, Italien og Japan, alle fjendtlige nationer? Hvad har efterkrigstidens Irak, Afghanistan, Syrien og Libyen oplevet? Er det måske sådan, at generalerne blev slået til riddere, netop fordi de krige, som de udkæmpede, systematisk underminerede USA’s nationale interesser og fremmede imperiets interesser, og ikke det amerikanske folk eller den amerikanske regering?

Tænk et øjeblik – men måske ikke for dybt – over det rådne korpus af “geostrategiske” ideer, som Henry Kissinger repræsenterede, og som er destilleret, hvad angår deres konsekvenser i det virkelige liv, i det politiske memorandum “Memorandum 200 – om nationale sikkerhedsstudier – Konsekvenser af verdensomspændende befolkningsvækst for USA’s sikkerhed og oversøiske interesser.” Dokumentets usagte, men klart underforståede holdning var, at verdens underlegne folk, især dem, der boede i “det Globale Syd”, ikke skriver historie og derfor skal fratages besiddelsen såvel som brugen af de materielle ressourcer, der kræves for at gøre det. Kissingers

tilståelse i Chatham House den 10. maj 1982 af, at han foretrak britiske imperialistiske holdninger frem for FDR's vision for verden, herunder Roosevelts fire friheder, betyder, at han ikke ville have haft nogen reel uenighed med Churchills velkendte udtalelse om Israel og Palæstina:

“Jeg er ikke enig i, at hunden i krybben har den endelige ret til krybben, selv om den måske har ligget der i meget lang tid. Den ret anerkender jeg ikke. Jeg indrømmer for eksempel ikke, at der er gjort en stor uret mod de røde indianere i Amerika eller de sorte mennesker i Australien. Jeg indrømmer ikke, at der er sket en uret mod disse mennesker, fordi en stærkere race, en race af højere kvalitet, en mere verdslig klog race for at sige det på den måde, er kommet ind og har taget deres plads.” (Winston Churchill til Peel-kommissionen om et jødisk hjemland i Palæstina, 1937)

Kissingers bemærkninger fra den 18. oktober – “Jeg mener, at Vestbredden bør sættes under jordansk kontrol i stedet for at sigte mod en to-statsløsning, som efterlader et af de to territorier fast besluttet på at vælte Israel” – stammer fra den samme geostrategiske kloak, som Churchills “ærlige diskussion” om imperialismens rigtighed er et udtryk for. Zbigniew Brzezinskis 40-årige (1973-2017) vanhelligelse af amerikansk udenrigspolitik blev plagieret fra den britiske efterretningstjenestes mesteragent og “arabist” Bernard Lewis, hvis “islamiske fundamentalismekort”-politik, også kendt som Bernard Lewis-planen, blev gjort spiselig for “Readers Digest” (tidsskriftet “Det Bedste”) og ompakket af Brzezinski som “Krisens Bue,” og senere, mere groft som The Grand Chessboard (Det store skakbræt) og endnu grovere af Brzezinskis Sancho Panza, Samuel P. Huntington, som civilisationernes sammenstød.

Overvej følgende uregelmæssighed, rapporteret i dagens briefing, vedrørende den manglende udbetaling af over 53 milliarder dollars af allerede bevilgede penge i løbet af de sidste 17 måneder, godkendt under Schumer-Young “CHIPS and Science Act”, som blev vedtaget af Kongressen i juli 2022. Kun

35 millioner dollars af disse er blevet udbetalt, og de er gået til det britiske våbenfirma BAE Systems. Hvorfor bliver pengene ikke brugt? Og hvorfor blev pengene egentlig brugt på BAE? BAE Systems, lad os huske det, er i centrum af 1980'ernes "Al-Yamamah" olie-for-våben-aftale mellem Storbritannien og Saudi-Arabien. Husk en historie fra 29. november 2010 fra The Guardian i London: "Under det to timer lange møde i 2008 på et hotel i hovedstaden Bishkek (Kirgisistan) angreb [prins] Andrew, der rejser verden rundt som særlig britisk handelsrepræsentant, Storbritanniens korrupsionsundersøgere i Serious Fraud Office (bagmands-politiafdeling) for det, han kaldte 'idioti'. ... I et telegram fra den amerikanske ambassade til Washington i oktober 2008 skrev (den amerikanske ambassadør i Kirgisistan), Tatiana Gfoeller: " Uforskammet sprog à la britisk ... [Andrew] vendte sig mod det generelle spørgsmål om at fremme britiske økonomiske interesser i udlandet. Han skældte ud på britiske anti-korrupsions-efterforskere, som havde været så "idiotiske" næsten at ødelægge Al-Yamamah-aftalen med Saudi-Arabien."

Mens Gfoeller udtrykte chok over Andrews ubehøvlede opførsel under den to timer lange dialog, fremhævede hun to emner: Prinsens pral om Storbritanniens genoplivning af det 19. århundredes "Great Game"; og hans åbenhjertige angreb på snagende britiske journalister og efterforskere, som vovede at blande sig i Storbritanniens Al-Yamamah-aftale. "Den amerikanske ambassadør, en erfaren karrierediplomat, der taler seks sprog, så ikke ud til at have stor respekt for Andrews intellekt."

Den oprindelige titel på "CHIPS and Science Act" var "Endless Frontier Act of 2019", som skulle indvarsle en "Apollo Project-style" eksplosion i udvidelsen af amerikanske videnskabscentre, rumforskningsudposter, kommunikationsteknologier osv. Men der er ingen fremdrift i dette, for videnskabelig og teknologisk optimisme skal nedprioriteres i Amerika. Videnskabsbegejstringen må ikke få

lov til at påvirke den amerikanske ungdom, som den engang gjorde under Kennedy-administrationen. Vi forbereder nu "faktablade" om arten og karakteren af de amerikanske militæruddgifter, som ikke kun afslører den iboende ødselhed i oppustede militæruddgifter, såsom Pentagon-fly med prismærker på "900 millioner dollars", men også det faktum, at penge under visse omstændigheder vil blive brugt vildt, men tilbageholdt, hvis deres anvendelse faktisk betyder et fremskridt for det menneskelige potentiale hos den amerikanske arbejdsstyrke og vælgere.

Det vil briterne ikke tillade i nogen regering, hverken republikansk eller demokratisk. Og det er derfor, USA stemmer, som de gør i FN i spørgsmålet om våbenhvile; hvorfor USA stadig forsøger at sende titusindvis af milliarder af dollars til Ukraine, når Ukraine er en militært tabt sag; og hvordan USA kan bruge 2 milliarder dollars på en krig i Afghanistan og stadig tabe. Vi må frigøre USA's sind for at standse den selvdestruktion....

Mod dette perspektiv har den seneste række af afstemninger og debatter, der har fundet sted i FN, især FN's generalsekretær António Guterres' handlinger, givet verdens regeringer moralske grunde til at overveje at vedtage løsninger på krige, som dem i Gaza og Ukraine, med ideer som Zepp-LaRouches Ti Principper. Konferencer som den der blev afholdt i Nicaragua i den forgangne weekend, især når de er forbundet med kampagnen for uafhængige amerikanske kandidater til høje embeder som Diane Saxe, kan sprænge den beslutningsmæssige proces, en proces, der næres af en ny fremtoning af reel moral, som udtrykt i FN-processen, der må støttes fuldt ud overalt, og især i USA.

Billede: offentligt domæne

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. december 2023 med formand Tom Gillesberg:  
Folkemordet i Gaza er afslutning på USA's og Vestens dominans.  
BRICS+ er fremtiden.**

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. november 2023 med formand Tom Gillesberg:  
Stop folkemordet i Gaza. Toms tale begynder 25 min. inde i videoen.**

Tom Gillesbergs tale begynder 25 min. inde i videoen.

Her er også et link til at gå direkte til Tom Gillesberg tale.

Se også de tre andre præsentationer på mødet her:

**Videoer: Stop folkemordet i Gaza/ Fred Gennem  
Udvikling,  
Møde den 11. november 2032 i København**

---

# **Video: Danske lægers opråb til regeringen: Danske læger siger fra og ønsker varig våbenhvile i Gaza**

(Schiller Instituttet har ikke været involveret i at lave videoen, men vi støtter indholdet.)

Tekst i forbindelsen med videoen, som blev lagt ud på læge Suher Othmans Facebook side:

Den 7. december skal Folketinget behandle et borgerforslag om, at Danmark skal arbejde for en varig våbenhvile i Gaza.

Du kan hjælpe med at opnå en permanent våbenhvile ved at lægge pres på politikerne allerede nu.

Du kan skrive en mail eller ringe til en af partiernes udenrigsordførere, hvor du opfordrer dem til at stemme for lovforslaget.

Danske læger siger fra og ønsker varig våbenhvile.  
Afskriftet findes nedenunder.

---

Her er linket til det opdateret borgerforslag om Gaza på Folketingets side (Udenrigsudvalget).

og her på vores side:

**Opdateret borgerforslag om Gaza til 1. behandling i Folketinget på torsdag den 6. december: våbenhvile, efterforskning af brud på folkeretten, øge bistand til Palæstina samt arbejde for en politisk løsning**

---

**Afskrift af videoen:**

**(Vejledende manuskript, ikke ordret.)**

Danske lægers opråb til regeringen

Som danske læger følger vi rædselsslagne med i den humanitære katastrofe, som lige nu udfolder sig i Gaza

Vi ser vores kolleger arbejde under umenneskelige forhold

Mere end 15,000 palæstinensere er blevet dræbt, deriblandt over 5,000 børn. 2/3 af de dræbte er kvinder og børn

Mange flere er savnede og ligger formentlig begravet under murbrokkerne.

Mange flere vil dø af sygdomme, som opstår af mangel på mad, mangel på rent drikkevand, af at bo tæt sammen, eller under åben himmel

Af sygdomme som kan behandles, men som ikke bliver behandlet fordi sundhedsvæsnet er brudt sammen.

Flere hospitaler er blevet angrebet direkte

Ambulancer er blevet angrebet

Hundreder af sundhedspersonale er blevet dræbt

Flertallet af Gazas hospitaler fungerer ikke mere fordi de er ødelagt, eller fordi de mangler strøm og brændstof

Hospitalerne mangler udstyr, medicin, vand

Operationer er blevet foretaget uden bedøvelse

Kirurgerne kan ikke længere redde liv i Gaza

Det eneste hospital der behandler børne-kræft er bombet

Som kirurg/børnelæge – hvor målet med vores arbejde er at redde børn/mennesker – er det hjerteskræende at tænke på ...

Tusindvis af patienter i Gaza lever med svær nyresygdom, som kræver dialyse

Men grundet mangel på elektricitet og luftangrebene på hospitaler er dialysepatienter i risiko for at dø

Der er mere end 50,000 gravide kvinder, som ikke har ordentlig adgang til sundhedsfaglig hjælp

Det betyder, at de nyfødte og deres mødre er i risiko for at dø

Vi har sjældent før set så direkte og ødelæggende angreb på hospitaler og sundhedspersonale

Vi har brug for at fastslå:

At angribe hospitaler og andre sundhedsfaciliteter er brud på international humanitær lov

At blokere en hel befolknings adgang til mad, vand og elektricitet er brud på international humanitær lov

At bombe flygtningelejre, boligblokke, skoler så man dræber tusindvis af børn er brud på international humanitær lov

Det er krigsforbrydelser

Til de den danske regering:

Gaza er blevet en gravplads for tusinder af børn

Vi kræver omgående beskyttelse af civile, og af vores kollegaer i Gaza

Dette folkemord går imod vores værdier som danske læger

En humanitær pause er kun et lille plaster på et ødelagt samfund

Der er intet humanitært ved en 6 dages våbenhvile, der efterfølges af yderligere angreb

Vi kræver at vores regering presser utvetydigt på for en permanent våbenhvile i Gaza

Den fordrevne civilbefolkning skal kunne vende tilbage til deres hjem – eller det der er tilbage.

Den danske regering må presse på for at Israel overholder international humanitær lov.

Hvis ikke regeringen klart og tydeligt kan fordømme det der sker som krigsforbrydelser, så mister den internationale humanitære lov sit indhold

Regeringen må presse på for at sundhedsfaciliteter og sundhedspersonale respekteres.

Bombninger og angreb mod hospitalerne skal stoppe

Der skal tillades hurtig og uhindret adgang til humanitær nødhjælp til hele Gaza

Hospitalernes adgang til brændstof og elektricitet skal genoprettes

Vi skal handle nu

Vi har brug for en fordømmelse af den vilkårlige ødelæggelse

Vi kræver respekt for menneskeliv, uanset sprog, religion og hudfarve

Vi kræver en permanent våbenhvile

Hvad mere skal der til, før Danmark handler?

Vores stilhed og manglende handling gør os medskyldige i den humanitære katastrofe.

Gaza har brug for Danmark

Kræv permanent våbenhvile nu

#ceasefirenow  
(våbenhvile nu)

---

# **Opdateret borgerforslag om Gaza til 1. behandling i Folketinget på torsdag den 6. december: våbenhvile, efterforskning af brud på folkeretten, øge bistand til Palæstina samt arbejde for en politisk løsning**

Fra Folketingets hjemmeside her:

Vedr. Borgerforslag B 84 – 2023-24:

**Forslag til folketingsbeslutning om, at Danmark skal fordømme israelske krigsforbrydelser i Gaza, øge dansk bistand til Palæstina og arbejde for en politisk løsning på konflikten**

Ved dagens foretræde ved forslagsstillerne bag borgerforslaget B 84 drøftede vi det ændringsforslag, som vi har udarbejdet i tæt dialog med forslagsstillerne. Ændringsforslaget er i sin helhed gengivet nedenfor, og vil blive fremsat i forbindelse med behandlingen af borgerforslaget. Forslagsstillerne meddelte, at de bakker op om ændringsforslaget. For at give alle partier mulighed for at tage stilling til ændringsforslaget i forbindelse med første behandlingen af borgerforslaget deles det hermed med udvalget.

Venlig hilsen,  
Christian Friis Bach, Radikale Venstre  
Sascha Faxe, Alternativet  
Trine Pertou Mach, Enhedslisten

Ændringsforslag til B84:

Danmark skal kræve våbenhvile i Gaza, bidrage til efterforskning af brud på folkeretten, øge dansk bistand til Palæstina samt arbejde for en politisk løsning på konflikten

Regeringen har gjort det klart, at brud på krigens love i Ukraine og i resten af verden ikke skal tolereres, og at krige skal kæmpes inden for rammerne af international lov, hvor der tages hensyn til proportioner i magtanvendelsen mod militære mål. Som følge af Israel-Hamas krigen, beskriver FN situationen i Gaza efter den 7. oktober som en hidtil uset humanitær tragedie, og en lang række internationale organisationer peger på mulige krigsforbrydelser og brud på folkeretten.

Folketinget skal derfor pålægge regeringen at:

- Arbejde for øjeblikkelig **våbenhvile** og åbning af humanitære korridorer for at sikre, at de over en million fordrevne civile i Gaza får den fornødne humanitære støtte og mulighed for at vende hjem, når det er sikkert.
- Aktivt at bidrage til efterforskning og dokumentation af **brud på folkeretten**, herunder den humanitære folkeret, og menneskerettighedskrænkelser og arbejde aktivt for at støtte internationale undersøgelser, inklusiv ved Den Internationale Straffedomstol, af krigsforbrydelser i Gaza og fordømme alle overtrædelser.
- Øge det danske bidrag markant med en akut **humanitær hjælpepakke** til Gaza til nødhjælp og

genopbygning af hospitaler, kritisk infrastruktur og skoler.  
Reaktivere og øge dansk  
udviklingsbistand til Palæstina, også for at styrke  
demokratiske stemmer i civilsamfundet, der har  
hårdt brug for støtte.

- Genetablere en **politisk horisont**: Tage initiativ i EU-regi til at formulere og vedtage en ny strategi, som adresserer de grundlæggende årsager, der driver konflikten og hvor hele EU's værktøjskasse tages i brug. Det indebærer politiske forhandlinger mellem parterne, afvikling af den israelske besættelse og fjernelse af folkeretsstridige bosættelser samt afholdelse af palæstinensiske valg.

---

## **Video: Stop folkemordet i Gaza// Oase-planen for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Schiller Instituttets møde den 16. december 2023**

### **Program:**

Stop folkemordet i Gaza, ved Tom Gillesberg, formand.

Lyndon LaRouches og Schiller Instituttets Oase-plan for fælles økonomisk udvikling i Israel-Palæstina, ved Feride Gillesberg, næstformand.

Følgende video fra 2010 blev vist under foredraget om Oase-planen:

## Invitation:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter og international leder sagde den 9. december:

“Angrebet den 7. oktober, hvor 1.200 mennesker blev dræbt, skal helt klart fordømmes. Men den israelske hær fuldstændig uforholdsmæssige angreb siden da har dræbt mere end 16.000 palæstinensere, hvoraf 70% var kvinder, børn og ældre, og et ukendt antal er begravet under murbrokkerne fra ca. 60% af alle huse i Gaza, som er blevet ødelagt eller beskadiget. Der er ingen mad, vand, medicin, elektricitet eller husly. 2,3 millioner mennesker er blevet fordrevet fra nord til syd, hvorefter de bliver bombet, uanset hvor de flygter hen. Der er ikke noget sikkert sted i Gaza, og nu bliver et meget stort antal mennesker “koncentreret” i et lillebitte område nær grænsen til Egypten.

“Der må omgående komme en våbenhvile, og der må indkaldes til en omfattende konference for Sydvestasien, som Kina har foreslået, for at gennemføre en to-statsløsning baseret på en generel økonomisk udviklingsplan, som Oase-planen, der blev foreslået af min afdøde mand, Lyndon LaRouche, allerede i 1975. “

Det er folkemord.

Vi må gøre alt for at stoppe krigen, men også højne debatten gennem at komme med løsninger for en fælles fremtid. Her er citater fra EIR's leder den 1. december:

“Det er yderst vigtigt at forstå, at LaRouches Oase-plan er det manglende løsningskoncept og den strategiske flanker, der nu er tilgængelig for at mobilisere kræfter i hele verden. Oase-planen, eller en tilnærmelse, må gennemføres samtidig med vedtagelsen af en tostatsløsning i Palæstina, en løsning, som Benjamin Netanyahu for nylig har erklæret, at han agter at modsætte sig, uanset hvad verden mener.”

Under mødet sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale leder, "Så når vi siger, at vi nu er nødt til at placere Oase-planen midt i denne diskussion, sker det ikke i et vakuum, men det er den eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan håbe at løse denne krise ved at bruge det faktum, at momentum var til stede for det nye økonomiske system omkring BRIKS og BVI (Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet), der blev udvidet til Sydvestasien... Det vi ønsker at gøre, ved at placere Oase-planen midt i det hele, er at få folk i alle landene i Sydvestasien til at kæmpe for en bedre fremtid, til at kæmpe for deres ret til at have en anstændig levestandard, til at have uddannelses- og sundhedssystemer og meget andet til deres børn og børnebørn."

En vigtig del af Oase-planen er at bygge mange afsaltningsanlæg, der producerer ferskvand, som kan gøre ørkenen grøn. Atomkraft vil være den mest effektive måde at forsyne disse anlæg med strøm.

(Udsat pga. sygdom: Fordraget om atomkraft ved Thomas Grønlund Nielsen)

Baggrund:

Video: Folkemordet i Gaza er afslutning på USA's og Vestens dominans. BRIKS+ er fremtiden. POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. december 2023 med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Video: Hvad førte til krigen i Gaza, og hvad er exit-strategien?

Med Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien. Fra mødet i København den 11. november 2023. På engelsk.

Hæfte: Våbenhvile nu! Stop voldsspiralen. NYHEDSORIENTERING september-oktober 2023.

---

# **Video: Hvad førte til krigen i Gaza, og hvad er exit-strategien?**

**Med Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien.**

**Fra mødet i København den 11. november 2023**

Ikke korrekturlæst

Nov. 11, 2023 (EIRNS)–KØBENHAVN- Hussein Askary afholdt i dag en timelang, dybdegående præsentation og diskussion på engelsk til et møde i Schiller Instituttet i Danmark i København via Zoom.

Hussein Askary diskuterede vigtige elementer i historien om den nuværende krig fra begyndelsen af 1900-tallet til i dag, herunder det Britiske Imperiums rolle i spillet på begge sider i regionen. Den amerikanske statsmand og økonom Lyndon LaRouches rolle og hans forslag til Oasis-planen, der startede i 1975, blev fremhævet, såvel som visionen om, at regionen skal tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej/Verdenslandbroen.

Diskussionen omfattede Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, og andre medlemmer.

Hussein Askary var gæstetaler ved mødet, som blev indledt med

en fejring af Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag med en tale af Feride Gillesberg og musikalske indslag (Dona Nobis Pacem, to kanoner til tekster af Schiller, Ode til glæden og Boston Schiller Institutes Cease-Fire Now-sang). Tom Gillesberg gav en international briefing efterfulgt af Hussein Askary. Mødet sluttede med en tale af Jens Jørgen Nielsen, den danske Rusland/Ukraine-ekspert, om det russiske syn på Israel-Gaza-krigen og Ruslands muligheder for at mægle i en løsning i betragtning af deres tætte relationer til israelerne, palæstinenserne og de andre arabiske nationer.

---

## **Videoer: Stop folkemordet i Gaza/ Fred Gennem Udvikling, Møde den 11. november 2032 i København**

1a. Fejring af Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag, ved Feride Istogu Gillesberg, næstformand, og Schiller Instituttets kor, for at minde os om Schillers ædle menneskesyn som vi har hårdt brug for:

1b. Stop Folkemordet i Gaza, ved Tom Gillesberg, formand  
Toms tale begynder 25.28 min. ind i videoen:

Linket til videoen, hvis den ikke er synligt her.

2. Hvad førte til krigen i Gaza, og hvad er exit-strategien? ved gæstetaler Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets Sydvestasien koordinator, medforfatter af "Udvid den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika" (på engelsk):

Linket til videoen, hvis den ikke er synligt her.

3. Rusland som mulig mægler mellem Israel og Gaza, ved Jens Jørgen Nielsen, Rusland ekspert:

Ikke korrekturlæst

Nov. 11, 2023 (EIRNS)–KØBENHAVN- Hussein Askary afholdt i dag en timelang, dybdegående præsentation og diskussion på engelsk til et møde i Schiller Instituttet i Danmark i København via Zoom.

Hussein Askary diskuterede vigtige elementer i historien om den nuværende krig fra begyndelsen af 1900-tallet til i dag, herunder det Britiske Imperiums rolle i spillet på begge sider i regionen, og i at fremme ekstremisterne på begge sider. Den amerikanske statsmand og økonom Lyndon LaRouches rolle og hans forslag til Oasis-planen, der startede i 1975, blev fremhævet, såvel som visionen om, at regionen skal tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej/Verdenslandbroen.

Diskussionen omfattede Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, og andre medlemmer.

Hussein Askary var gæstetaler ved mødet, som blev indledt med en fejring af Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag med en tale af Feride Gillesberg og musikalske indslag (Dona Nobis Pacem, to kanoner til tekster af Schiller, Ode til glæden). Tom Gillesberg gav en international briefing efterfulgt af Hussein Askary. Mødet sluttede med en tale af Jens Jørgen Nielsen, den danske Rusland/Ukraine-ekspert, om det russiske syn på Israel-Gaza-krigen og Ruslands muligheder for at mægle i en løsning i betragtning af deres tætte relationer til israellerne, palæstinenserne og de andre arabiske nationer.

Følgende sang var også sunget af vores kor under fejring af

Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag:

Ceasefire for Israel-Palestine: Eye for an eye only brings blindness – YouTube

---

# Lyndon LaRouches Oaseplan for Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten Nu på dansk

Følgende 5 min. video om Oaseplanen er fra 2010:

2. Følgende uddrag med Harley Schlanger fra Schiller Instituttet, som begynder 12 min. inde i den øverste video:

## Lyndon LaRouches Oaseplan for Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten

**Et uddrag fra: At vinde krigen mod krigspartiet**

Manhattan Project Dialogue, Saturday, October 21, 2023

HARLEY SCHLANGER: ... Jeg vil give jer en kort kronologi [af Lyndon LaRouches arbejde for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling i Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten]. Det er så stort et arbejde, at det ville kræve mange dage og konferencer, og det burde vi gøre. Men jeg vil bare give jer et kort indblik i, hvad han gjorde, og hvordan han formede denne kamp, og hvorfor det i dag er den politik, som han og vores organisation repræsenterer, der er alternativet. Lad os starte med et historisk øjeblik i april 1975. LaRouche blev inviteret til at deltage i en konference i Bagdad for Ba'ath-partiet. Og mens han var der, mødtes han med en række arabiske ledere og kom derfra med et forslag fra irakerne om at samle en udviklingsfond på 30 milliarder dollars til Israel og Palæstina. Da LaRouche præsenterede det

for vores medlemmer, var det ganske forbløffende. Han fulgte op på turen til Bagdad med en pressekonference, hvor han annoncerede udgivelsen af sin Internationale Udviklingsbank, som var en opfordring til et nyt monetært system, der ville være sammenhængende med denne pakke af penge til udvikling af Israel og Palæstina.

Lad mig give jer en kort beretning om omfanget af dette. Lige efter dette skete, bragte vi en overskrift i vores avis, hvor der stod: "Irak tilbyder Israel en fredsplan til 30 milliarder dollars." Jeg var sammen med en gruppe mennesker, der delte den ud ved en tale, som Moshe Dayan holdt på Wake Forest University i Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Der var hundredvis af mennesker, og vi var meget bange for, at hvis vi gik derhen og sagde, at Irak ønsker at afslutte konfrontationen og tilbyder penge, ville folk blive vrede. Men det vi fandt ud af var, at de var meget interesserede i det. Vi solgte hver eneste avis, vi havde, og efter Dayans tale rejste jeg mig op blandt publikum – José Vega-style – og sagde til Moshe Dayan: "Vi har et forslag, som Lyndon LaRouche har lagt på bordet fra Irak om en udviklingsplan til 30 milliarder dollars for Israel og Palæstina. Vil du støtte det?" Jeg forventede en tirade fra ham, for han havde ry for at være lidt af en hidsigprop, en hård militærleder. Det han sagde var fascinerende. Han sagde: "Det her er meget interessant. Det kan ændre alt. Jeg er meget åben for at høre mere om det." Det viste på det tidspunkt potentialet for LaRouches intervention – det var lige efter krigen i 1973, efter den arabiske olieembargo, efter det, der så ud til at være enden på enhver mulighed for at realisere ideen om en to-statsløsning for Israel og Palæstina.

Da LaRouche introducerede sin politik for Den internationale Udviklingsbank, sagde han følgende: "Med en IDB-politik i udsigt skulle den fredselskende fraktion i Mapai [som var et israelsk parti] snart blive herskende. Israelerne og de vigtigste arabiske stater kunne let blive enige om betingelserne for fortsatte forhandlinger om det

palæstinensiske spørgsmål inden for rammerne af en øjeblikkelig fast aftale om samarbejde om udviklingspolitik." Med den tilgang holdt LaRouche møder i løbet af de næste par år, begyndende i 1975, hvor han havde et møde med den israelske leder Abba Eban for at fremme diskussionen om denne tilgang. I 1977 skrev LaRouche en artikel, som blev offentliggjort i et Paris-baseret israelsk nyhedsbrev med titlen: "Israel and Palestine; A Future for the Middle East". Her er, hvad han sagde i den:

"Generelt, uden direkte forhandlinger mellem Israel og Den Palæstinensiske Befrielsesorganisation(PLO), kan der ikke blive nogen løsning i Mellemøsten inden for en overskuelig, umiddelbar fremtid. Vi kender alle alt for godt de underliggende forhindringer for sådanne forhandlinger. Vi burde vide, at vi hurtigt må fjerne forhindringerne for sådanne direkte forhandlinger." Han henviser udtrykkeligt til idéen om, at man først skal have en politisk aftale og derefter gå videre. Det han siger er, at "det objektive grundlag for en løsning i Mellemøsten er den økonomiske udviklingspakke, vi har peget på. Enhver anden tilgang vil mislykkes; vil hurtigt blive nedbrudt til en farce. Men det er ikke blot materielle fordele i sig selv, der skaber grundlaget for fred. Det er det faktum, at regeringernes forpligtelse til at realisere betydelige videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt fremmer humanistiske holdninger i befolkningerne."

Det var den idé, LaRouche havde om sit westfalske princip; om vigtigheden af økonomiske politikker, der viser, at hver side anerkender fordelene ved den anden, som grundlag for fred. Det var hans tema i mange andre artikler i den periode. Han gik imod strømmen, da folk sagde, at man ikke kan forhandle med Arafat, han er ikke villig til at forhandle. Hvad LaRouche skrev i december 1983: "Arafat er den etablerede leder af det, der faktisk er en eksilregering for de palæstinensiske arabere. Hvis vi skal have succes med at forhandle med det palæstinensiske arabiske folk, er det Arafats lederskab, vi

skal forhandle med.” Derefter skrev han et politisk dokument, “Forslag om at begynde udviklingen af en langsigtet økonomisk udviklingspolitik for staten Israel.”

Kort tid efter, i april 1986, opfordrede Shimon Peres, som på det tidspunkt var Israels premierminister, til at afsætte en pulje på 25-30 milliarder dollars til at skabe en udviklingsfond for Mellemøsten for de næste ti år. Peres kaldte det en Marshallplan for Mellemøstens udvikling. Lyndon LaRouche bakkede op om den og skrev flere artikler, hvor han forsvarede den. Men han påpegede det utilstrækkelige i tilgangen. Hvad han sagde på det tidspunkt var, at det, der er nødvendigt, er at tage fat på det mest alvorlige problem, der findes med hensyn til økonomien. Og hvad er det? Det er manglen på vand, og forholdet mellem det og manglen på strøm eller energi. Så mens LaRouche støttede Peres' Marshallplan, og i 1986 havde Peres øget det samlede beløb til 50 milliarder dollars, begyndte han at beskrive, hvordan man kan skabe mere vand til Mellemøsten. Dette er grundlaget for det, der senere, i 1990, blev kendt som hans Oase-Plan. Han sagde, at man var nødt til at have en menneskeskabt Jordan-flod, som kunne flyde og give mere vand til alle de områder, der grænser op til den; herunder Jordan, Israel, Egypten og Den Arabiske Halvø. For at gøre det, sagde han, har man brug for afsaltning. Man har brug for en række atomkraftværker på 300 MW, som giver strøm til afsaltningen. Det vil også give den elektricitet, der er nødvendig for industrialisering og avanceret landbrug. I 1990 skrev han et stykke med titlen: “En fredsplan i arabernes og israelernes sande interesse”. Her skrev LaRouche, at vi har brug for “geografisk ingeniørkunst” til at føre kanalerne mellem Middelhavet og Det Røde Hav, og derefter Det Røde Hav til Det Døde Hav, for at skabe vandløb, som med atomdrevet afsaltning til at levere vandkraft og transport, ville give mulighed for industriel og landbrugsmæssig udvikling.

Her er det, han sagde, som virkelig er interessant:

“Man kunne definere den rette tilgang til udviklingen af

Mellemøsten, hvis der ikke boede nogen mennesker der i øjeblikket, som hvis vi for eksempel planlagde bosættelsen af Mars: en ubeboet planet, ved hjælp af kunstigt miljø, og så videre.” Han fortsatte med at skrive, at opdelingen og fordelingen af vand og strøm skal organiseres, så den gennemsnitlige kvadratkilometer jord kan udvikles til at være produktiv på de nødvendige niveauer for forskellige typer af jordbrug – græsning, afgrøder, beboelse, industri og handel.

Ideen med de to kanaler og den overordnede tilgang til industriel udvikling blev betragtet som revolutionerende. Hvordan kunne man opnå en aftale på dette grundlag? Hvad der skete på det tidspunkt var, at Bush-regeringen forsøgte at gøre præcis det, som LaRouche havde advaret dem imod at gøre. For at forsøge at få en politisk løsning holdt de en konference i Madrid med repræsentanter for palæstinenserne og israelerne, men den førte ingen steder hen. De samme gamle argumenter, de samme gamle kampe, de samme gamle modsætninger; det faktum, at der havde været en række krige siden 1948, i '48 og '56 og '67 og '73, og fortsatte træfninger og terrorisme. Hvordan kunne man få de to sider til at mødes? Mens Madrid-konferencen stod på – og på det tidspunkt var det Yitzhak Shamir, der var premierminister – var der noget andet, der blev sat i gang, da Yitzhak Rabin blev premierminister året efter i 1992. Det var en diskussion bag kulisserne i Oslo, Norge, mellem repræsentanter, der var tæt på Shimon Peres, som var kommet med ideen om en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten, og repræsentanter for Arafat.

Det førte til en aftale i september 1993, kaldet Oslo-aftalen. Det vigtigste ved Oslo-aftalen, og de fleste fokuserer på det faktum, at Arafat og Rabin gav hinanden hånden, er, at de talte om at gøre en ende på fjendskabet. Det var her, Rabin kom med sin berømte udtalelse om, at for at gøre dette, må man have modet til at ændre aksiomer. Og det afspejlede de blot ved at mødes og give hinanden hånden. Det var et meget anspændt øjeblik, indtil de to greb hinandens hænder, kiggede

hinanden i øjnene og derefter gik væk og udbragte en skål for hinanden. En skål for dem, der har modet til at ændre aksiomer. Men det, der lå til grund for dette potentiale, var netop LaRouches idé om økonomisk samarbejde og udvikling i de to økonomiske bilag, der var knyttet til Oslo-aftalen.

Jeg vil lige læse et par aspekter af dette. Det økonomiske bilag nr. 3: "Protokol om israelsk-palæstinensisk samarbejde om økonomiske og udviklingsmæssige programmer."

"De to parter er enige om at etablere en israelsk-palæstinensisk komité for økonomisk samarbejde, der blandt andet skal fokusere på følgende.

"1. Samarbejde om vandområdet, herunder et vandudviklingsprogram ...

"2. Samarbejde inden for elektricitet ...

"3. Samarbejde om energiområdet ...

"4. Samarbejde om det finansielle område, herunder et finansielt udviklings- og handlingsprogram til fremme af internationale investeringer på Vestbredden og i Gazastriben ...

"5. Samarbejde inden for transport og kommunikation ...

"6. Samarbejde inden for handel ..." og endelig,

"7. Samarbejde inden for industri, herunder industrielle udviklingsprogrammer, som vil sikre oprettelsen af fælles israelsk-palæstinensiske industrielle forsknings- og udviklingscentre..."

Så det var bilag 3. Bilag 4 befæster dette med ideen om: "Protokol om israelsk-palæstinensisk samarbejde vedrørende regionale Udviklingsprogrammer." Den taler om et økonomisk udviklingsprogram for Vestbredden og Gaza, en mellemøstlig udviklingsfond og endelig en mellemøstlig udviklingsbank. Alt dette var muligt på det tidspunkt, og det ville have gjort

præcis det, som LaRouche foreslog, nemlig at skabe et grundlag hvor folk i de palæstinensiske områder ville se en fordel i at samarbejde med Israel, og israellerne ville se en fordel i at samarbejde med palæstinenserne. Ikke bare for at stoppe drabene, men for at skabe et miljø med gensidigt fordelagtige produktive aktiviteter, som ville hæve levestandarden for folk på begge sider af konflikten. Og på det grundlag ville en to-statsløsning være mulig. Det er kernen i LaRouches ideer.

Hvad skete der med den plan? Tja, den blev først dræbt af Verdensbanken, for i november 1993 sagde Verdensbanken, at de ikke ville kanalisere penge eller give midler, der kom fra donorer. Præsident Clinton forsøgte blandt andet at rejse midler til dette. Der var donorer, som var parate til at give penge, men Verdensbanken sagde, at de ikke ville give pengene til palæstinenserne, fordi de ikke stolede på dem på grund af "korruption". Især var der modstand mod, at Arafat skulle have nogen mulighed for at modtage midlerne. Som et resultat var pengene der bare ikke. Det var et stort problem for opfølgningen. To år senere, den 4. november 1995, blev Yitzhak Rabin myrdet af en mand ved navn Yigal Amir, som var en del af bosætterbevægelsen og især havde været meget aktiv i Hebron, som var et af de største konfrontationsområder mellem de palæstinensere, der boede der, og de jødiske bosættere, som brugte den israelske stats magt til at rykke ind. Mordet på Rabin, oven i lukningen af potentialet for midler, afsluttede muligheden for succes for Oslo. LaRouche har specifikt udtalt i september 1993, efter håndtrykket i Washington, at det er presserende, at de første skridt til disse nye projekter bliver taget med det samme. Ellers var der fare for, at dette forslag ville drukne i begge parters blod. Han identificerede specifikt Sharon-netværkene i bosætterbevægelsen som truslen mod det. Og det var hvad der skete; en mulighed gik tabt.

Som vi ser, er det tilstrækkeligt at se på udviklingen fra 1995 til i dag. Palæstinenserne har stadig ingen stat; faktisk er de nu delt mellem to grupper, hvoraf den ene – Hamas, som

Netanyahu nu sværger at udrydde – siden 2009 har Netanyahu og Israel givet midler til Hamas for at opbygge dem som en modvægt til Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre. Hvorfor det? Fordi Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre er en nationalistisk bevægelse, der repræsenterer palæstinenserens interesser som nation, i modsætning til Hamas, som er en religiøs bevægelse. Så længe man har Hamas, der kæmper mod Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre, har man ingen samlet regering at forhandle med. Det er, hvad Netanyahu sagde; han pralede af at gøre det. Det anslås, at mere end 1 milliard dollars blev kanaliseret fra Israel gennem Qatar til Hamas, som Netanyahu nu siger, at han vil udrydde og udslette.

Så løsningen her er, at man bliver nødt til at identificere, hvad problemet er. Problemet er ikke israelere og palæstinensere, selvom det måske er dem, der udfører de desperate handlinger. Men de handler ikke i egen interesse; de handler i de højere magters interesse, som ønsker at forhindre enhver form for brud med de gamle aksiomer.

På engelsk:

... HARLEY SCHLANGER: Thank you. As I'm sure almost everyone realizes now, we're facing a growing threat of an expanding war in Southwest Asia; at the same time, we have a continuing proxy war against Russia in Ukraine, and some of the neo-cons are pushing as hard as they can to get a war against China over Taiwan. This was made absolutely clear by Biden's nationwide address on Oct. 19th. He had just come back from meeting with Netanyahu and his war cabinet. He pledged eternal support of the United States for Netanyahu and the policy of exterminating Hamas. And then he came back and presented a speech to the American people where he made the link of Ukraine and support for Israel. Why did he do that? Because there's growing opposition to funding the war in Ukraine. This was part of the reason for the ouster of House Speaker Kevin McCarthy, and part of the reason they can't put together a new speakership now for the House. What Biden tried to do was a

clever trick; link the two things together as one package. Here's what he said:

" Hamas and Putin represent different threats, but they share this in common: They both want to completely annihilate a neighboring democracy. American leadership is what holds the world together. American values are what makes us a partner that other nations want to work with. To put all of that at risk if we walk away from Ukraine, if we turn our backs on Israel, is not worth it." Then he went on to say, "[H]istory has taught us that when terrorists don't pay a price for their terror, when dictators don't pay a price for their aggression, they cause more chaos and death and more destruction. They keep going, and the cost and the threats to America and to the world keep rising."

Now if you take that second part of the statement, you could apply it to the United States. Where has been the correct blame on the United States for the wars of aggression by America and NATO? The destruction of Libya, of Iraq, of Afghanistan, of Syria, of Ukraine. They have not been held accountable. People like George W. Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, or Joe Biden. So, to attempt to make this a question of standing up for democracy, this is precisely the line of the leading oligarchs through their Atlantic Council, which sponsored a Summit for Democracy to try and say the divide in the world is between democracies led by America, and authoritarian governments led by Russia, China, and now they throw in Iran, North Korea, and some others.

The attempt to connect these two funding situations—the war in Ukraine and the war in Israel—is an attempt to outflank those conservative Republicans who are opposing the new package Biden presented for Ukraine funding, initially a \$24 billion request. In the budget deal that was reached, they threw that out completely. But listen to what leading Democrats are saying about the importance of Biden's speech. Senate Majority

Leader Chuck Schumer applauded his plan and said, "We're going to do everything in our power to ensure the Senate delivers the support of Israel and the rest of the package," that is, Ukraine. Senator Ben Cardin, a Democrat who is head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, concurred with Schumer and said, "The linkage has bipartisan support, and is our best shot to get it done now." That's the intent to outflank the opponents of Ukraine funding; but more importantly, what's the real intent here? Permanent warfare to disrupt the potential of nations to break out from the unipolar order or the rules-based order.

What we've been emphasizing, as you heard from Lyndon LaRouche just before, is that the drive for war comes from higher up; above the elected officials who parrot the demands coming from the think tanks and the corporate cartels. But it's the higher-ups you have to look at. Last week, in the Manhattan Project, I went through LaRouche's assessment, which is that both sides in the Middle East have been played; both sides. The Arabs and Palestinians, and the Israelis. This is something that didn't start just recently; it's an orchestration by the British Empire going back, as LaRouche talked about, for thousands of years, but in the more recent period, going back to the pre-World War I period, when the question was, "How do you replace the Ottoman Empire to make sure that it remains under the control of the British Empire?" That is, the geographical area which we now call the Middle East, but which is essentially Southwest Asia. How do you keep it under the control of the British Empire? This was part of the fight in World War I. The intention to keep Germany and Russia away from each other so that the Trans-Siberian Railroad and the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad did not cut out the power of the British Navy to control international trade and commerce.

In 1916, there was the Sykes-Picot Agreement, where the British and the French carved up the Middle East to make sure

that there would not be a coherent plan for nations to develop, but that they could easily be pitted against each other based on national views, tribal interests, religious differences such as Shi'ite and Sunni, and so on. And in 1917, they added to that with the Balfour Declaration, promising a Jewish state in Palestine.

When you look at the developments in recent days and the war expanding in Southwest Asia, this is what LaRouche said is a result of geopolitics. You look at that area, and what's there? It's an automatic natural land connection between Asia and Europe, and between Asia and Africa. It's a sea connection with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean. These were areas central to British control, and that's what geopolitics is about. How do you manipulate governments so that there will be no opposition to a looting policy directed from above by the British Empire? That's the reason, LaRouche says, people are played there.

Let me just give you a brief sense of what I mean when I say the higher-ups involved in manipulation. There's a fellow called Frederick Kempe, who is the CEO of the Atlantic Council, which is one of the leading think tanks for the geopoliticians and the corporate oligarchs. The Atlantic Council is funded by the British government; it's highly integrated into British intelligence; and then it's funded also by corporate cartels from the City of London and Wall Street. Here's what Kempe had to say about Biden's speech Thursday night. He said:

"Historians may come to know U.S. President Joe Biden's speech to the nation as his 'inflection point address'," because Biden said this is an inflection point. Kempe goes on to say, "It was as eloquent and compelling as any he has delivered in his lifetime," which, by the way is not saying much. But then he goes on to say, "It has the potential to be the most significant of his Presidency, and it was choreographed to be

seen as such. It was only the second time he has chosen to speak from behind the resolute desk in the Oval Office, and he did it with the backdrop of wars in Ukraine and Israel, and simmering tensions around Taiwan.”

Now, to show you that Kempe actually understands what’s going on, he does make the counterpoint that, as this was going on, “as if scripted by a grand dramatist, Chinese leader Xi Jinping and Russian President Vladimir Putin were meeting in China as Biden travelled to Israel; doubling down on their common cause to rewrite the rules of the global order.” On that, Kempe is absolutely right. They are rewriting the rules, because they don’t accept the rules of the unipolar order dictated by the corporate cartels centered in London and Wall Street. They are, in fact, leading a rebellion against it, which includes most of the Global South. There are 150 nations at the Beijing conference of the Belt and Road Initiative. So, Kempe has a sense that he’s speaking going uphill. But what he’s identifying, and what Ursula von der Leyen, who is also very close to the Atlantic Council, said in her trip to Washington, what would happen if the U.S. role as the sole superpower is rejected? That’s what Biden said also. The pivotal role of America as the indispensable nation as the murderous Madeleine Albright called it. Well, Lyndon LaRouche has been a primary intellectual force in the opposition to this globalist policy for his whole life. In the time I knew him, from 1972 until his passing in 2019, he gave many speeches, conferences, voluminous writings presenting an alternative to submitting to this order.

I’m going to give you a brief chronology. It’s such a massive opus of work, it would require many days and conferences and we should do that. But I just want to give you a brief glimpse into what he did, and how he shaped this fight, and why today it’s the policies that he and our organization represent that are the alternative. Let’s start in one historic moment, April 1975. LaRouche was invited to attend a conference in Baghdad

of the Ba'ath Party. And while he was there, he met with a number of Arab leaders, and came out of there with a proposal from the Iraqis to pull together a \$30 billion development fund for Israel and Palestine. This, when LaRouche presented it to our membership, was quite staggering. He followed the trip to Baghdad with a press conference announcing the release of his International Development Bank, which was a call for a new monetary system which would be coherent with this package of money for developing Israel and Palestine.

Let me give you a brief anecdotal report on the magnitude of this. Right after this happened, we put out in our newspaper, a headline stating, "Iraq Offers \$30 Billion Peace Plan to Israel." I was with a group of people who distributed this at a speech given by Moshe Dayan at Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. There were hundreds of people there, and we were very much afraid that if we went there and said Iraq wants to end the confrontation and offers money, people would be angry. But what we found out is that they were highly interested in it. We sold every single newspaper we had, and then after the speech by Dayan, I stood up in the audience—José Vega-style—and said to Moshe Dayan, "We have a proposal that Lyndon LaRouche has put on the table from Iraq for a \$30 billion development plan for Israel and Palestine. Would you support that?" I was expecting a harangue from him, because he had a reputation of being a bit of a hothead, a tough military leader. What he said was fascinating. He said, "This is very interesting. This could change everything. I'm very open to hear more about it." It showed at that time the potential for LaRouche's intervention—this is just after the 1973 War, after the Arab oil embargo, after what appeared to be an end to any possibility of realizing the idea of a two-state solution to Israel and Palestine.

When LaRouche introduced his International Development Bank policy, he said the following: "With an IDB policy in the wind, the pro-peace faction of the Mapai [which was an Israeli

party] should soon become hegemonic. The Israelis and key Arab states could readily agree on durable terms of continued negotiation concerning the Palestinian question within the context of immediate firm agreement for cooperation in development policies." With that approach, LaRouche conducted meeting over the next few years, beginning in 1975 when he had a meeting with Israeli leader Abba Eban to further the discussion of this approach. In 1977, LaRouche wrote an article which was published in a Paris-based Israeli newsletter called "Israel and Palestine; A Future for the Middle East." Here's what he said in that:

"In general, without direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, there can be no Middle East settlement for the foreseeable, immediate future. We all know all too well subjective obstacles to such negotiations. We ought to know that we must rapidly eliminate the obstacles to such direct negotiations." He's referring specifically to the idea that you should have a political agreement first, and then move on. What he says is that "The objective basis for a Middle East settlement is the economic development package we have indicated. Any other approach will fail; will be quickly degraded into farce. However, it is not mere material advantage in itself which provides the basis for peace. It is the fact that the commitment of the governments to realize high rates of scientific and technological progress fosters humanist outlooks in the populations."

That was the idea LaRouche had of his Westphalian principle; of the importance of economic policies that show each side recognizing the benefit of the other as the basis of peace. This was his theme in many other papers during that period. He went against the tide when people were saying you can't deal with Arafat, he's unwilling to make a negotiation. What LaRouche wrote in December 1983: "Mr. Arafat is the established leader of what is, in fact, a government in exile of the Palestinian Arabs. If we are going to deal successfully

with the Palestinian Arab people, it is with Mr. Arafat's leadership that we must deal." He then wrote a policy paper, "Proposal To Begin Development of a Long-Range Economic Development Policy for the State of Israel."

Shortly after this, in April 1986, Shimon Peres, who was at that time Israeli Prime Minister, called for a \$25-\$30 billion pool of money to create a Mideast Development Fund for the next ten years. Peres called it a Marshall Plan for Middle East Development. As far as it went, Lyndon LaRouche backed it, and wrote several articles defending it. But he did point out the inadequacy of the approach. What he said at that time was that what's necessary is to address the most serious problem that exists in terms of the economy. What is that? It's the lack of water, and the relationship of that to the lack of power or energy. So, while endorsing Peres' Marshall Plan, and by 1986, Peres had upped the total to \$50 billion, what LaRouche did is, he started writing about how you can create more water for the Middle East. This is the basis of what became known later, by 1990, as his Oasis Plan. What he said is that you need to have a manmade Jordan River, which could flow to provide more water for all the areas that bordered it; including Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and the Arabian Peninsula. He said to do this, you need desalination. You need a string of 300MW nuclear plants that give you the power to do the desalination. It will also provide the electricity needed for industrialization and advanced agriculture. In 1990, he wrote a piece called "A Peace Plan in the True Interests of Arab and Israeli." What LaRouche wrote in this is that we need "geographic engineering" to run the canals between the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea, and then the Red Sea to the Dead Sea, to create water courses which, with nuclear-powered desalination to provide water power and transport, would allow for industrial and agricultural development.

Here's what he said that's really most interesting:

"One could define the proper approach to development of the

Middle East, if no persons lived there presently, as if, for example, we were planning the settling of Mars: an uninhabited planet, by aid of artificial environment, and so forth." He went on to write, the division and distribution of water and power must be organized to develop the average square kilometer of land to be productive at needed levels for different types of land-use—pastoral, crop, residential, industrial, and commercial.

This was idea of the two canals and the overall approach to industrial development was seen as revolutionary. How could you get an agreement on this basis? What happened at that point was that the Bush administration tried to do exactly what LaRouche had warned them not to do. To try and get a political settlement, they had a conference in Madrid, which included representatives of the Palestinians and Israelis, but it was going nowhere. The same old arguments, the same old fights, the same old antagonisms; the fact that there had been a number of wars since 1948 in '48 and '56 and '67 and '73, and continued skirmishing and terrorism. How could you get the two sides together? While the Madrid conference was going on—and at the time it was Yitzhak Shamir who was the Prime Minister, there was something else that was launched when Yitzhak Rabin became Prime Minister the next year in 1992. It was a back channel discussion in Oslo, Norway, between representatives who were close to Shimon Peres, who had come up with this idea of the Mideast Marshall Plan, and representatives of Arafat.

This came to fruition in the September 1993 agreement called the Oslo Accord. Now, what's most important about the Oslo Accord, and most people focus on the fact that Arafat and Rabin shook hands, they spoke about putting an end to the enmity. This is where Rabin made his famous statement that in order to do this, you must have the courage to change axioms. And they reflected that merely by meeting together and shaking hands. It was a very tense moment until the two of them

grabbed each other's hands, looked in each other's eyes, and then moved away and did a toast to each other. A toast to those who have the courage to change axioms. But what was underlying this potential was precisely LaRouche's idea of economic cooperation and development in the two economic annexes that were attached to the Oslo Accord.

I'm just going to read a couple of aspects of this. The economic annex #3: "Protocol on Israeli-Palestinian Cooperation in Economic and Development Programs."

"The two sides agree to establish an Israeli-Palestinian Continuing Committee for Economic Cooperation, focusing, among other things, on the following:

"1. Cooperation in the field of water, including a Water Development Programme ...

"2. Cooperation in the field of electricity ...

"3. Cooperation in the field of energy ...

"4. Cooperation in the field of finance, including a Financial Development and Action Programme for the encouragement of international investment in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip ...

"5. Cooperation in the field of transport and communications ...

"6. Cooperation in the field of trade ..." and finally,

"7. Cooperation in the field of industry, including Industrial Development Programmes, which will provide for the establishment of joint Israeli-Palestinian Industrial Research and Development Centres...."

So, that was Annex #3. Annex #4 consolidates that with the idea of the "Protocol on Israeli-Palestinian Cooperation Concerning Regional Development Programs." It talks about an economic development program for the West Bank and Gaza, a Middle East development fund, and finally, a Middle East

Development Bank. All of this was possible at that time, and this would have done precisely what LaRouche was proposing, which was to create a basis where people in the Palestinian territories would see a benefit in cooperating with Israel, and the Israelis would see a benefit in cooperating with the Palestinians. Not just to end the killing, but to create an environment of mutually beneficial productive activity which would lift the standard of living of people on both sides of the conflict. And on that basis, a two-state solution would be possible. That's at the center of LaRouche's ideas.

Now, what happened to that plan? Well, it was first killed by the World Bank, because by November 1993, the World Bank said they would not funnel money or provide funds that came from donors. President Clinton among others was trying to raise funds for this. There were donors who were prepared to give money, but the World Bank said they would not extend that money to the Palestinians because they didn't trust them because of "corruption." In particular, opposition to having Arafat having any possibility of receiving the funds. As a result, the money was just not there. This was a major problem for the follow through. Then, two years later, Nov. 4, 1995, Yitzhak Rabin was murdered by a man named Yigal Amir, who was part of the settlers' movement and in particular had been very active in Hebron, which was one of the major areas of confrontation between the Palestinians who lived there and the Jewish settlers who were using the power of the Israeli state to move in. The assassination of Rabin, on top of the shutdown of the potential for funds, ended the possibility of the success of Oslo. LaRouche has specifically stated in September 1993, after the handshake in Washington, that it's urgent that the earth start being moved for these new projects immediately. Otherwise, there was a danger that this proposal would be drowned in the blood of both sides. He specifically identified the Sharon networks in the settlers' movement as the threat to it. And that's what happened; an opportunity was lost.

As we see, just project from 1995 to today. The Palestinians still have no state; in fact, they now are divided between two groups, one of which— Hamas, which Netanyahu is now vowing to exterminate— since 2009, Netanyahu and Israel have been providing funds to Hamas to build them up as a counter to the Palestinian Authority. Why? Because the Palestinian Authority is a nationalist movement that represents the interests of the Palestinians as a nation, as opposed to Hamas, which is a religious movement. As long as you have Hamas fighting with the Palestinian Authority, you have no unified government to negotiate with. That's what Netanyahu said; he bragged about doing that. The estimate is that more than \$1 billion was channeled from Israel through Qatar to the Hamas, which now Netanyahu says he's going to exterminate and wipe out.

So, the solution here is that you have to identify what the problem is. The problem is not Israelis and Palestinians, though they may be the ones who carry out the desperate actions. But they're not acting in their own interests; they're acting in the interests of those higher up, who want to prevent any kind of break with the old axioms. We're seeing this happening around the world. Why did this happen right now? Well, I can't speak for the decision-making process of Hamas, but the timing on this is certainly worth looking at. You have the breakdown of support for the Ukraine war in the United States Congress. You have the Ukraine war going terribly. The counteroffensive fizzled out. You may be providing more weapons to Ukraine, but as Putin pointed out, that just means that there will be more deaths of Ukrainians.

The second point is that you have the emergence of a new counter pole to the unipolar order; namely, the BRICS. The emergence of the Global South with the commitment to the kind of development projects that Lyndon LaRouche has been writing about for 50 years; which means against the International Monetary Fund, against such projects as the Great Reset and the global Green New Deal, and so on. So, if you look at this

from the standpoint of a Frederick Kempe and the Atlantic Council, and the people who bankroll that, a peace settlement in the Middle East would be a horrible for them. Just as a negotiated settlement of the Ukraine war, in which what Putin proposed for the last eight years—security guarantees for both Ukraine and Russia, and a recognition for the potential for the two nations to work together—this represents a threat to the continuation of what Blinken calls the rules-based order. And so, that's why it's so revolutionary and important to grasp what LaRouche is saying; both in terms of who's manipulating this, what's the hand above the scene that's playing the two sides against each other? And secondly, how do you defeat that? You have a movement in the Western nations—the United States and Europe—that rejects the unipolar order and the so-called rules-based order and reach out their hands to the Global South to work on joint development projects in the benefit of the other.

So, there is a solution. Those who say there is no solution are just the victims of the psychological warfare which is designed to make you depressed. But the solutions rest with what we've been trying to do; what we've been working on for years, and which is coming together now in the International Peace Coalition and the overall movement of the LaRouche Organization. We can make these solutions happen, but it depends on we, the people; not elected officials who have proven to be too corrupt and too intellectually small to take up the task at hand.

That's my presentation for today.

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 26. oktober 2023:**

## **Stop folkemordet i Gaza inden vi får en storkrig. Formand Tom Gillesberg.**

Lydfilen:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/tg-1-26.10.23-final-mp3.mp3>

---

## **Erklæring fra Jacques Cheminade om den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt**

Den 16. oktober 2023 (EIRNS) – Forfatteren er formand for det franske politiske parti Solidarité et Progrès. Han har været officiel præsidentkandidat i Frankrig tre gange, i 1995, 2012 og 2017. Han er lederen af LaRouche-bevægelsen (og Schiller Instituttets samarbejdspartnere) i Frankrig.

– *“Fra den stærke [kom] noget sødt.” (Dommerne 14:14)*

– *Bed om natten, så folk kan sove. (Hadith)*

Paris, 10. oktober 2023.

Situationen i Mellemøsten er en skændsel for alle. En skam,

fordi ingen virkelig har kæmpet for at afslutte den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt. Vi har tilladt et folk, der lever og føler sig omgivet af fjender, at omringe et andet folk, der lever i et fængsel under åben himmel. Ud af denne ondskab, som har eksisteret så længe, må vi i dag, mod alle odds, sikre, at der kommer et større gode ud af det.

Ethvert menneske kan kun blive chokeret over billederne af de israelske ofre for Operation Al-Aqsa Flood og den behandling, som palæstinenserne har været udsat for af de skiftende israelske regeringer. Ud over ofrenes forfærdelige lidelser er vores udfordring at finde en løsning, der vil sætte en stopper for dette. Det er en udfordring, der vedrører os alle, fordi denne lille del af verden er et vigtigt centrum for civilisation, som ikke kan overlades til barbari.

Det værste er gidseltagningen af alle, af Hamas, men også af de virkelige racistiske angreb på Vestbredden, og drab på civile under særligt grusomme forhold.

Det første, vi kan gøre, er at inspirere disse fjender til at tænke og til at sætte sig i den andens sted, uanset hvor smertefuldt det måtte være. Martin Luther King guider os i denne indsats ved at forklare, hvorfor vi skal elske vores fjender for at forvandle dem til venner og for at forvandle os selv.

Disse refleksioner vil utvivlsomt virke utopiske og virkelighedsfjerne for dem, der søger modsætninger uden at søge fred. På den anden side kræver denne refleksion to ting: at granske sin samvittighed og at forestille sig et større gode ud over betingelserne for den nuværende tragedie.

Denne samvittighedsundersøgelse er en opfordring til palæstinenserne. Vi kan ikke opnå fred ved at proklamere udslettelsen af jøderne og ødelæggelsen af Israel. Målet helliger aldrig midlet, og terrorismens midler ødelægger ikke kun den anden, men også en selv. Fanatisme fører til uhæmmet

terrorisme. De områder, der rammes af Hamas, er således dem, hvor mange aktivister fra den sekulære israelske venstrefløj, der går ind for fred uden besættelse, bor. Det er værre end en forbrydelse at ødelægge dem, man en dag skal tale med.

Denne granskning af samvittigheden er ligeledes en opfordring til israelerne. At tillade en del af befolkningen, især bosættterne, at behandle palæstinensere som hunde, i strid med Israels egne love, er en næsten daglig forbrydelse. At gøre Gaza til en udendørs fangelejr fremprovokerer uundgåeligt vold og fortvivlelse blandt indbyggerne. Endnu værre er det, at det er en vederstyggelighed at ville belejre det fuldstændigt. Ved at hævde: "Ingen elektricitet, ingen mad, ingen gas, vi kæmper mod dyr, og vi handler derefter," overtræder den israelske forsvarsminister Yoav Gallant, desværre i kølvandet på mange andre, de grundlæggende principper i jødedommen og menneskerettighederne. Den totale belejring af Gaza-striben (og vi må nu tilføje: intet vand!) er forbudt ifølge international humanitær lov. Ved gentagne gange at erklære, at "Den Palæstinensiske Myndighed er vores byrde, Hamas er vores mulighed", har finansminister Bezalel Smotrich, ligesom alle israelske embedsmænd før ham, der har støttet Hamas, kynisk leget med ilden for at miskreditere de legitime repræsentanter for den palæstinensiske sag. Vi formoder, at det var disse tvivlsomme spil, der i det mindste delvist førte til, at de israelske myndigheder ikke kunne beskytte en grænse, der ikke desto mindre er fyldt med sensorer, kameraer og vagter.

En offensiv af denne art kan sammenlignes, ikke med 11. september, som mange gentager uden at tænke over det, men med "Tet-offensiven" under Vietnam-krigen, og man må afveje de forfærdelige konsekvenser, den vil få, hvis der ikke findes rimelige kompromiser for at undslippe dilemmaet.

I virkeligheden kender vi den formelle løsning: Stop blodsudgydelserne med en retfærdig og varig fred, med oprettelsen af en palæstinensisk stat. De to folk kunne så, om ikke komme tættere på hinanden, så i det mindste respektere

hinanden, om ikke institutionelt, så gennem økonomisk samarbejde i hele Sydvestasien. Men denne løsning kan ikke anvendes i en kontekst, der er begrænset til selve konfliktområdet, fordi begge parter opfatter den anden som en eksistentiel trussel. Eksterne påvirkninger forværrer konflikten mellem to folk, der betragtes som eksemplariske, men reduceres til "kort", der skal spilles i en stedfortræderkrig. Først Storbritannien, så USA og alt for ofte Frankrig har spillet et dobbeltspil for at kontrollere regionens olieressourcer og på det seneste de tekniske færdigheder i Israels avancerede industrier. Det er derfor primært en destruktiv udenlandsk indblanding, der skal ophøre og omdannes til en katalysator for udvikling og gensidig sikkerhed, som skaber betingelserne for en løsning og garanterer, at den opnås for begge parter.

Frankrig alene kan ikke spille denne rolle. Men Kina har netop præsenteret en erklæring om et "globalt samfund med en fælles fremtid", og præsident Putin har under Valdai-diskussionen den 5. oktober fremmet betingelserne for en "retfærdig multipolaritet: hvordan man sikrer sikkerhed og udvikling for alle i et nyt globalt system".

Global Times, den halvofficielle kinesiske regeringsavis, påpegede, at "enhver plan med geopolitiske motiver er i sagens natur dømt til at mislykkes, når det gælder om at fremme en gensidig og fredelig udvikling i Mellemøsten. Det er muligheder, der skal gribes, især fordi de russiske og kinesiske interventioner indtil videre har udvist reel moderation.

Men vi må gå længere. Eftersom den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt kun er ét element i en global økonomisk krise, vil vi kun kunne løse dette blodige dilemma ved at inkludere det i en international løsning, ligesom det gælder for at afslutte krigen i Ukraine.

Landene i det Globale Syd ønsker ikke at blive trukket ind i

krige, hvor de har alt at tabe, og derfor ønsker de at slippe ud af den koloniale og neokoloniale fælde.

Ved at tage et skridt i deres retning kan Frankrig spille en hidtil uset rolle i ånden fra den Alliancefri Bevægelse i Bandung, som er ved at genopstå i dag, og i ånden fra general de Gaulles afspænding, forståelse og samarbejde. En enorm opgave? Naturligvis, men uden en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur i hver nations interesse kan sammenbruddet af det nuværende vestlige finanssystem kun føre til et sammenstød mellem blokke og i sidste ende til en verdenskrig, først økonomisk og derefter militær. Operation "Al-Aqsa Flood" ville i så fald kun være den første storm.

Frankrig skal vise politisk vilje til at leve op til sin historiske rolle, og med ryggen mod muren giver det, der sker i Israel og Palæstina, os paradoksalt nok en sådan mulighed.

Det er op til os at genopdage en "borgerånd" for at ændre magtens retning herhjemme, synkront med det, der skal ændres i verden. Ved at gå sammen med andre på vejen til en kollektiv løsning. For at gøre dette må vi hver især løfte debatten ud over Mellemosten, som er dens prøvesten.

I dag går mine tanker til min ven Maxim Ghilan (1931-2005), direktør for International Jewish Peace Union, digter og chefredaktør for Israel & Palestine, ven af Nahum Goldmann, Pierre Mendès-France og Abou Nizen.

---

## **Retfærdighed for landene i**

# Sydvestasien (Mellemøsten). Tale af Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets Sydvestasien koordinator den 22. maj 2021

På engelsk:

This sections starts at 24:20 in the video above:

Regarding Palestine: We have a major presentation which will be done by Hussein Askary in just a few minutes on this.

But I just want to point out the following to you concerning Lyndon LaRouche. Back in 1983, looking at and anticipating the kinds of problems that we're seeing today in Gaza, East Jerusalem, and the West Bank, Lyndon LaRouche wrote a proposal with respect to Israel. I think we have a view of that. "A Proposal to Begin Development of a Long-Range Economic Development Policy for the State of Israel." As I said, that was back in 1983. Subsequent to that, we've done much work from both *Executive Intelligence Review* and from the Schiller Institute to promote this conception of development that he puts forward. A bit about the subject and why this segues us into talking about the real issue of Palestine and the real issue of Israel.

We're talking about an area which is about 27 miles long and about 7 miles wide. We're talking about an area that has 2 million people inside of it, in which you have the borders completely controlled. Nothing can move in or out. On one side is Egypt, on the other side there's Israel. You're talking about 96% of the drinking water being unusable; 50% unemployment; 75% youth unemployment. 50% of the people are

under 18 years old. The internet is controlled; electricity is controlled. Movement of food or any other commercial capability is controlled. And some Israeli activists have referred to Gaza in particular as the largest open-air prison in the world. Baruch Kimmelman, who is I believe deceased now, back in 1983 wrote a book called *Politicide* in which he talked about this as being a form of concentration camp. And he knew what he was saying; he was very clear about what he was saying. He was a professor at a university in Israel at the time when he made those statements. People found him very controversial then, but the fact of the matter is, that when you're looking at this issue of the control of population, whether we're talking about Mark Carney in the case of Africa, or we're talking about the case of Palestine, or we're looking around the world in other ways, this matter of the Great Reset so-called, the great First Global Revolution as Alexander King called it, this takes us into a different province. And it's this province that we are going to discuss with you today concerning both the issue of Southwest Asia as a whole, not merely Israel in particular, but more importantly, this concept of the method of the Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites.

With me today are Hussein Askary, who is the Southwest Asia director of the Schiller Institute, and also Diane Saxe, who is a candidate for United States Senate, running in 2022 against Chuck Schumer of New York. So, we're going to go right to Hussein, whose presentation is called "Justice for the Nations of Southwest Asia."

HUSSEIN ASKARY: Thank you very much, Dennis. Hello to Diane. I'm very happy to be with you, and thank you for the nice introduction you just made.

As Lyndon LaRouche said in the clip you saw, you don't have any problem in this region especially which is not created by the British Empire. This is a classic case of geopolitical manipulation of religion and politics and geography to pit

nations against each other, peoples against each other. Before the British Empire got its nose into this region in 1917, we didn't have any problems between Jews and Arabs and Christians and so on. This is a very classic case, but also it's a tragic situation in which, as you just mentioned, the situation in Gaza, for example, is a horrendous situation where the living conditions are similar to an open prison. Now you have the lying Western media talking about Xinjiang in China being an open-air prison and a concentration camp, which is a complete lie, but they are completely blind to the fact that what the Palestinian people—especially in Gaza—have been subjected to is prison camp or concentration camp conditions.

The thing with tragedies is that the people who are inside the tragedy are not able to solve the problem per se, because they are locked into a dead end. Both Hamas and the current Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu are into a game which they believe has nothing to do with anything else than their own goals. The reality is that there is a much bigger picture in which we, who are outside the tragedy so to speak, can situate this problem and find a solution to it. So, the problem does not come from the Palestinians or Jews or anybody, although they are now in the news media the major players. The Israelis are shooting rockets, so the Palestinians are shooting rockets and so on and so forth. But that's not really the real story.

Last week on your show, Harley Schlanger did a fantastic job of explaining the historical background for this. I'm just going to touch on a very few things on that issue, because as I mentioned, there is this British game which continues up to today. The people who planned this knew it was going to continue. But the thing which is important for us today is to situate these events in Gaza of today and in Southwest Asia in the larger context. When and where these things are happening. This is something we have learned from Lyndon LaRouche, because we cannot understand any event by itself without looking at the larger context. And we won't be able to find a

solution for that. Now, these attacks, and I wrote a few weeks before this on Facebook that there are very interesting moves in the region, that can point to a different direction than what we have seen in the past six—we count the years by how many American administrations there have been—so we had two Obama administrations and one Trump administration. That's the diary, and during these three administrations we had a terrible situation in the region, but recently we had very important developments taking place concerning countries in this region. But also it involves Russia and China. The new Biden administration, if you remember the first foreign policy declaration by President Biden is that the United States is back. Now, that was a terrifying message as I recollect when I heard it. The thing is that what Biden means is that what the Trump administration did in this region by disengaging from many issues there, for example, regime-change wars and launching new wars, that made the United States to lose its leadership in the region and in the world. And therefore, the United States should take the leadership in this region back from whom? From China and Russia, because according to the Biden administration, the vacuum created by the lack of U.S. leadership was filled by Russia and China, but it was filled by Russia and China for a good reason with a good policy.

Recently we had the possibility of the 5+1—the 5 permanent members plus Germany—reopening the negotiations with Iran for the nuclear deal, the JCPOA, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Lifting the sanctions against Iran and having Iran cooperate with the international community so to speak, on its own nuclear program to limit Iran's possibility to produce a nuclear weapon, although Iran never had that intention. In any case, these negotiations were going well, it was also still going on in Vienna, and at the same time, Iran and China signed a very strategic and economic joint agreement for 25 years, mostly on economic development along what the Chinese now call the Belt and Road Initiative, the New Silk Road. Iran and China will work intensively to build infrastructure,

develop industry, technology transfer, and other strategic and military cooperation. We had at the same time Saudi Arabia and Iran, who are rivals in this region, the big Sunni-Shi'a rivals, starting negotiations in Baghdad, the Iraqi capital to ease the tension and find ways of ending their so-called proxy wars in other parts of the region. We had the prospect of Syria re-entering the Arab League again, and ending the war there in which Russia has played a key role. We also the prospects of a possibility of having a new Yemen envoy to the UN instead of the British diplomat who has been actually playing a dirty game in Yemen in the last few years. A new envoy who will start negotiations. The Iran-Saudi negotiations will have a positive effect on solving the horrible situation in Yemen, which you have discussed many times in your shows, and Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has made an issue of lifting the blockade and sanctions on Yemen, which is genocidal. At the same time, we had the Libya situation becoming calm due to interventions by many nations, but especially Russia, Egypt, and Turkey working together to stabilize the situation. Egypt and Turkey which have been rivals for the past 10-12 years are now re-approaching each other diplomatically.

So, you had a situation in the region where things were going in the right direction, and suddenly we had the increase of tension in Palestine and Israel, with East Jerusalem first with the Sheik Jarrah neighborhood, which was about to be taken over by Israeli Jewish settlers from its Arab inhabitants. But the core decision was delayed, but then you had all the rioting and the treatment by the Israeli police of the Palestinians. And Hamas, from Gaza, intervening with its rockets. So, we had this development which everybody saw on the news.

The problem is, there are people who, if we don't look at the general context, if we don't look at the history of this conflict, there are certain fallacies which people push out. For example, that Israel and Palestine are treated as equal,

but Israel is one of the strongest military powers in the world. It's backed by the most advanced military power in the world—the United States. They have the most advanced weapons and intelligence and everything. The Palestinians don't have that. The other thing is that the Palestinians don't really have a state. So, you cannot demand from the Palestinians to take certain actions when they are living in a state-less condition and being oppressed both in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. People say, "Why can't the Palestinians live in peace with the Jews and the Israelis?" The problem is, the Palestinians are not treated as equals, they are not treated as humans, even. Also, what they are seeing—and this is something which Harley Schlanger discussed last week—that we have an ideology in Israel, especially in the right wing like Netanyahu's party, the Likud and other extreme so-called Zionist political parties and religious groups, who really don't consider the Palestinians or the Arabs as somebody whom they should live with and exist there. We remember Ariel Sharon's old slogan that "Jordan is Palestine." His idea was that the Palestinians should be moved, transferred to Jordan where they can have their Palestinian state, but not on the so-called Holy Land. Therefore, we have many issues that are not resolved; but solving them could become easier if we look back at the history of the situation. There are UN resolutions that can give the Palestinian people and the Arab countries a fair solution to this problem, and make sure that the moderate forces in the Arab world and in Palestine are the ones who have the upper hand, not the extremists.

Just to recall, one thing we have discussed and developed, the LaRouche movement and *Executive Intelligence Review*, that Hamas, for example, has its own agenda. It's part of the international Muslim Brotherhood movement, and it does not do things just for national interest. The problem with the Muslim Brotherhood is they have been the creation of the British Empire, and have been manipulated, including by the CIA, to oppose the nationalist anti-imperialist forces in the whole

Southwest Asia region and the Arab world. So, Hamas itself, and I'm making myself unpopular now in the Arab countries, has its own agenda; exactly as Benjamin Netanyahu and his people have their own agenda.

I just want to share with you a few things on the historical background to understand how the British manipulated the situation. While World War I was going on, you had young people dying on the Western Front so to speak. Germans, French, and even Americans were involved later, by the tens of thousands. The British were planning, together with the French, other things somewhere else in the world. We have described it as the Sykes-Picot Agreement. The British and the French would divide the territories of the old Ottoman Empire, which also includes what is today Palestine, Israel. It was still under control of the Ottomans, the Turks, until that point. So, they were planning that, and then they had also at the same time—November 1917—the British presenting what is historically called the Balfour Declaration. The Balfour Declaration was a letter sent by Lord Arthur Balfour, the Foreign Secretary of Britain, to Lord Rothschild, who was the head of the UK-based Zionist organization. In that letter, the British, as you see in the text, are willing to have a Jewish Zionist state in Palestine. This is an admission that there was a such a place called Palestine, but the British wanted to offer that as a homeland for the Jews in Europe.

The thing is, what the British set up is actually a trap, both for the Jews and for the nations of the region. Because prior to that—it's a bit humorous how some of these Jewish organizations in the 19th Century and even the early 20th Century were thinking where their future Jewish state should be. And you can find it on the internet if you look for proposals for a Jewish state. There are about 10-11 proposals, none of them include Palestine. These are places in the U.S., there is a place in Uganda, there was one in Russia, Japan, Madagascar, in Guyana, Ethiopia, and so on. But the British

chose to have Palestine because they had their own plans how to divide and conquer this region and also use it because it is the crossroads of the continents and the oceans. So, the British can control that region forever. Or manipulate others like the United States is being manipulated now into supporting Israel in whatever Israel does so that the conflict continues. There is no way out of such a conflict. This is one of the sinister things the British created like you have in Kashmir and so on, which is a big problem.

So, the problem is now, how to get out of that situation. We cannot get out of that problem by rolling back history. You cannot negate the existence of the Israeli state; you cannot either ask the Palestinians to leave for Jordan as Sharon wanted to do to have their own state. We should follow certain steps, make certain compromises to allow the Palestinian people to have their own state. Because without the Palestinian state, you would have this continuous problem where the Palestinians continue to lose territory and power, and they will have to resort to either rioting, or as we have seen now recently, rocket attacks on Israel. Hamas knows it cannot defeat Israel with military means, but what they want to show Israel is that they cannot be safe being there and exerting that kind of force and policy against the Palestinians. Which is correct. It's not only the Palestinians. You cannot exist in that region where you have 100 million Egyptians, you have 40 million Iraqis, millions of Jordanians, 30 million Syrians, 5 million Lebanese, and so on. And you think you can live like an island of peace and tranquility in the midst of a hell you are contributing to create. Like Israel played a key role in the war on Syria in recent years; also in Lebanon. So, there are certain ways of getting to diplomatic ways of resolving the Palestinian issue. We have United Nations resolutions, which clearly mark where the Palestinians could have their own state, and the Israelis could have their state. There is UN Resolution 242, which came after the 1967 War, in which Israel occupied the West Bank and

Gaza and Golan Heights and other parts and the Sinai Peninsula. This is a resolution which was voted unanimously by the United Nations Security Council, including the United States. But people have been dragging their feet on that.

This is an old map of the partition plan of 1947, before Israel was officially established. The first Arab-Israeli war, where in the blue you have Israel. The UN Partition Plan was supposed to solve the problem at the time. Remember, President Roosevelt was very active in the last year of his life, when he met with leaders of the region. In his discussions with the Saudi king, Abdul Aziz ibn-Saud, he suggested the king intervene with the other Arab leaders to resolve the problems created by the British in the region in this Palestinian area. Because Roosevelt was sensing that he had to stop this British game in the region, but also that there were moves inside the United States to entangle the United States into this conflict through what we saw later emerging, especially under Harry Truman; so-called election considerations forced the United States to side completely with the Israeli side. Roosevelt was trying to get the Arabs to accept a compromise to establish this so-called Two-State Solution and stop the British geopolitical manipulation. But that did not happen. Roosevelt died; the British continued to control there. But then the British pulled out and allowed the Israelis to take even more of the Palestinian land, as you see in the pink and green colors. These were taken in 1949, but also later the green zones, the West Bank and Gaza were taken in 1967, including eastern Jerusalem.

This is the United Nations demarcation plan after the war in 1967, which marks where the different territorial claims of the different parties would be. And then, what has happened since then is that the Israelis have been building illegal settlements in these occupied areas, like you have in the dark red areas. So, the Palestinians are living in these enclaves in the West Bank which are cut off by a series of settlements

by the Jewish settlers, and also walled off. They had walls built between the different parts of the West Bank. The Palestinians see their land shrinking more and more, and their rights disappearing. The Palestinians are told they should stop complaining, and accept whatever they are offered. The problem is that the Palestinians having looked at this history, and their country shrinking, their water being stolen from them, and every other right. And they know that Netanyahu and his supporters have no intention of establishing a Palestinian state. Actually, even the Arab Israelis, there are Arabs inside Israel who are Israeli citizens, who are also being targetted right now. Last year the Israeli Knesset removed Arabic language from existence inside Israel; they decided there shouldn't be any Arabic language. So, the Arabs in Israel also see themselves threatened. They are the ones who are making lots of demonstrations in the previous weeks. They are Israeli citizens, but they have Arab ethnic background.

Asking the Palestinians to stop complaining is like asking the woman who is beaten by her husband the whole time, that she should stop complaining so her husband stops beating her. The problem is, the husband continues beating her, because he's a sociopath; he's an insane person. Somebody comes with a statistical study like we see all the time—people like Jared Kushner is typical. The theory is that the more the woman complains, the more there is abuse. Therefore, complaining is counterproductive. So, the Palestinians should stop complaining, because that creates the problem. So, you have that enormous injustice, and the Palestinians can see that they are not being treated, that their future is threatened. There is no future in the view to see, and there are major powers who are against them, and they have no allies. That's what creates the enormous frustration among the Palestinians who see no other way than fighting back. That's really terrible.

The other thing which I think we should discuss, besides these diplomatic solutions I mentioned—either a two-state solution going back to the Oslo Agreement, going back to these United Nations' solutions. We need to have a solution for the whole region, which is the issue which Lyndon LaRouche has been fighting for since the 1970s. The only way out of these wars is economic cooperation, economic development; especially in terms of water resources, transportation, power, electricity, education, and health care. I think this is the important issue to discuss now, because if we don't take whole so-called Palestinian issue back to the big powers, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche has mentioned, we should have a summit of the major powers. LaRouche called it the Four Powers—the United States, Russia, China, and India. We can also discuss the United Nations Security Council powers and others, to have a discussion about establishing peace in this whole region with economic development. I think the best solution which we have had, which has worked, is achieving things on the ground, is what China is doing with the Belt and Road Initiative, the New Silk Road. Building infrastructure, health care, and so on. Russia is also playing a key role in providing specific technologies like nuclear power to nations in the region; to Iran, now Egypt. We have also with other African nations. So scientific and technological cooperation, economic cooperation is the solution. It has been since LaRouche announced that in the early 1970s, and it continues to be in the future. I think this is one of the big issues that has to be put on the table for people, so we don't get entangled into these ethnic, religious matters. There was no real ethnic or religious problems between Jews and Arabs before the British Empire stuck its nose into this region.

I stop here, and I allow more matters to be discussed in the discussion period.

SPEED: Thank you a lot for that Hussein. There are going to be several questions. There's a lot of ways we can take this.

---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING MAJ 2021: Vores moralske sammenbrud råber på et nyt paradigme**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Det er stormagternes ansvar at sikre midlerne til livets opretholdelse**

14. maj (EIRNS) – Søndag den 16. maj finder et møde om de israelsk-palæstinensiske stridigheder sted i FN's Sikkerhedsråd. Med Kina som formand i denne måned blev Rådet på grund af USA's forsinkelsestaktik forhindret i at mødes tidligere på ugen, eller endog at udsende en erklæring med opfordring til at stoppe de forfærdelige blodsudgydelser. Ud over antallet af dræbte under voldsomhederne, stiger lidelsen og antallet af dødsfald for hver time på grund af den udbredte ødelæggelse af midlerne til livets opretholdelse – vand, energi og mad. På søndag lukkes der for elektriciteten i Gaza, der er hjemsted for 2 millioner mennesker, efter israelsk lukning af brændstofforsyninger over grænseovergangene. Vandforsyningen, der allerede er lav og svigtende, kunne stoppe.

Denne kriseregion og den verdensomspændende virkning af den langvarige pandemi og den forværrede hungersnød, skriger efter samordnet handling fra stormagterne. Der er allerede institutionelle netværk til opgaverne. Nødsituationen gør det dramatisk klart, at der er behov for et møde med lederne for de fem permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd (USA, Rusland, Kina, Storbritannien og Frankrig) så hurtigt som muligt, som foreslået af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin første gang i Jerusalem den 23. januar 2020.

Putin og FN's generaldirektør, Antonio Guterres, mødtes i går (online) og opfordrede til at stoppe kampene mellem Israel og palæstinenserne og til handling for at "sikre civilbefolkningens sikkerhed", som Kreml sagde. Guterres lovede specifikt under sit besøg i Moskva, at FN er "fuldt parat" til at genoptage arbejdet i Mellemøsten-kvartetten – Rusland, USA, FN og Den Europæiske Union – for at standse volden.

Den amerikanske modstand mod en fredsintervention er en fortsættelse af den mangeårige britiske udenrigspolitiske drejebog med at anspore permanente spændinger – vanvittigt i en tidsalder med atomvåben. Især den amerikanske udenrigspolitik med at indføre økonomiske sanktioner i hele denne region, og så mange andre steder, ødelægger bevidst midlerne til livets opretholdelse for millioner af mennesker.

I Syrien, eksempelvis, forhindrer de direkte og indirekte virkninger af amerikanske sanktioner, at syrere vender tilbage til deres hjem. En ny rapport siger: "Fra i dag at regne er 2.249.050 syriske borgere vendt tilbage til de steder, hvor de har valgt bopæl", men millioner flere – især som flygtninge i nabolandene – kan ikke gøre dette og lider meget. De mangler mad, rent vand, medicin, byggematerialer og så videre. "Alle opfordringer til at reducere de grusomme sanktioner er hidtil blevet kynisk ignoreret." (13. maj, 2021, "Erklæring fra Den russiske Føderation og den Syriske arabiske Republiks fælles koordinationsudvalg om problemerne med repatriering af de

syriske flygtninge og internt fordrevne".  
[http://eng.mil.ru/en/news\\_page/country/more.htm?id=12361170@egNews](http://eng.mil.ru/en/news_page/country/more.htm?id=12361170@egNews))

Samarbejdet mellem stormagterne for umiddelbar intervention for våbenhvile involverer samtidig humanitær nødhjælp med vand, energi og medicin og forpligtelse til udvikling. Der er allerede økonomiske programmer på dagsordenen for regionen. På Schiller Instituttets internationale onlinekonferencer, 2020-2021, blev f.eks. "Project Phoenix" for Syrien og "Project Felix" for Yemen og andre projekter præsenteret og drøftet. "Oasis Plan -perspektivet – præsenteret for årtier siden af statsmanden og økonomen Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. – opfordrer til storstilet økonomisk udvikling i fuld skala i hele Mellemøsten og Nordafrika (MENA), i overensstemmelse med mange specifikke projekter, f.eks. det russisk-egyptiske atomprojekt, der nu er i gang i El Dabaa.

I marts i år besøgte den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi seks sydvestasiatiske lande og præsenterede et fempunkt-initiativ for regional sikkerhed, der involverer økonomisk udvikling i forbindelse med Bælte- og Vejinitiativet. Han sagde udtrykkeligt, at Kina, når det overtager formandskabet for FN's Sikkerhedsråd i maj måned, vil tilskynde FN's Sikkerhedsråd til fuldt ud at drøfte spørgsmålet om Palæstina for at bekræfte tostatsløsningen. Nu er dette løfte blevet den største, mest påtrængende opgave for hele verden.

Her er et uddrag af en briefing, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav til medarbejdere mandag den 17. maj:

"Wang Yi fremsatte et firepunkt-forslag vedrørende konflikten mellem Palæstina og Israel, hvor forslagene først og fremmest består af våbenhvile og ophør med vold som den højeste prioritet; at begge sider straks skal stoppe militære og fjendtlige handlinger; for det andet er humanitær bistand et akut behov; at der øjeblikkeligt må være en opfyldelse af forpligtelser i henhold til internationale traktater, hvilket

betyder at ophæve alle blokader og belejring af Gaza så hurtigt som muligt; for det tredje skal der være fast støtte til en tostatsløsning, som på dette stadium vil kræve en større indsats; og for det fjerde, tostatsløsningen, herunder oprettelsen af en uafhængig palæstinensisk stat, der har fuld suverænitet med Østjerusalem som hovedstad, baseret på 1967-grænserne, og realisere den fredelige sameksistens mellem Palæstina og Israel. Dette fremlægger Kina i sin egenskab af nuværende formand for FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

"Dette er alt sammen i overensstemmelse med eksisterende FN-resolutioner, og man vil normalt sige, at det er den oplagte løsning. Problemet er imidlertid, at der på grund af mange års tolerance af bosættelserne ikke er en tomme territorium i Palæstina, der ikke har bosætterboliger, så det vil være ekstremt vanskelig at realisere. Hvilket bringer vores grundlæggende punkt tilbage, at man ikke kan løse nogen af disse problemer isoleret. Den eneste måde, man kan have noget håb om at løse Mellemøsten-problemet er, at man udvikler hele regionen, fra Iran til Irak, til Syrien, til Egypten, til Tyrkiet, herunder Afghanistan, som en del af Silkevejen. Kun under disse betingelser kunne man udarbejde en multilateral tilgang for at få tilstrækkelige fordele for alle parter til, at de ville være enige om en sådan løsning. Og jeg tror, at dette forslag ser så godt som umuligt ud, men alternativet ville være evig krig, og i sidste ende bliver Mellemøsten en udløsende faktor for 3. verdenskrig eller i det mindste en større krig".

Lad os gøre stort brug af dialogen på Schiller Instituttets konference den 8. maj om: "Det moralske sammenbrud i den transatlantiske verden skriger på et nyt paradigme". Præsentationer arkiveres og er individuelt tilgængelige. <https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/05/07/conference-the-moral-collapse-of-the-trans-atlantic-world-cries-out-for-a-new-paradigm/>

## **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

---

## **Briterne skubber på for krige i Mellemøsten,**

# for at afspore fremvoksende samarbejde mellem de Fire Magter. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Schiller Institut Webcast, 17. maj, 2018. Engelsk udskrift

*Introduktion: I oktober måned, 2009, talte Lyndon LaRouche på Forum for Dialog mellem Civilisationer på øen Rhodos, hvor han fremlagde konceptet om, at en aftale mellem fire, ledende magter – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – kan danne grundlaget for at skabe et nyt, globalt kreditsystem til at erstatte det håbløst bankerotte, transatlantiske finanssystem, der på spektakulær vis krakkede det foregående år. I løbet af de seneste år er dette potentiale, under ledelse af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, begyndt at antage konkret form. Med valget af Donald Trump til præsident i 2016, og som for en stor dels vedkommende skyldtes hans afvisning af hans forgængeres politikker for krig og finansspekulation, sås det, at han var parat til at tage skridt til at bevæge USA til at gå med i denne aftale.*

*Dette alene forklarer de desperate handlinger imod ham, med begyndelse i de svindelagtige Russiagate-beskyldninger, som var brygget sammen af britiske efterretningsnetværk og Obamas efterretningsfolk. Det forklarer også indsatsen for en skarpere konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland og Kina, inkl. Sripal-affæren og anklagerne om de kemiske våben i Douma, under falsk flag. De seneste, farlige handlinger fra Israels Netanyahu-regering mod Syrien, Iran, Libanon og*

*palæstinenserne, og den fortsatte folkemorderiske krig, som saudierne fører imod Yemen, er alle en del af den samme deployering for at bruge krig til at stoppe konsolideringen af LaRouches idé om en Firemagtsalliance.*

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche har sagt, at det eneste, der kan stoppe denne dynamik for de Fire Magter, der har vundet frem omkring Kinas lederskab og Bælte & Vej Initiativet, er krig. Krigsfremstødet, der kommer fra Storbritannien, må nedkæmpes! Hør fr. LaRouche kommende torsdag for den seneste opdatering om denne kamp, og hvad du kan gøre for at sikre, at Imperiet og dets geopolitiske vanvid bringes til en afslutning.*

Engelsk udskrift:

### **British Push Mideast Wars to Derail Emerging Four-Power Cooperation**

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, May 17, 2018  
With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to this week's international webcast, featuring our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Over the last weeks Helga has been emphasizing the deployment by British Imperial geopolitical interests out to wreck the promising potential that's emerged in Eurasia, and especially around the recent developments of a potential peace agreement with North Korea. Helga's repeatedly emphasized that this looks a lot like sleepwalking into World War I and in fact, with the events that just took place in Gaza, in the last couple of days, the massacre there by Israeli

soldiers,  
the threat for the situation to break out of control,  
obviously,  
Helga, this looks like this is a potential kind of pre-war  
kind  
of deployment to disrupt the emergence of this four power  
agreement.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes, I think what has happened around  
Gaza in the last days is really a tragedy. Obviously, it  
coincided with the opening of the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem,  
which I think was an unnecessary and provocative thing to do.  
But the situation in the Gaza is an open-air jail; it's a new  
Warsaw Ghetto. If you look at what has happened there – OK,  
I'm  
not excluding, that there are some violent Hamas elements, who  
used  
the fact, that people are generally upset about the  
conditions.  
Basically, you have a very tiny area, of the size of the  
city-state of Bremen in Germany, which is very small, where 2  
million people are crowded. They have no money for food, they  
have only a few hours of electricity, they have no clean  
water,  
and no medical supplies, which now, after 61 people were shot  
and  
killed, and 2,700 wounded became a real nightmare, because you  
had all these wounded people who were not treated.  
So people have been demonstrating, and the Israeli IDF and  
special snipers shot into the crowd, which was completely  
unnecessary. If you want to dissolve a crowd, you can use  
water  
throwers, you can use such other means – you don't have to  
shoot  
people dead. So, this has inflamed the situation and as I  
said,  
after a day of mourning and funerals, now the thing is not

stopping. The Israelis are firing airstrikes at installations of the Hamas in Gaza.

This could easily lead to an escalation where you have a war between Israel and Hamas, Hezbollah, potentially Iran, and then,

from there it goes to a big war. This is a terrible situation. And I should remind people that what is happening in this area,

even though it's not in the spotlight of the mass media, when you

had the Oslo Agreement, which was in 1993, already at that time,

the Palestinians were supposed to get only 25% of the territory

of Palestine, and the Israelis would get 75%. But in the meantime, 60% of the so-called West Bank of Jordan has been occupied by settlers, so there's only 40% left, and this is really becoming a very dire situation, and obviously the aim, and

several people have said that, the aim is to demoralize the Palestinians in such a way that they give up and just quit, which

won't happen.

You have a situation, where the Jewish population is becoming quickly a minority and you cannot maintain a rule a hostile population which outnumbers you in such ways: We saw that in other occasions, such as in South Africa, it didn't function, and it will not function here.

So even if you don't have an escalation to a big war, you have Hell! And I have been saying this, and naturally my husband

has been saying it for decades: You need economic development.

Because if you have a lot of young people in Gaza and elsewhere,

who are growing up, being 14, 15, 16, and already at that time

have the feeling they have no future, it is a chain of violence,  
an escalation of violence is pre-programmed.  
We have been making the point, the whole time, that while you have Christian fundamentalists in the United States who think that an early Middle East war is a good thing – I have heard such people talking like that. The reality is that the Middle East, Southwest Asia, has been the playground of British Imperialism, and at a certain point also French Imperialism, which basically have treated this region as a region for proxy wars for their own geopolitical interests. This was demonstrated in the Sykes-Picot Treaty of 1916, which carved up this region in ways which was the seed for future conflicts. And right now, you can see very clear, the aim is to get a confrontation with Russia – Iran – but, Russia, China, and that way prevent the possibility of a cooperation in a New Paradigm. My husband has said this many times; emphatically he has made speeches about it at international forums, that the only way how you can break this terrible nightmare of violence and horror is by having a Four Power agreement among the United States, Russia, China, and India, and that way, you have enough people and enough military, political, and economic power to end the British Empire and their ability manipulate the situation. This has to be put on the agenda, because if it's not, the danger is, that this thing spirals out of control, and already now it's a terrible nightmare and a tragedy for the people who are suffering these situations.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned the Sykes-Picot Agreement which was a perfect example of the British geopolitical deployment

that

led to World War I, and then the immediate period afterwards where the British were moving in, to try to replace the collapsing Ottoman Empire and establish what the British call the

“Middle East” today, a bridge that they could control between Asia, Africa, and Europe.

These geopoliticians are on the march, they’re threatening – in Israel you have threats against Lebanon, Israeli strikes on Iranian positions in Syria. But, Helga, I think the important

thing for people to understand, is your emphasis and your husband’s emphasis on a bigger picture agreement, which would be

that of the great powers. None of these small states can maneuver effectively within this. How is this that you could get

an agreement? Isn’t this a perfect opportunity for Trump and Putin to get together and sit down and talk about it?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. I think that that particular move. They did agree on the telephone to have an early summit. President Trump even invited Putin to come to the White House. And given the extremely difficult factional situation in the United States, and anti-Trump, Russiagate coup attempt, which is

completely falling apart, but it’s still not officially acknowledged, and it needs to be gotten through in terms of putting the culprits of this coup in trial instead.

Given these difficult and complex situations, I think that if this summit between Putin and Trump would take place as quickly as possible, and take all the time needed to discuss and

develop flanks to the situation, I think that is the one thing which could cut through all of this and create new options. I think we should all wish, and speak out, that such an early summit would occur.

SCHLANGER: We also see the great potential on the Korean Peninsula, somewhat set back by these comments by Bolton, the national security advisor, comparing North Korea to Libya, which is an unmistakable reference for anyone in North Korea that the threat that, when Qaddafi went along with an agreement to get rid of his nuclear weapons, less than a decade later, Obama, Cameron, Sarkozy and Hillary Clinton went in and destroyed the country. What's your sense of where things stand now, following the statement from North Korea of the cancellation of the North Korea/South Korea summit that was supposed to take place, I think today; what's your sense of where this is heading?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think it is a dangerous phase. It's not yet hopeless, because after this North Korea/South Korea summit was cancelled, the State Department said the United States still assumes that the summit between Trump and Kim Jong-un will take place on June 12 in Singapore. And there were rumors in the Japanese papers that maybe even Xi Jinping would participate in such a summit. So this is not yet off the table. And the Deputy Foreign Minister of North Korea, whose name is Kim Kye-gwan, he made a very clear distinction between the statements and the line of Pompeo and Trump; and Pompeo was in North Korea came back and reported very respectfully and very positively about Kim Jong-un

and Trump clearly has taken up a very respectful tone towards Kim Jong-un as well. However, Bolton – and this Deputy Foreign Minister made this distinction very clearly – Bolton in, I don't know if it was just being unclever or deliberate, I have no way of saying, but to tell the North Koreans that the model of the denuclearization proposal by Kim Jong-un will following the Libya model!—I mean, you cannot say something worse. Because if you remember, Libya, Qaddafi, turned over all of Libya's nuclear weapons and then the result was, he was overthrown and killed, and the country has been in complete chaos ever since, basically ungovernable to the present day.

This Deputy Foreign Minister basically said they will never accept such a model, obviously, and that North Korea is proposing something which is not to be taken as a weakness, but it is actually an effort by Kim Jong-un to solve a very untenable, terrible situation, but it's not a sign of weakness. And it cannot be done by unilateral commands from the side of the United States, but it has to occur in a trustful atmosphere of dialogue and cooperation. So, since I think that President Trump is intending to do that, I don't think it's completely in danger, but there clearly is a cloud over the horizon.

And obviously the events in the Middle East also have a peripheral impact, namely the question which is being raised by many people, if the United States can rip apart the nuclear agreement with Iran, which was a negotiated agreement, it took 12 years, many nations were involved, the United Nations approved it, so if you unilaterally get rid of such an agreement, you

know, it also puts a question of doubt on the reliability of the United States in general.

All of this means we are really in a very dangerous situation. And, for example, there was just a new poll, where by

now, 57 % of all Russians are convinced that the crisis in Syria

will lead to a global war. Now, I hope not, but the air is full

of worry, about war, and people who are concerned about this, they should help us to mobilize to bring in the alternative:

Which is the cooperation among nations for a win-win cooperation

overcoming geopolitics. And the potential clearly is there.

I

think a lot of good things have happened: The rapprochement between China and Japan; careful steps in this direction between

China and India; clearly a good relation between Japan and Russia; Trump clearly has stated his intention to keep, despite

all trade issues, a good relationship with "his friend Xi Jinping," as he always calls him; and there is the pending summit

between Trump and Putin.

So all the potentials are clearly there, but it is also clear that as the Western financial system is in absolute mortal

danger of a new blowout, the risks to the situation cannot be overstated, and make every intervention in the direction of solving these problems with the Four Laws proposed by my husband,

extremely urgent. So I would call on all of you that you should

get in contact with us, you should become a member of the Schiller Institute, you should help us to put the Four Laws of

Lyndon LaRouche on the agenda, because they're not only needed in the United States, they're equally needed in Europe and other affected by the effects of the trans-Atlantic financial system.

SCHLANGER: This just highlights the difficulty of existing in between two paradigms: On the one side you have the old geopolitical, unilateralist paradigm, which is an imperial paradigm, of war, of proxy wars, of false flags, of terrorism, of bail-outs, of austerity; and that's being rejected by the world's population. But we haven't yet seen the full consolidation of the New Paradigm, and that's what the work of the Schiller Institute has been from the beginning, to bring this New Paradigm into existence.

On that, also the Iran situation is sort of hanging between these two paradigms; it's not clear where that's going. But, Helga, there's been some discussion among Europeans as to whether or not the agreement can be salvaged. What do you know about that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, the Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif travelled to China; he travelled to Russia and then to Brussels, because all of these countries – that, is Russia, China, Germany, France, and Great Britain, and the EU basically have stated that they want to try with all possible means to maintain the Iran nuclear agreement, even if the United States pulled out unilaterally. It is not clear if that will function. Naturally, the fact that Russia and China are backing it is a very

important  
point.

However, if the U.S. would impose secondary sanctions on European firms that maintain business with Iran, I don't know what will happen: Because the European Union foreign policy representative Federica Mogherini said that they will pull out some regulations which were voted in, or accepted in the '90s, but they were never used, to protect such firms from sanctions.

Now, I have a hard time to imagine how that will function, given

the fact that international banks are operating internationally,

so if the United States would impose these secondary sanctions,

it could cause absolute havoc in the whole situation.

The Europeans have now said that they demand additional negotiations with Iran, this time not concerning the nuclear program, but concerning the Iranian missile program, which is also something which President Trump had mentioned, and he said

all the time that he would come up with a better deal – well, I

hope that this better deal is a comprehensive solution for the whole region.

We have discussed this many times, but I want to reiterate it: That if you want to solve the problem in the Middle East, or

in Southwest Asia, you have to take into account the security interests of every country and every single party, and that emphatically includes not only Israel, but it includes Iran, it

includes the Palestinians; it includes every country. And equally important is that you need to have economic development:

You have right now several situations which are turning into a nightmare. One is Yemen. You know, you have {the} largest

humanitarian catastrophe of the planet right now taking place in Yemen. You have the situation in the Gaza Strip. And naturally, you have all the areas which have been destroyed by these wars: The situation in Afghanistan remains quite out of control, even so, there are hopeful signs that this could be turned around. Now, what you need, is, if you have a very complex situation like that – and obviously, the many things which have happened, the terrorisms, many wars – emotions are hurt, people have an incredible accumulated rage: You need something big, and the only way how you could get it, is if you had all the neighbors, Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, the United States, and hopefully European nations all agreeing that the only way how this can be solved, is, you have to have the extension of the New Silk Road into the region and develop every country as part one, integrated, industrial infrastructure development program. There are already the beginnings of that. When President Xi Jinping was three years ago in Iran, he agreed already with President Rouhani at the time, that the New Silk Road would be extended into Iran. You had the Afghanistan President demanding that the New Silk Road should be applied in Afghanistan; and at the recent Wuhan meeting of President Xi Jinping and India's Prime Minister Modi, they agreed that China and India would cooperate in bringing the Silk Road into Afghanistan, by building, as a first step, a large train connection between Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Iran, China, and that way start to connect Afghanistan to the Silk Road.

That same approach must be taken for Iraq, for Syria, for the situation in Yemen, and naturally Egypt will have to play a very important role as a bridge between Asia and Africa. I think Egypt is absolutely thinking in this direction, already. And however, naturally, these are gigantic projects and they cannot be done by any one country alone; even if China has a special envoy for Syria, they have said they want to play a leading role in the reconstruction of Syria. You have the earlier commitment of Russia to supply energy, of Iran to help in the industrial development. But that needs to be presented as a comprehensive proposal.

And I'm sure that there are people in Israel, as well, who will not agree with the present course of Netanyahu – who, by the way, faces his own problems and may look into not such a bright future for his own political career – but there are people in Israel who agree, that you need to come out of this terrible paradigm of the present configuration. And if there would be an agreement, between Trump, Xi Jinping, Putin and Modi, and then other leaders joining with them, to go in this direction, even this very difficult situation of Southwest Asia could be approached and a solution could be found. But it does require an extraordinary intervention.

SCHLANGER: And just to inform our new viewers, and as well as to remind our regular viewers, we produced that blueprint, the report that we've done on the New Silk Road coming into Africa and West Asia, and that's available through the Schiller

Institute. ["Extending the New Silk Road to West Asia and Africa:

A Vision of an Economic Renaissance"]

<http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com/extending-new-silk-road-west-asia-africa/>

And it is a comprehensive picture of what the Chinese have proposed, and what they're actually already doing, moving the earth, creating jobs, educating people, and doing the job training that's necessary.

As long as we're continuing to review the danger spots, there's one other one that won't go away, and that's the situation in Ukraine, where you had just this week the raid on the offices of RIA Novosti; you have various kinds of threats coming from Poroshenko, and the neo-Nazis in the security agencies in Ukraine.

You also have this very interesting development of a new bridge opening connecting Russia to Crimea, and this being a cause for some wild Ukrainian fascists, calling for blowing up the bridge because this is an attack on Ukrainian independence.

Helga, what's the situation on the ground as far as you can see in Ukraine right now?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: This raid on the offices of RIA Novosti is very serious, because they arrested the office chief Kirill Vyshinsky; they compared RIA Novosti with Goebbels – I mean, talking about the free press, you can really say that in Ukraine

right now, the situation is quite dire.

Mrs. Merkel, the German Chancellor, will go to Sochi, Russia to meet with Putin and this will be one of the subjects of discussion; naturally, the other crisis spots as well. So, I think if one could somehow put pressure that the Minsk Agreement

is being put back on the table, which right now it is obviously

not, because Kiev is absolutely not cooperating, and you have the law by Poroshenko to solve the situation in East Ukraine by military means. So this is definitely another extremely dangerous situation.

But, because it is so dangerous, I think more people are waking up to that, and that may be a first step to hopefully prevent something which could easily become World War III.

SCHLANGER: And the Ukraine issue brings up another aspect of Russiagate. I was just doing some review of this in the last couple of days, and I noticed something that I had forgotten, which is that John Brennan, the former CIA director who is at the center of much of the operation of Russiagate against Trump, that Brennan had made a secret trip to Kiev shortly after the overthrow of Yanukovych, and put in motion U.S. support for the criminal regime that came in. So this new discussion coming up around Brennan in the Mueller, this is quite interesting what Sen. Rand Paul brought up. Helga, do you think this adds to the weight against Mueller? The judges are turning against him, there are exposés of the FBI and overall corruption. Where is this thing heading? Why hasn't it been shut down by now?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think it could be shut down quickly, because the latest twist is, I just read an article that Mueller is now suspected of having had collusion with a Russian oligarch, which I'd find a little bit humorous, if the situation weren't

so

serious.

But I think this letter by Sen. Rand Paul is really important: He wrote a letter to Gina Haspel, the newly nominated

head of the CIA, demanding that she should turn over all information the CIA has, as to was there any investigation; did

the CIA bug the Presidential candidates in 2016, not just Trump

but every other candidate, as well? And did they work, given the

fact that the CIA is prohibited by law from surveilling Americans, did they ask other intelligence services from other countries to cooperate with them in doing that? And I think he

hinted also to British intelligence directly.

And then, in an interview with NBC, he even went further, and also brought up in this context, the visit by Robert Hannigan, the then-head of GCHQ, the British equivalent of the NSA, to the United States to brief Brennan about all of this.

So this is now coming out in the mainstream media that there was such a collusion with British intelligence, and this is really a very good thing, because obviously, this is completely

illegal, unconstitutional; it may be even criminal. And the more

quickly these things are being followed up, the better.

Also Congressman Nunes, the head of the House Intelligence Committee, basically said that it's now 100% certain that there

was absolutely no collusion of the Trump team with Russia.

And

he said that given the fact that those who pretended that there

was such a collusion knew that it did not exist, why was this whole operation instigated in the first place?

I think this question must be answered: Because this was a coup attempt against an elected President of the United States,

and it has shed light on exactly who are the forces of the Empire

– we call it the British Empire, because it is in the continuity

of the British Empire – but all the people who have come out quickly against Trump on the side of those who accused, have also

shown their true colors.

So, if the United States should get back to its constitutional form, there were demands that the entire FBI, and

Department of Justice must be cleaned out and reorganized afresh.

I think all of this is necessary.

And Trump must be freed from this, because this ongoing situation is the only reason why the relationship with Russia, with China, and naturally, in an indirect form in the Middle East, why these situations are so dangerous. If world peace is

supposed to be saved, the British coup must be uncovered completely. All the culprits must be held accountable. And then

Trump can actually do what he promised he would do – and most of

it actually went in a good direction, and even some of the critics have to see that.

However, the one Damocles Sword which is hanging over this is the danger of a financial blowout. And we need to have this debate on not only Glass-Steagall, but go to Hamiltonian economics and apply the Four Laws of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche,

as an absolutely urgent matter of priority.

SCHLANGER: And Helga, in conclusion, I'd like to pose

something to you, that comes back to this question of Hamiltonian

economics, which is, that as all of these war provocations are progressing, as the British are pulling every string that they have, the Chinese are continuing with very bold plans around the

New Silk Road. The New Silk Road Spirit, as you called it, is catching around the world. And even the efforts of some who sabotaged the U.S.-China relationship around trade, around tariffs, and things of that sort, seems to be moving in a potentially good direction, with the visit of another team of Chinese officials to Washington.

How do you think this can affect the overall situation – the Trump-Xi relationship? Isn't that really one of the keys to breaking through the New Paradigm?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. If the proposal by Li Keqiang, the Chinese Prime Minister, would be taken up, that the way to balance the trade between the United States and China is not by

imposing tariffs, but by increasing trade, by increasing investments in third countries, that way it could be done in a much more elegant way. And there are plenty of opportunities: The United States could join with China in investments in Latin

America; in, as I said already, the Middle East; other Asia countries. And there is a new Chinese offer now to India, that

rather than being a rival in African investment, that given the

fact that Chinese has a big expertise in building infrastructure,

where India is really lagging behind, that they should join efforts, and India should bring in the kinds of things they can

do well, and China would provide the large-scale

infrastructure  
without which all of these investments don't function.  
Now, for the United States, they could also be a part of  
that. And I think that, to look at the world in a  
non-geopolitical way – I know that this is almost impossible  
for  
some people to imagine, because they are so trained that the  
world is a zero-sum game, that if China rises, the United  
States  
goes under – this is just not the case, the Chinese want to  
have  
for the situation. China has made many times the point that  
they  
do not want to replace the United States as an unipolar,  
dominant  
force, but they want to have a new type of relations among  
major  
powers. And that involves dramatically, the idea of joint  
economic projects in third countries, joint ventures, and  
re-define entirely how you go about it.  
If you look at it from a longer arc of history, it is not  
natural that people solve conflict with weapons or wars. This  
always what I call the infant diseases of mankind. Like  
little  
boys who kick each in the shins when they are four years old,  
or  
even seven years old. Eventually, you can become an adult,  
and  
you have cherish the creative mind of the other person and  
work  
together like Max Planck and Einstein; like Schiller and  
Humboldt; you can have a relationship to other countries where  
you address the creative potential of the other and that  
enriches  
in turn, your own potential.  
I think the future of humanity, which is after all the only  
species capable of creative reason, of making fundamental

discoveries about universal principles of the physical universe,  
again and again, and that way develop more knowledge about our planet, the universe in which we are living, about the principles  
of science and technology, which we then apply in the production  
process which leads to an increase in productivity, which leads  
to an increase in living standards, an increase in longevity,  
—  
this is what we are! We are not animals. We are human beings, who are the only species, at least known so far, in the universe,  
which can relate to their create power as their identity. And if we take that approach, then, to have many nations, and to have many cultures all based on their cultural tradition,  
all based on their sovereignty, they can work together to a higher level of reason, and that is the {only} way how mankind will survive! I think we are at a crossroads: If we decide to stay with geopolitics, in this world, this will lead to World War  
III, for all we know, the extinction of our species. On the other side, the New Paradigm is already working, 140 countries are already cooperating, and I think we need a mass movement of  
people who say, mankind has reached a new era and we must consciously form our future, our “shared community for the future  
of mankind,” as Xi Jinping always calls it.  
I think we need a discussion on these.

SCHLANGER: I think you just made a compelling case for people to give up sleepwalking, and to instead catch the New Silk  
Road Spirit. So, Helga, until next week, thank you, and thank

you for joining us.

And take up this challenge, those you watching this: Take up the challenge to become active with the Schiller Institute. Thank you, and see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes.

---

# **Briterne, der frygter fremskridt i Asien, rykker ud for at sprænge Mellemøsten i luften**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. maj, 2018* – Benjamin Netanyahus israelske regering har begået en utilgivelig massakre på palæstinensere i Gaza i løbet af det seneste døgn; og de har hermed øget faren for en ny og *generel* krig i Mellemøsten, som allerede er rykket alt for tæt på. Den fare, som dette udgør for verdensfreden, bør ikke undervurderes – og det samme gælder for den katastrofe, det kunne blive for den økonomiske genopbygning og ditto fremskridt, der potentielt står til rådighed for Mellemøsten og Afrika, på basis af Bælte & Vej Initiativet, der spreder sig i hele Eurasien.

Netanyahu er ikke den, der primært får tingene til at ske i denne optrapning, selv ikke med sin åbenlyse aggression mod Syrien og krigstrusler mod Iran og Libanon. Det er heller ikke præsident Trump, hvis hasarderede fejltagelse med hensyn til Jerusalem kom, mens han kæmpede for sit politiske liv imod en kampagne for hans afsættelse og retsforfølgelse.

Det er britisk efterretning og eliten i den britiske regering,

der er de primære aktører i krigsfremstødet, og som af Trump kræver en krigskonfrontation med Rusland samtidig med, at de anstifter og optrapper kupforsøget imod ham.

Igen i dag belærte chefen for britisk efterretnings MI5, Andrew Parker, efterretningsrepræsentanter fra den Europæiske Union om nødvendigheden af at bekæmpe Rusland på enhver tænkelig måde. Siden marts måned har den britiske regering oppisket krigssvindelnumre og anti-russiske konfrontationer – Skripal-forgiftningsaffæren; det særdeles tvivlsomme »angreb med kemiske våben« i Douma, Syrien. Britiske aktiver i Israel og Saudi-Arabien har iscenesat deres egne svindelnumre imod Iran samtidig med at angribe Syrien og føre en etnisk udrensningsskrig mod Yemen.

Så rædselsslagne er britiske geopolitikere over udsigten til et samarbejde omkring den Nye Silkevej mellem Kina, Rusland, Indien og Trumps USA, sammen med også Japan, Sydkorea og andre, at de med overlæg har promoveret krige imod det.

Lige nu kan truslen om generel krig i Mellemøsten kun vendes på basis af, at præsident Trump og præsident Putin mødes og samarbejder om det, som de begge ønsker. Disse to præsidenter kan stoppe denne nedstigning. Men faren kan i virkeligheden kun fjernes gennem en omfattende plan for økonomisk udvikling fra Afghanistan til Middelhavet og fra Kaukasus til Golfen, inkl. skabelse af afgørende ny infrastruktur og ved anvendelse af Kinas metoder til bekæmpelse af alvorlig fattigdom.

Dette vil være muligt gennem Bælte & Vej Initiativets nye paradigme, hvis de fire, store hovedmagter, vi tidligere nævnte, kan samarbejde om det, assisteret af de andre asiatiske nationer. Præcis et sådant niveau af – tilsyneladende umulige – gennembrud har vist sig mulige gennem fremskridtet mod fred og genopbygning på Koreahalvøen. Det er fremkommet ud fra viljen til at samarbejde mellem Trump, Kinas præsident Xi, Putin, Sydkoreas præsident Moon og Japans premierminister Abe. Denne mulighed, inkl. Indiens afgørende

bidrag, må holdes frem som eksempel for Sydasien, Mellemøsten og Nordafrika.

For USA skal der mere til. Det britiske angreb på præsidentskabet er en krig imod samarbejde med Rusland og Kina; men det er ligeledes et angreb på lederskab som sådan. Det er et halvt århundrede siden, at USA havde et præsidentielt lederskab, der blot delvist trodsede britisk geopolitik; og dette lederskab blev myrdet. I løbet af dette halve århundrede har amerikanerne i stigende grad ladet Wall Street tage over fra præsidenter og styre kongresser; de har mistet fornemmelsen for produktiv beskæftigelse og er blevet kulturelle pessimister.

»Jeg synes om denne leder, eller den leder« eller, »Jeg synes ikke om alt det kaos og al den interne strid«, vil ikke løse noget som helst. Amerikanske borgere må selv blive ledere og selvstændigt tænkende mennesker, som de engang brystede sig af. At tage deres økonomi og regering tilbage fra Wall Street er det formål, for hvilket LaRouche-bevægelsen forsyner dem med værktøjet.

*Foto: Borgere i Gaza demonstrerer ved en barriere mellem Gaza og Israel 11. maj, 2018. (IDF Spokesperson Unit)*

---

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer  
til  
diplomati for fred og**

# udvikling i kølvandet på drab i Gaza

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. maj, 2018 – Dødstallet efter det voldsomme, israelske angreb 14. maj mod palæstinensiske demonstranter på Gazas grænse er nu oppe på 61 dræbte mennesker, med 2.700 sårede, heraf næsten halvdelen fra åben ild. Dette fandt sted samme dag som den ceremonielle åbning af den nye amerikanske ambassade, der blev flyttet fra Tel Aviv til Jerusalem, en handling, man vidste, var en provokation, i betragtning af områdets historie.*

Konfliktlinjerne blev oprindeligt trukket op i blod i Sydvestasien af britiske, geopolitiske interventioner for et århundrede siden, for at skabe vilkårlige grænser og fortsættende stridigheder. I dag fortsætter de denne praksis, i betragtning af den Londoncentrerede opposition mod drivkraften for global udvikling, der er knyttet til initiativet for den Nye Silkevej og potentialet for samarbejde mellem de »Fire Magter« – Kina, Rusland, Indien og USA, for at gøre en ende på imperiegeopolitik én gang for alle.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets præsident, opfordrede i dag til nødhandling i overensstemmelse med det Nye Paradigme for udenrigsrelationer, for fred og økonomisk udvikling. Hun understregede, at faren for en optrapning til generel krig er stor.

Under samtaler med medarbejdere sagde Zepp-LaRouche:

*»Jeg vil blot sige, at denne situation i Mellemøsten er virkelig farlig. Jeg mener, vi absolut også må kræve, at der må komme en efterforskning af, hvad det var, der skete – for det, der synes at være sket, er, at der var disse demonstrationer. For det første, så var resultatet af at flytte den amerikanske ambassade til Jerusalem forudsigeligt,*

*i betragtning af, at begge sider gør krav på Jerusalem, og det er nu desværre sket. Men, da der kom demonstrationer imod dette i Gaza, skød de israelske, væbnede styrker på folk og dræbte 60 og sårede over 2.000. Dette er en grusomhed.*

*Situationen er naturligvis superspændt og kunne fuldstændig eksplodere. Jeg mener, at dette er meget ulykkeligt. Dette er virkelig slemt, men fremgangsmåden må være den, at man får alle sider til at erkende, at dette kunne være luntten til en virkelig stor krig, hvis ikke den store krig. For, hvis dette fører til en optrapning mellem Israel, Hezbollah og Hamas, så kunne det hurtigt optrappe hele vejen.*

*Så dette er virkelig noget, der viser os, hvor tæt verden står ved afgrunden, eller Armageddon, for den sags skyld. Folk bør virkelig indse, at vi må have en ændring i den måde, hvorpå man fører politik, til et Nyt Paradigme, hvis verden skal reddes. Dette er virkelig en meget alvorlig situation, og vi bør gøre dette til en forstærket appel om, at vi må have en ændring af politikken, hvor de Fire Magter arbejder sammen om alle disse spørgsmål, for så ville denne form for destabiliseringer ikke kunne forekomme.«*

---

## **Israelske forfattere advarer om, hvad Netanyahu's krigspolitik fører til**

*13. maj, 2017 – Præsident Donald Trumps erklærede hensigt om at tvinge Iran ind i en »ny aftale, en bedre aftale – bedre for Iran«, løber direkte ind i Netanyahu-regeringens hensigt om at have en israelsk krig med Iran og involvere amerikanske styrker i den. Tæt samarbejde mellem Trump og den russiske*

præsident Vladimir Putin er *sine qua non* for at genoprette fred i Sydvestasien.

To artikler af israelere, og som forekommer i hhv. *Ha'aretz* og *New Yorker*, gør det klart, at, alt imens visse israelske ledere og medier er euforiske over angrebene 9. maj mod iranske styrker i Syrien, så er det større spørgsmål, som konfronterer israelerne, at dette kunne føre til en langvarig krig mod Hezbollah og kunne resultere i et helt andet udfald, end de selvsikre israelere forventer.

Hvad ingen siger, er, at det kunne være gnisten, der udløser en global atomkrig.

I *Ha'aretz* 12. maj anerkender Amos Harel det, som den israelske regering hidtil ikke har: At israelerne udførte bombningen den 9. april af T4-flybasen i Syrien, som resulterede i syv iraneres død, og som efterfulgtes af bombningen den 9. maj. Han siger ligeledes, at, foreløbig, »har Rusland ikke anstrengt sig for at assistere Iran«, hvilket, med præsident Trumps tilbagetrækning af Iran-atomaftalen, kan have opildnet israelerne.

Harel understreger, »det er værd at vente, før man holder medaljeceremonierne og sejrfejringerne« og »det ville være bedre ikke at lade sig indfange af den nuværende selvsikre, arrogante spiral, der åbenlyst ses i reaktionerne fra visse fjernsynsstudier, i Knesset og på de sociale medier. Under ekstremt pres eller længere fremme kunne Teheran ikke desto mindre rulle sit tungere våben, Hezbollah, frem, i tilfælde af hvilket konflikten kunne antage en ganske anden rækkevidde«.

10. maj skriver den israelske forfatter Bernhard Avishai for *New Yorker* ligeledes, at dette kunne ende i en langstrakt konfrontation mellem Israel og Hezbollah, som kunne ende dårligt for Israel. Desuden er USA's militære intimidering af Iran – en politik, som Avishai identificerer med USA's nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver John Bolton – »præcis det,

Netanyahu regner med, i betragtning af muligheden af en eskalering i Syrien og Libanon, som han ikke ønsker, Israel skal konfrontere alene«.

Avishai understreger det, som Amos Yadlin, chef for Institut for Nationale Sikkerhedsstudier, sagde til han: »Situationen har et presserende behov for russiske og amerikanske ledere, der vil dæmme op for truslen om en større krig«.

*Foto: Benjamin Netanyahu, der har været Israels premierminister siden marts 2009, taler i det israelske parlament, Knesset. Foto fra 2016.*

---

## **Konflikt mellem Iran og Israel blusser op i Syrien**

10. maj, 2018 – Kampe mellem Israel og Iran er blusset op, med Syrien, der er blevet krigsskuepladsen. Sent om natten den 9. maj anklagede Israel den iranske Revolutionsgardes Quds-styrke for at affyre 20 raketter mod de israelskbesatte Golan-højder. Talsmand for de Israelske Forsvarsstyrker (IDF), brigadegeneral Ronen Manelis, sagde, ingen af dem ramte israelsk territorium; fire raketter blev opfanget af Iron Dome-systemet, og resten landede på syrisk jord. Israel siger som respons, at det angreb 50 lokaliteter i Syrien, som det hævder, er baser for iranerne, og som Manelis definerede som »en af det Israelske Luftvåbens største operationer i det forgangne årti«.

Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium sagde, at Israel udsendte 28 fly, der affyrede mindst 60 missiler, af hvilke halvdelen blev

opfanget; Den Syriske Arabiske Hær rapporterer tre mennesker dræbt. Ruslands viceudenrigsminister Mikhail Bogdanov sagde, hans land var bekymret over voksende militære spændinger mellem Israel og Iran over Syrien. »Dette er alt sammen meget alarmerende, det vækker bekymring. Der bør arbejdes på at deeskalere spændinger«, citerede TASS Bogdanov for at sige.

Manelis sagde, israelske styrker angreb køretøjet, der lancerede raketterne, såvel som også fem batterier fra det syriske antiluftskytssystem. Han sagde også, at IDF advarede den syriske hær om ikke at intervenere og informerede russerne forud for angrebet, gennem dekonfliktions-aftalen mellem Rusland og Israel.

Det Syriske Arabiske Nyhedsagentur, SANA, bekræftede, at Israel lancerede »titals« raketter, af hvilke nogle ramte deres mål og ødelagde en af deres radarstationer.

Pressesekretær for Det Hvide Hus, Sarah Sanders, sagde i et interview til Fox News, at den oplussede situation med Israel i Golan »blot er en yderligere demonstration af, at man ikke kan stole på det iranske regime og endnu en god påmindelse om, at præsidenten traf den rette beslutning om at træde ud af Iran-aftalen«.

Angrebene fandt sted få timer efter den israelske premierminister Benjamin Netanyahus tilbagevenden fra Moskva, hvor han diskuterede sine bekymringer over Syrien/Iran med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin.

Israels forsvarsminister Avigdor Lieberman sagde om angrebet: »De [Iran] må huske på talemåden, hvis det regner på os, stormer det på dem. Jeg håber, vi har afsluttet denne episode, og at alle forstod.« Lieberman sagde, at Israel ikke ønsker en eskalering, men »ikke vil lade nogen angribe os eller bygge infrastruktur til at angribe os i fremtiden«.

Fra Frankrig blev en erklæring udstedt i præsident Macrons navn, der sagde, at »Han opfordrer til deeskalering« og at

Macron ville diskutere sagen med den tyske kansler Angela Merkel, når han mødes med hende i Aachen senere på dagen.

*Foto: Israel har lanceret massive missilangreb mod iranske militære mål i Syrien.*

---

# **Det smuldrende Imperium er endnu ikke dødt; tørster desperat efter krig**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. maj, 2018* – Lad os tage et overblik: Alle bestræbelser fra briternes side på at bringe USA's regering under præsident Donald Trump til fald er mislykkedes. MI6-agent Christopher Steeles uvederhæftige dossier er nu afsløret som det eneste grundlag for Obamas korrupte efterretningsteams lancering af Trumpgate, og gerningsmændene står nu selv over for retsforfølgelse for kriminelle handlinger; Skripal-affæren er forsvundet fra medierne, med forbindelserne til selv samme Christopher Steele, der er kommet frem i lyset; svindelen med de kemiske våben i Syrien, som blev brygget sammen af de britiskstyrede Hvide Hjelme, er nu blevet internationalt afsløret som en nazi-lignende, iscenesat hændelse, med det formål at retfærdiggøre et militært angreb. Dette angreb, hvor Trump blev narret til at tilslutte sig briterne og franskmændene, har *de facto* erklæret den internationale lov, folkeretten, som blev etableret efter Anden Verdenskrig gennem FN for at forhindre endnu en krig, for død.

Imperiet vil ikke tavst forsvinde i natten. Bibi Netanyahus

narrestreger – hvor han hævder at have bevis for, at Iran stadig udvikler atomvåben – bliver latterliggjort af selv tidligere israelske efterretningsfolk som 'nyheder' i ny indpakning, som allerede er kendt af IAEA, og som intet beviser. Men briterne har altid brugt den israelske højrefløj, og den saudiske kongefamilie, til at fremprovokere splittelse og, når dette var nødvendigt, anstifte krige. Med Trump, der har samarbejdet med Putin omkring overvindelse af ISIS i Syrien, og som sværger, at USA skal trækkes ud af Syrien i det hele taget og »holde op med at være verdens politibetjent«, trækker briterne nu i alle tilgængelige tråde for at trække USA ind i flere krige.

Den samme situation eksisterer i Ukraine. I dag lancerede Porosjenko sin operation »Fælles Styrker«, hvor han konsoliderer Nationalgarden, det Nationale Politi og de indbyrdes forskellige, nynazistiske militser under én centralkommando, der er helliget en militær løsning i Donbas.

En ny krig i Syrien eller Ukraine kunne hurtigt eksplodere til krig med Rusland, og en ny verdenskrig, denne gang med atomvåben.

Og dog, når USA arbejder sammen med Kina og Rusland, kan der ske mirakler, som det blev demonstreret i Korea. Den »permanente krise« i Korea, lige såvel som den »permanente krise« i Mellemøsten – både den arabisk-israelske konflikt og konflikten mellem sunni og shia – er med fuldt overlæg blevet opretholdt af briterne og deres aktiver, som 'kamphane-arenaer' for krig mellem Øst og Vest for at holde stormagterne splittet, til fordel for Det britiske Imperium, der kontrollerer finanssystemet, centreret omkring City of London og Wall Street.

Men den Nye Silkevej er en trussel imod denne »del-og-hersk«-mentalitet. Win-win-politikken i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, som transformerer den »Tredje Verden« til moderne, agro-industrielle nationalstater gennem moderne

infrastrukturudvikling, har demonstreret, at konflikter, baseret på etnicitet, religion, omstridte territorier og lignende, kan overvindes, baseret på fremme af alle nationers og alle folkeslags fælles interesser.

USA's rolle i denne globale krise er afgørende. Med den indiske premierminister Narendra Modis historiske topmøde med Xi Jinping i sidste uge, arbejder de tre store kulturer Rusland, Kina og Indien nu sammen om skabelsen af en Nyt Paradigme for menneskeheden. Lyndon LaRouche har længe insistet på, at »Firemagtskombinationen« Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA er nødvendig for at gøre en ende på Imperieverdenen, én gang for alle.

Præsident Trump har gentagne gange understreget, at venskab med Rusland og Kina »er en god ting, ikke en dårlig ting«, hvilket er hovedårsagen til, at britisk efterretning i det hele taget lancerede Russiagate-kupforsøget. Hvis Trump skal overleve, må det amerikanske folk identificere briternes rolle, befri Trump for det britiske kupforsøg og støtte op om hans bedste impulser for fuldt og helt at gå sammen med Amerikas naturlige allierede i Rusland og Kina, gennem fuld deltagelse i den Nye Silkevej.

LaRouchePAC-aktivister i hele USA rapporterer den stærke respons til dette krav om at gøre en ende på Imperiet, gå med i BVI og afslutte det Wall Street-kontrollerede »topartisystem«-s inddæmning af det amerikanske folk. Her har Trump vist vejen ved at angribe Republikanere og Demokrater lige energisk, når de bringer nødvendigheden af at konfrontere Rusland og Kina til torvs. Det Nye Paradigme er ikke alene inden for rækkevidde, men er også absolut nødvendigt, hvis briternes krigsplaner skal besejres.

*Foto: Præsident Trump og førstedame ved en statsmiddag med Frankrigs præsident Macron og frue, 24. april, 2018. (Official White House Photo by D. Myles Cullen)*

---

# IAEA til Netanyahu: Vi har allerede vurderet Irans atomprogram

*Tirsdag, 1. maj, 2018* – I en udtalelse fra det Internationale Atomenergiagentur (IAEA) responderede agenturets talsmand afmålt i dag på Bibi Netanyahus vaudeville-optræden « i går med »et halvt ton dokumenter, at IAEA's bestyrelse grundigt havde undersøgt alt dette før og var kommet til en endelig afgørelse i december, 2015, om at lukke efterforskningen af Irans atomprogram, baseret på IAEA-generaldirektør Yukiya Amanos slutvurdering, der lød, at »agenturet ikke havde nogen troværdige indikationer på aktiviteter i Iran med hensyn til udviklingen af en eksplosiv atomenhed efter 2009«.

IAEA gennemgik slutrapportens resultater. »Agenturet vurderede, at, før afslutningen af 2003, var en organisationsstruktur på plads i Iran, som var egnet til koordineringen af en række aktiviteter med hensyn til udviklingen af en eksplosiv atomenhed.«

Så meget for Netanyahus »nye information«.

IAEA's erklæring fortsatte:

»Selv om der fandt visse aktiviteter sted efter 2003, så var de ikke en del af en koordineret indsats. Agenturets overordnede vurdering var, at en række aktiviteter i forbindelse med udviklingen af en eksplosiv atomenhed blev udført i Iran før afslutningen af 2003 som en koordineret indsats, og visse aktiviteter fandt sted efter 2003. Agenturet vurderede ligeledes, at disse aktiviteter ikke gik længere end til foreløbige og videnskabelige undersøgelser og tilegnelsen

af visse relevante, tekniske kompetencer og kapaciteter. Samme rapport erklærede, at Agenturet ikke havde nogen troværdige indikationer på aktiviteter i Iran med hensyn til udviklingen af en eksplosiv atomenhed efter 2009.«

Bestyrelsen traf sin beslutning på dette grundlag.

IAEA vil ikke yderligere kommentere Netanyahus historie, fastslog agenturet. »I overensstemmelse med IAEA-standardpraksis, evaluerer IAEA al sikkerhedsrelevant information, som er tilgængelig. Det er imidlertid ikke IAEA's praksis, offentligt at diskutere spørgsmål i forbindelse med nogen sådan information.«

---

## **Britisk geopolitik: Fjende af Trump; fjende af Amerika; fjende af fred**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. april, 2018* – For at præsident Donald Trumps præsidentskab skal overleve og opnå noget som helst af betydning for Amerikas fremtid, må de britiske angreb mod hans administration blive besejret.

Disse angreb har gentagne gange haft til formål at tvinge præsidenten ind i en konfrontation med Rusland »på britisk side«, eller også blive drevet ud af embedet af en »Russiagate«-skandale, der er opfundet af britisk efterretning.

Og britisk, geopolitisk tankegang internt i Trumps

administration skubber ham væk fra enhver politik for at »gøre Amerika stort igen«, som han lovede under sin valgkampagne.

Britiske krav om en krigskonfrontation med Rusland har skabt kriser for præsidenten og den politik, han har i sinde, for samarbejde mellem stormagter for fred og økonomisk fremskridt. Men når dette samarbejde har frembragt afgørende fremskridt hen imod fred og genopbygning af Koreahalvøen, bliver Trump skubbet til at angribe Iran: igen, så er det Rusland, der er målet.

Storbritanniens »Skripal-forgiftningsaffære« og »kemiske angreb i Douma« – der forårsagede masseudvisninger af russiske diplomater og krig mod Syrien – ser nu i stigende grad ud til at have været krigs-svindelnære, ligesom Tony Blairs »irakiske masseødelæggelsesvåben«. Så nu har den israelske premierminister »Bibi« Netanyahu pludselig hævdet, at han har »100.000 hemmelige filer«, han ikke kan afsløre, om »Projekt Amad«, hvor atomvåben fremstilles af Iran, og som USA må hjælpe Israel med at ødelægge. Fra et Israel, der i hemmelighed anskaffede og udviklede snesevis af leveringsdygtige atomvåben, og stadig lyver om dem, er dette en uhyrlighed. Men dets mål er indlysende: Trump må vælge krig, vælge briternes side imod Rusland, opgive sin politik for stormagtssamarbejde.

Amerikas økonomi får samme behandling.

Præsident Trump bliver skubbet bort fra sine erklærede hensigter – at bryde Wall Streets »gigantboble«, bygge ny, højteknologisk infrastruktur, udvide rumprogrammet og atter sætte »vore fodaftryk i fjerne verdner« – for i stedet at vedtage *britiske* alternativer. Disse alternativer blev udtrykt af finansminister Mnuchin på Fox Tv mandag morgen, mens han kom med totalt falske påstande om den amerikanske økonomis reelt set særdeles magre resultat. »Skattelettelser«, sagde Mnuchin; den politik for skattelettelser til styrkelse af konkurrenceevnen blandt transatlantiske nationer, som blev

lanceret af Storbritannien under Margaret Thatchers regeringer i 1979-90. »Afregulering af bankerne«, lød Mnuchins slagord, og som blev opfundet af en britisk afregulering af bankerne i 1986, der var så gennemgribende, at den blev kaldt »Big Bang« og drev Amerika til at opgive Glass/Steagall-loven og dernæst til at opleve et finanskarak præcis et år senere.

Og »privatisering«, en politik, der blev udviklet i 1970'erne og 1980'erne i UK og i de britiske kolonier New Zealand, Australien og Canada, bliver nu brugt til at ødelægge det amerikanske rumprogram og Trumps forpligtelse til at bygge en ny, økonomisk infrastruktur.

Den 27. april afsværgede lederen af National Space Council, skabt af præsidenten, internationalt samarbejde om rumforskning, alt imens en anden embedsmand sagde, NASA ikke skulle udvikle noget nyt rumsystem, hvis det kunne købe et allerede eksisterende, privat system. Den amerikanske transportminister udelukkede bogstavelig talt under et besøg i Beijing samarbejde med Kina om nye infrastrukturprojekter.

Kinas globale netværk med store infrastrukturprojekter, Bælte & Vej Initiativet, udgør den største mulighed for stormagtssamarbejde – USA med Kina, Indien og Rusland – der nogen sinde har eksisteret.

Hvis USA forsætter med denne stupiditet, vil Kina, Indien, Rusland og Japan snart anføre menneskets udforskning af rummet, mens Amerika kigger frem af mudderet af økonomisk stagnation og omsiggrubende narkeafhængighed.

I sit forslag fra 2014, »Fire Nye Love«, specificerede Lyndon LaRouche en »omgående genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven, der blev indført af USA's præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt, [og] en tilbagevenden til et system af et topstyret og gennemgribende defineret, statsligt nationalbanksystem« med det formål at investere i produktivitet gennem højteknologisk infrastruktur, et udvidet NASA og et forceret program for

opnåelse af fusionskraft.

Dét repræsenterer »det Amerikanske System«, som de britiske geopolitikere altid har søgt at ødelægge – og som kan besejre dem.

*Foto: På sidelinjerne af det 25. APEC-møde for økonomiske ledere. Med USA's præsident Donald Trump og den russiske præsident, Vladimir Putin. 11. nov., 2017. (en.kremlin.ru)*

---

## **Netanyahu lancerer tredje britiske krigs-svindelnnummer siden 1. marts**

30. april, 2018 – Siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin den 1. marts på nationalt Tv viste, at NATO's »antimissil« missilinddæmning af Rusland (og Kina) var slået fejl pga. en ny generation hypersoniske våben, og i stedet opfordrede til forhandlinger, er de, der er hengivne over for britisk geopolitik, blevet sindsforstyrrede. I USA har nogle neokonservative krævet, at man overvejer at fremprovokere en krig med Kina *nu*, fordi en sådan krig ellers, om ti år, ikke vil kunne vindes. I UK har Royal Institute for International Affairs (Chatham House) krævet en ny, Commonwealth-centreret militær alliance bestående af »de villige« imod Rusland, til at afløse NATO.

Og siden 1. marts er to successive, britiske konfrontationer med Rusland – først over Skripal-affæren med »forgiftning på britisk jord«, og dernæst det »syriske angreb med kemiske våben« i Douma – kommet til at se mere og mere ud som krigs-

svindelnumre, der atter fremkalder mindet om Tony Blairs »uvederhæftige dossier«, som udløste invasionen af Irak i 2003.

I den forgangne weekend optrappede den israelske premierminister Benjamin Netanyahu med en tredje konfrontation. Mens han på dramatisk vis aflyste en ferietale på israelsk Tv, annoncerede Netanyahu i stedet for verden, at israelsk efterretning havde stjålet »100.000 hemmelige filer, et halvt ton filer,« fra Iran. Disse beviste, sagde han, at Iran havde et program for atomvåben og løj om det, før landet underskrev Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action i 2015 (JCP0A) (Fælles omfattende handleplan 2015) med fem permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd plus Tyskland, og som blokerede Iran fra at udvikle atomvåben.

Israel havde, sagde Netanyahu, på overraskende vis netop fået denne information inden for de seneste 10 dage, og hvor der kun er 10 dage tilbage til, at præsident Donald Trump må beslutte sig for, om han vil trække sig ud af denne aftale! Han (Netanyahu) havde briefet Trump den 28. april, udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo den 29. april og europæiske regeringsfolk den 30. april; nu befandt de »belastende dokumenter, kort, præsentationer, planer og fotografier« sig på et »meget sikkert sted«.

Netanyahu syntes ikke at hævde, at Iran overtrådte JCP0A, med sit krav om at opgive aftalen. Han sagde snarere, at han beviste, at Iran havde løjet forud for JCP0A – ja, man kunne vel sige, ligesom Israel i årevis løj, og stadig lyver, om de mange leveringsdygtige atomvåben, det er i besiddelse af.

Men hans formål var tydeligvis at skabe en atmosfære for krig mod Iran, især i Syrien, og samtidig ødelægge JCP0A. Blot få timer tidligere havde ni missiler af fortsat ukendt oprindelse ramt to baser i det centrale Syrien, som Israel siger, bliver benyttet af iranske irregulære styrker.

Truslen om en stedfortræderkrig, som i realiteten sætter Storbritannien og Frankrig op imod Rusland og trækker Trumps USA med ind, er nu blevet rejst.

*Foto: Den britiske premierminister Theresa May og den israelske premierminister Benjamin Netanyahu giver hinanden hånden efter Netanyahu ankom til et møde i nr. 10, Downing Street, 6. februar, 2017.*