

# **Den humanitære krise i Afghanistan: På vej til en langsigtet løsning: Fælles videokonference: Rådet for internationale anliggender i Rusland og Schiller Instituttet, torsdag den 10. februar kl. 14**

Det russiske råd for internationale Anliggender (RIAC) og Schiller Instituttet (SI) indkalder til et seminar, torsdag den 10. februar, 2022, kl. 14 dansk tid om emnet:

Blandt de emner, der vil blive drøftet af et panel af seks talere, vil være:

Hvad er årsagerne til den humanitære krise i Afghanistan?

Hvad er de geopolitiske konsekvenser af en nødlidende stat i Afghanistan?

Hvad skal der til for at vende den umiddelbare risiko for omfattende hungersnød og flygtningeproblemer?

En langsigtet løsning på den humanitære krise: de globale magters rolle.

Indlednings- og afslutningserklæringer vil blive præsenteret af Dr. Andrej Kortunov, generaldirektør for RIAC, og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, (international) formand for SI.

Andre talere vil være:

Ivan Safranchuk, direktør fra Center for Eurasiske Studier ved MGIMO-universitetet

Temur Umarov, forsker ved Carnegie Moscow Center

Jim Jatras, amerikansk diplomat, tidligere rådgiver for det republikanske parti i det amerikanske senat

Graham Fuller, 25 års karriere som operativ CIA-officer, forfatter

Seminaret varer to timer og vil være tilgængeligt på Schiller Instituttets websted.

---

Der er også en Schiller Institut videokonference lørdag den 19. februar med titlen:

100 sekunder til midnat på Dommedags-uret – Vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur!

“En atomkrig kan ikke vindes og må aldrig udkæmpes.”

---

**NYHEDSORIENTERING      DECEMBER  
2021-JANUAR 2022:  
2022 er Lyndon LaRouches år//**

# Kan vi undgå krig med Rusland?

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

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

Læs afskriftet på engelsk nedenunder.

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er cand. mag. i idéhistorie og historie,

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

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

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

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

---

Nogle højdepunkter:

Et højdepunkt er Jens Jørgen Nielsens personlige diskussion i

1989 med Mikail Gorbatsjov om NATO-udvidelse mod øst:

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

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

dårligt eftermæle for dig.'

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

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

---

Interviewet har andre afgørende afsnit:

Baggrund om NATO's udvidelse mod øst.

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

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

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

Hvordan Ukraine-krisen ikke startede med "annekteringen" af

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

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

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

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

Michelle Rasmussen fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark: 53 57 00 51, [si@schillerinstitut.dk](mailto:si@schillerinstitut.dk), [www.schillerinstitute.com](http://www.schillerinstitute.com); [www.schillerinstitut.dk](http://www.schillerinstitut.dk)

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Interview med Rusland ekspert  
Jens Jørgen Nielsen:  
Hvorfor USA og NATO bør  
underskrive traktaterne**

# foreslået af Putin. Interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Why the U.S. and NATO should sign the treaties proposed by Putin?

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

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

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

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

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

The Schiller Institute released a [\[\[memorandum\]\]](#) December 24 titled "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War



III.” In the beginning, it states, “Ukraine is being used by geopolitical forces in the West that answer to the bankrupt speculative financial system, as the flashpoint to trigger a strategic showdown with Russia, a showdown which is already more dangerous than the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, and which could easily end up in a thermonuclear war which no one would win, and none would survive.”

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

%Russian ‘Red Lines’

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

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

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

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

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

things which play a role that we envisage in a situation like that now.

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

And we can see it now, because recently, some new material has been released in America, an exchange of letters between Yeltsin and Clinton at this time. So, we know exactly that Yeltsin, and Andrei Kozyrev, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs at this time, were very much opposed to it. And then Putin came along. Putin came along not to impose his will on the Russian people. He came along because there was, in Russia, a will to oppose this NATO extension to the East. So, I think things began at this point.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### %NATO Expansion Eastward

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

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

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

[[[begin quote indent]]]

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

[[[end quote indent]]]

I think, also, some of the new material which has been released—I have read some of it, some on WikiLeaks, and some can be found. It's declassified. It's very interesting. There's no doubt at all. There were some oral, spoken promises to Mikhail Gorbachev. It was not written, because, as he said, "I believed them. I can see I was naive."

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

But then, the nature of the NATO expansion has gone step, by step, by step. First, it was the three countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—and then, in 2004, six years later, came, among other things—the Baltic republics, and Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. And the others came later on—Albania, Croatia, etc. And then in 2008, there was a NATO Summit in Bucharest, where George Bush, President of the United States, promised Georgia and Ukraine membership of NATO. Putin was present. He was not President at this time. He

was Prime Minister in Russia, because the President was [Dmitry] Medvedev, but he was very angry at this time. But what could he do? But he said, at this point, very, very clearly, "We will not accept it, because our red lines would be crossed here. We have accepted the Baltic states. We have retreated. We've gone back. We've been going back for several years," but still, it was not off the table.

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

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

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

%%A Coup in Ukraine

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

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

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

on the other part, against its will. And that was actually what happened.

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

I think we should ask if the right of Ukraine to have NATO membership—which its own population does not really want— “Is

it really worth the risk of a nuclear war?" That's how I would put it.

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

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

## %%Diplomacy to Avert Catastrophe

Michelle Rasmussen: Today, Presidents Biden and Putin will speak on the phone, and important diplomatic meetings are scheduled for the middle of January. What is going to

determine if diplomacy can avoid a disaster, as during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just called this a "reverse missile crisis." Or, if Russia will feel that they have no alternative to having a military response, as they have openly stated. What changes on the Western side are necessary? If you had President Biden alone in a room, or other heads of state of NATO countries, what would you say to them?

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

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

"So, I would say to Biden, "I think it would be wise for you, right now, to support Putin, or to deal with Putin, engage with Putin, and do some diplomacy, because the alternative is a possibility of war, and you should not go down into history as the American president who secured the extinction of humanity. It would be a bad, very bad record for you. And

there are possibilities, because I don't think Putin is unreasonable. Russia has not been unreasonable. I think they have turned back. Because in 1991, it was the Russians themselves, who disbanded the Soviet Union. It was the Russians, Moscow, which disbanded the Warsaw Pact. The Russians, who gave liberty to the Baltic countries, and all other Soviet Republics. And with hardly any shots, and returned half a million Soviet soldiers back to Russia. No shot was fired at all. I think it's extraordinary.

"If you compare what happened to the dismemberment of the French and the British colonial empires after World War II, the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact was very, very civilized, in many ways. So, stop thinking about Russia as uncivilized, stupid people, who don't understand anything but mere power. Russians are an educated people. They understand a lot of arguments, and they are interested in cooperating. There will be a lot of advantages for the United States, for the West, and also the European Union, to establish a kind of more productive, more pragmatic relationship, cooperation. There are a lot of things in terms of energy, climate, of course, and terrorism, and many other things, where it's a win-win situation to cooperate with them.

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

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

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

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

Because the attack I remember in recent times is the 9/11 attack, the twin towers in New York. Otherwise, the United States does not have these experiences. It tends to think more in ideological terms, where the Russians, certainly, but also to some extent, some people in Europe, think more pragmatically, more that we should, at any cost, avoid war, because war creates more problems than it solves. So, have some pragmatic cooperation. It will not be very much a love affair. Of course not. But it will be on a very pragmatic—

%%The Basis for Cooperation

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

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

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

stupid.

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Of course, I have a different point of view. Russia for me, is not a perfect country, because such a country does not exist, not even Denmark! Some suppose it is. But there's no such thing as a perfect society. Because societies are always developing from somewhere, to somewhere, and Russia, likewise. Russia is a very, very big country. So, you can definitely find things which are not very likable in Russia. Definitely. That's not my point here.

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

Even during the time of Yeltsin, he was also considered

liberal and progressive, and he loved the West and followed the West in all, almost all things they proposed.

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

Well, I think that's not good enough. I understand why the Russians—I very often talk to Russian politicians, and other people, and what they are sick and tired of, is this notion that the West is better: “We are on a higher level. And if Russians should be accepted by the West, they should become like us. Or at least they should admit that they are on a lower level, in relation to our very high level.”

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

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

I think that cultural attitudes play a role when we're talking about politics, because a lot of the policy from the American,

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

When I discuss with people at universities and in the media, and other places, I encounter this. That is why I wrote the latest book, because it's very much about our way of thinking about Russia. The book is about Russia, of course, but it's also about us, our glasses, how we perceive Russia, how we perceive not only Russia, but it also goes for China, because it's more or less the same. But there are many similarities between how we look upon Russia, and how we look upon and perceive China, and other countries.

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

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

And the same goes, from what I have said, for China. I do not know the Chinese language. I have been in China. I know a



little about China. Russia, I know very well. I speak Russian, so I know how Russians are thinking about this, what their feelings are about this. And I think it's important to deal with these questions.

%%'A Way to Live Together'

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes. Afterwards, Putin was criticized by the military, and also by politicians in the beginning of his first term in 2000, 2001, 2002, he was criticized because he was too happy for America. He even said, in an interview in the BBC, that he would like Russia to become a member of NATO. It did not happen, because—there are many reasons for that. But he was very, very keen—that's also why he felt very betrayed afterward. In 2007, at the Munich Conference on Security in February in Germany, he said he was very frustrated, and it was very clear that he felt betrayed by the West. He thought that they had a common agenda. He thought that Russia should become a member. But Russia probably is too big.

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

Michelle Rasmussen: A way of living together.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, how to live together It was actually a parallel development of the European Union and NATO, against Russia. In 2009, the European Union invited Georgia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, to become members of the

European Union, but not Russia. Even though they knew that there was really a lot of trade between Ukraine, also Georgia, and Russia. And it would interfere with that trade. But they did not pay attention to Russia.

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

%%Ukraine, Again

Michelle Rasmussen: Just before we go to our last questions. I want to go back to Ukraine, because it's so important. You said that the problem did not start with the so-called annexation of Crimea, but with what you called a coup against the sitting president. Can you just explain more about that? Because in the West, everybody says, "Oh, the problem started when Russia annexed Crimea."

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

policy not to become a member of NATO.

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

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

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

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

increased the Russian's suspicion that the European Union was only a stepping-stone to NATO membership.

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

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

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

were many people from the West also, so things broke down.

%%Crimea

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

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

That's the basic context for the decision of Putin to accept Crimea as a part of Russia. In the West, it is said that Russia simply annexed Crimea. It's not precisely what happened, because there was a local parliament, it was an autonomous part of Ukraine, and they had their own parliament, and they made the decision that they should have a referendum, which they had in March. And then they applied to become a member of the Russian Federation. It's not a surprise, even though the Ukrainian army did not go there, because there was a Ukrainian army. There were 21,000 Ukrainian soldiers. 14,000 of these soldiers joined the Russian army.

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

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

like that.

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

And Putin was aware that he could not live, not even physically, but certainly not politically, if Sevastopol, with the harbor for the Russian fleet, became a NATO harbor. It was impossible. I know people from the military say "No, no way." It's impossible. Would the Chinese take San Diego in the United States? Of course not. It goes without saying that such things don't happen.

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

Michelle Rasmussen: Regime change?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, regime change.

%%The Importance of Cultural Exchanges

Michelle Rasmussen: I have two other questions. The last questions. The Russian-Danish Dialogue organization that you are a leader of, and the Schiller Institute in Denmark, together with the China Cultural Center in Copenhagen, were

co-sponsors of three very successful Musical Dialogue of Cultures Concerts, with musicians from Russia, China, and many other countries. You are actually an associate professor in cultural differences. How do you see that? How would an increase in cultural exchange improve the situation?

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

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes.

%%The Role of Schiller Institute

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

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

I'm not uncritical to China, but, of course, I can see very positive perspectives in the Belt and Road program. I can see



really, really good perspectives, because just look at the railroads in China, for instance, at their fast trains. It's much bigger than anywhere else in the world. I think there are some perspectives, really, which I think attract, first and foremost, people in Asia.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Definitely

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

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

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

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

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I thank you.

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 25. juni 2021: Hvad der mangler i billedet: Det enorme potentiale Kina skaber i rummet og på jorden**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Se Schiller Instituttets internationale videokonference den 26.-27. juni 2021 eller bagefter:

**Invitation: For det almene vel af alle mennesker, ikke regler, som er til fordel for de få.**

**Schiller Instituttets online internationale konference den 26.-27. juni 2021 kl. 15 dansk tid**

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet · Hvad der mangler i billedet: Det enorme potentiale Kina skaber i rummet og på jorden

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 16.**

# april 2021: Vestens civilisationskrise: krig eller fred gennem udvikling

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Schiller Instituttet · Vestens civilisationskrise: krig eller fred gennem udvikling

---

## Helga Zepp-LaRouche om 'Besked fra Biden- administrationen: Atomkrig er en reel mulighed'

6. februar (EIRNS) –Følgende er en oversættelse af Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedartikel i det tyske tidsskrift Neue Solidarität, nr. 6, den 11. februar 2021:

Forholdet til Amerika vil ikke være let endnu et stykke tid fremover. I betragtning af de forskellige strategidokumenter mod Rusland og Kina samt udsagn fra førende militærofficerer lyder præsident Bidens meddelelse i hans første udenrigspolitiske tale – "Amerika er tilbage" – som en skjult trussel. Under hans ledelse sagde han, at de dage, hvor USA

vil "lægge sig fladt ned", når de står over for Ruslands aggressive handlinger, er forbi, og Kinas aggressive tvangsforanstaltninger vil blive imødegået. Titlen på hans tale var "Amerikas plads i verden", og ifølge Biden er denne plads overalt i verden. Regeringer såvel som ansvarlige borgere overalt i verden skal straks begynde at reflektere over, hvordan de vil reagere på de erklæringer om politisk hensigt, der er hørt i forbindelse med Bidens tiltrædelse.

De mest chokerende udsagn kom fra adm. Charles Richard, chef for den Amerikanske Strategiske Kommando, der skrev i februarudgaven af USA Flådeinstitutets Proceedings:

"Der er en reel mulighed for, at en regional krise med Rusland eller Kina hurtigt kunne eskalere til en konflikt, der involverer atomvåben, hvis de opfatter, at en konventionel krigs nederlag ville true regimet eller staten. Derfor må det amerikanske militær flytte sin hovedantagelse fra 'brug af atomvåbner er ikke mulig' til 'brug af atomvåbner er en meget reel mulighed' ... "

Det burde være klart, at admiral Richard her taler om 3. verdenskrig, hvilket sandsynligvis ville betyde tilintetgørelse af menneskeheden. Som MIT-atomvåbenekspert Theodore Postol blandt andet gentagne gange og overbevisende har hævdet, er den afgørende forskel mellem konventionelle krig og en atomkrig faktisk det, at en atomkrig ikke forbliver begrænset. Men NATO's utopiske fraktion mener tværtimod, at en begrænset atomkrig kunne blive "vundet". Og hvilke "regionale konflikter" kunne man overveje? En konflikt ved den russiske grænse på grund af Aegis-baserede missilforsvarssystemer i Polen og Rumænien? Eller vedrørende det østlige Ukraine, hvor Europa bliver krigsskuepladsen? En konflikt mellem Israel og Iran eller en eskalering af spændingerne omkring Taiwan?

Admiral Richards uhyrlige bemærkninger skal betragtes på baggrund af adskillige forskellige strategiske papirer og doktriner, hvor det meste perfide er et dokument udgivet af

Atlantehavsrådet den 28. januar. Dokumentet er underskrevet "Anonym", som er "en tidligere senior regerings embedsmand med dybdegående ekspertise og erfaring med at beskæftige sig med Kina," ifølge beskrivelsen i forordet af Frederick Kempe, lederen af Atlantehavsrådet. Dokumentet på 85 sider, der er beskrevet som et af de vigtigste, Rådet nogensinde har offentliggjort, har titlen "Det længere telegram: Hen imod en ny amerikansk Kina-strategi (The Longer Telegram: Toward a New American China Strategy)", i eksplicit henvisning til dokumentet "Lang telegram (Long Telegram)" fra 1946, der også blev offentliggjort anonymt i sin tid af George Kennan, hvor han opfordrede til en inddæmningspolitik mod Sovjetunionen.

Denne nye anonyme forfatter opfordrer åbent til et kup imod præsident Xi Jinping og hans "indre kreds" for at erstatte ham med oppositionsledere inden for det kinesiske kommunistparti. Da styrningen af hele det kommunistiske parti med sine 91 millioner medlemmer ikke har nogen chance for at få succes, siger han, at den amerikanske strategi skal forblive "laserfokuseret" på Xi Jinping og sigte mod at opsplitte CCP-ledelsen, hvor højtstående partimedlemmer er uenige i Xis politiske retning og hans uendelige krav om absolut loyalitet. Man skal hjælpe disse kredse i CCP-ledelsen med at komme til magten, der i modsætning til Xi Jinping ikke ønsker at implementere deres egen kinesiske model for en international orden, men vil underkaste sig den USA-dominerede verdensorden. Xi har ifølge "Anonym" til hensigt at projicere Kinas autoritære system over hele verden og udgør ikke længere et problem kun for den USA-ledede liberale internationale orden og amerikanske forrang, men et alvorligt problem for hele den demokratiske verden.

Lad os forstille os følgende tænkeeksperiment. Hvordan ville den tyske regering reagere, hvis en førende russisk tænketank offentliggjorde en undersøgelse, der opfordrede til at kansler Merkel og hendes inderkreds skulle væltes med laserlignende præcision, for at hjælpe med til, at en fraktion i CDU, der

ville være underordnet Moskvas interesser tager magten, mens chefen for de strategiske våben samtidig talte om, at en atomkrig er sandsynlig? Der ville være et hidtil uset oprør i hele Tyskland! Det bør ikke overraske nogen, at chefredaktøren for Kinas Global Times, Hu Xijin, reagerede på artiklen af admiral Richards med en opfordring til Kina om, at opbygge et atomarsenal på 1.000 atomvåben for at gøre Kinas anden-strejke-kapacitet troværdig.

Både i Atlantic Council-dokumentet og i det officielle papir fra USA's Udenrigsministeriums Kontor for politisk planlægning (Office of Policy Planning) med titlen "Elementerne i den kinesiske udfordring (The Elements of the Chinese Challenge)" er det klart, at det er succesen med den kinesiske økonomiske model og hastigheden af dens teknologiske innovation, der betragtes som truslen mod amerikansk dominans i verden. Det var en forkert beregning at antage, at Kinas integration på verdensmarkedet, ved at tilslutte sig WTO, automatisk ville føre til, at nationen ville vedtage den vestlige neoliberale demokratimodel, siger Udenrigsministeriets papir. For Kina opbyggede også sin egen "marxist-leninistiske" model af en autoritær stat, domineret af "partiets ekstreme fortolkning af kinesisk nationalisme." Derudover fortsætter det, at Kina er fast besluttet på at skabe en "national foryngelse", der skal kulmineres i transformation af den internationale orden.

Vi kan selvfølgelig ikke kommentere på alle de ekstremt fjendtlige beskyldninger i de to papirer, da Udenrigsministeriets dokument er 72 sider langt. Sammenfattende kan det siges, at stort set alle anklager, der påstås mod Kinas politik, er en projicering af deres egne politikker og intentioner. Der gøres ikke noget forsøg på at forstå Kina ud fra dets 5.000-årige historie og kultur, og der erkendes heller ikke, hvor stor en civilisationspræstation det var for Kina at løfte 850 millioner mennesker ud af ekstrem fattigdom i løbet af de seneste årtier. Fra dette perspektiv betragtes naturligvis Silkevejsinitiativet ikke som en

økonomisk politik, der tillader udviklingslande at overvinde deres underudvikling for første gang nogensinde, men som bevis på Kinas intentioner om at opnå overherredømme.

I betragtning af det Nationale Sikkerhedsagenturs samlede overvågning af ikke kun dens egen befolkning, men siden 11. september 2001 hele verden og censur af endog den daværende siddende præsident for USA (Donald Trump) fra TV-netværkerne og IT-giganterne i Silicon Valley, kræver det en meget speciel form for optik for at beskylde Kina for at have spioneret på og overvåget sine borgere. Virkeligheden er, at digitalisering i Kina har muliggjort meget effektiv kontaktsporing i coronaviruspandemien, og at det sociale kreditsystem har overvældende populær støtte, fordi belønningen med positiv adfærd for samfundet også gavner hver enkelt.

Fælles for begge dokumenter er, at deres forfattere genfortolker absolut alt om kinesisk kultur, som i tusinder af år har sat interesse for det fælles gode over individets interesse, og som strømmer fra et dybtliggende behov for en harmonisk udvikling af alle, og de gør det til den vestlige ordens fjendebillede.

Det er ikke det kinesiske kommunistparti, der søger verdensherredømme, men snarere at den unipolære verdensordens nyliberale etablissement frygter, at det vil miste sit overherredømme og har bevæget sig kilometer væk fra de universelle principper, med hvilket Amerika blev grundlagt, og som det hævder at repræsentere. Og hvad Biden-administrationen synes om respekt for andre landes suverænitet er indlysende i dens modstand mod Nord Strøm 2-gasprojektet.

I øvrigt tjener hele hurlumhejet omkring Vladimir Putins påståede forgiftning af Alexey Navalny, som er støttet af vestlige efterretningsagenturer, det samme formål, om at sætte en farverevolution i gang og derved skabe en opposition inden for Putins inderkreds, der kunne bruges til at fjerne ham fra embedet.



Alle ansvarlige og tænkende mennesker opfordres til gennem deres mobilisering at bidrage til at forhindre, at Europas regeringer trækkes videre ind i den bebudede kampagne mod Kina og Rusland. Kansler Merkel understregede korrekt i sin tale til World Economic Forums online-begivenhed, at hun afviste enhver form for blokdannelse imellem USA og Kina, hvor Europa derefter skulle vælge side, og sagde, at den multilateralismes time var kommet.

I lyset af admiral Richards farlige udsagn må de europæiske lande ikke kun udtrykkeligt distancere sig fra en sådan politik, de skal også trække sig ud af NATO og søge en sikkerhedsarkitektur, der afspejler deres befolkningers interesser. Det, der står på spil, er Europas overlevelse.

zepp-larouche@eir.de

Billede: DOD/Lisa Ferdinando

---

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

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

af Lyndon LaRouche i hans dokument af 08.06.2014, "Fire nye love for at redde USA nu! Ikke en mulighed, men en nødvendighed".

Den Britiske Imperium genkendte dette samme potentiale i Præsident Trump og tog en offentlig ed om, at de aldrig ville tillade noget som helst i den retning at ske – at en anden periode for Trump måtte forhindres for enhver pris, som det blev udtrykt af det engelske overhus i december, 2018. Briterne, med deres Obama-administration, samt andre aktiver, skabte den infame "Russiagate" løgn ud af den tynde luft, for at prøve at sænke Trumps præsidentskab. Den store "Rusland-Rusland-Rusland"-løgn – at Rusland havde hacket den Demokratiske Nationale Komité's computere, for at give valgsejren til en "medsammensvoren" Trump – er nu blevet miskrediteret vidt og bredt, og med den stadige aktivitet fra LaRouchePAC, Bill Binney, Roger Stone og andre, kunne den bryde sammen hvert eneste øjeblik. Men de samme britiske imperie netværker har nu opdigtet den store "Kina-Kina-Kina"-løgn – at Kina er årsagen til COVID-19-pandemien, som de eksportererede og er ansvarlige for millioner af dødsfald – for at sikre at verdens to største økonomier ikke samarbejder for at sætte en stopper for den globale pandemi og fortsætte derfra til reorganisering af hele det globale, bankerotte finanssystem.

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

I denne tynde strategiske atmosfære offentliggjorde det halvofficielle kinesiske dagblad, *Global Times*, d. 31. juli,

en leder, som var et tydeligt signal af en ny slags, som, hvis han ønsker at vinde valget i november, tilskynder Præsident Trump til, ikke at skyde skylden for forværringen af COVID-19 og den økonomiske krise i USA på Kina og andre, men burde i stedet konfrontere disse kriser direkte gennem et samarbejde med Kina. "Lav justeringer tidligere," skrev de, og "slutte sig sammen med Kina".

Helga Zepp-LaRouche tog tilbuddet op i går.

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

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

Zepp-LaRouche understregede at "dette er den eneste måde hvorpå Trumps valgsejr kan sikres. Grupper for og imod Trump må i samme grad indse, at krisen må konfronteres og overvindes

før valget. Vi har brug for et internationalt kor af nationer, der kræver et sådant samarbejde, særligt mellem USA og Kina. Vi har brug for et stigende antal af stemmer for et P5-hastetopmøde. Som jeg ofte har sagt kan Trump blive en af de største amerikanske præsidenter, *hvis* han tager de nødvendige skridt. Det er vores ansvar at sørge for at dette '*hvis*' rent faktisk sker".

---

## Den 'store løgn' kan forårsage atomkrig

Den 26. maj (EIRNS) – Amerikanerne (og verden) husker godt G.W. Bush-administrationens 'store løgn', da Bush og hans kontrollør, Tony Blair, bryggede den store løgn om masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak, og slap en række folkemorderiske regimeskifte-krige løs, der ødelagde Mellemøsten og drev millioner af flygtninge til Europa og andre steder. Præsident Donald Trump identificerede korrekt denne løgn som årsagen til Amerikas værste fejltagelse i moderne historie, måske i hele dens historie. EIR afslørede denne særlige løgn på det tidspunkt det skete, og behøvede ikke de empiriske beviser, der fremkom efter invasionen. Se "The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's Deadly Iraq War," April 18, 2003 ('De uværdige løgnere bag Bush' dødelige Irak-krig')

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

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

Niveauet for informationskrigsførelse i Chinagate er feberagtig. Det er blot nødvendigt for befolkningen at tage fat på den kendsgerning, at en krig med Kina, eller endog bare en "afkobling" fra Kina, ikke vil løse noget. LaRouchePAC har nu offentliggjort en rapport "The LaRouche Plan To Reopen the U.S. Economy: The World Needs 1.5 Billion New, Productive Jobs," ('LaRouche-planen for genåbning af den amerikanske

økonomi: Verden har brug for 1.5 milliard nye produktive arbejdspladser'), som giver en reel løsning, én der begrebsmæssigt blev præsenteret af Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange i løbet af de sidste 50 år, men som ikke længere kan udsættes. Vilkår som under en mørk tidsalder er allerede ved at feje hen over Sydamerika, Afrika og endda dele af USA og Europa. En kamp med et usynligt virus og det lige så dødbringende spekulative virus, der spreder sig fra de tåbelige bestræbelser på at dække over det fallerede vestlige finanssystem, kræver den samme form for samarbejde, som blev organiseret af Franklin Roosevelt for 80 år siden for at besejre fascismen. Samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og USA var afgørende for at vinde den krig, lige som det er for at vinde slaget med COVID-19 og det økonomiske sammenbrud.

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

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

w

---

**Afskriftet af Helga Zepp-**

# LaRouches tale til Schiller Instituttets og EIR's seminar for diplomater den 29. november 2018

(Vi er i gang med at oversætte talen til dansk.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed the seminar via video conference from Germany. In addition EIR Economics Editor Paul Gallagher by pre-recorded video from Virginia, and Hussein Askary in person addressed the seminar in Copenhagen. Diplomats from nine countries attended the seminar, as well as members and contacts of The Schiller Institute.

TOM GILLESBERG: Helga Zepp-LaRouche was very beautifully introduced, I think, by Hussein Askary, in his presentation going through the fantastic road. She as the founder of the Schiller Institute has taken upon herself as the "Silk Road Lady" in bringing about this Belt and Road policy, the New Silk Road policy. So we are very proud and very happy to be able to have her on here live to discuss what is in the situation the world is in right now, after the U.S. midterm elections, and here, the day before we'll have the G20 summit taking place in Buenos Aires.

So, Helga, thank you for being here with us. The word is yours.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, I want to say hello to you and I'm very happy to be able to speak to you, even if it's only via video. Obviously, we have reached a very important point in history, and for once, I have to agree with President Macron of France, who just said that the upcoming G20 meeting better produce some real results, or else, such a gathering of the heads of state would be even counterproductive.

Now, I agree with that.

We have made a campaign for the last several weeks and actually months, that basically what should be the outcome of this G20 meeting. Given the fact that we have both war danger, as was demonstrated very acutely again in the case of the incident in near the Kerch Bridge in the Black Sea, and the general situation between the major nuclear powers is not exactly a calm one, so we have the danger of nuclear war, potentially. Then, we have the immediate danger of a repetition of the financial crash of 2008, except this time, it could be much, much worse, because all the parameters are much worse than in 2008.

In light of these two existential crises, we have defined what should be the outcome of either the G20 meeting or, at least, of those heads of state where one can expect they can go in the direction of establishing a new paradigm: And that refers to President Trump, Putin, Xi Jinping, Prime Minister Modi, and possibly others, Prime Minister Abe, and maybe some other heads of state and government. And what we defined as the absolutely necessary outcome, is that they establish a New Bretton Woods system to replace the presently completely bankrupt financial system, with a New Bretton Woods, which would be in the position of the old Bretton Woods system, however it would include the added features which Franklin D. Roosevelt originally wanted, namely, to end colonialism for the developing sector, which then, unfortunately was not implemented, because Roosevelt died, and the Bretton Woods was established by Truman and Churchill, at least under their political guidance.

And obviously, a New Bretton Woods would only function if it is accompanied by Four Laws which were defined by Lyndon LaRouche already in 2014, as the absolutely necessary changes in the financial and economic system, being: first, the implementation of Glass-Steagall banking separation; secondly to go to a national bank, to bring the power of credit



generation back under the control sovereign powers, under the sovereign control of governments; and thirdly, to create an international credit system; and fourthly, to increase the productivity of the world economy by going for a crash program for a fusion economy and establish more close international space cooperation to get the necessary increase in the productivity of the world economy.

Given the fact that it cannot be expected that all countries of the G20 will agree with that – I can easily imagine that those which are absolutely tied to the City of London and the opposition to Trump coming from Wall Street, that there will be some countries that will absolutely oppose such a solution. And therefore, we have proposed that it can only be the cooperation of those countries which are powerful enough to resist the power of these financial centers, London and Wall Street, and that can only be: President Trump, President Xi Jinping, President Putin, and prime Minister Modi, the four powers together, which represent both the largest nuclear powers, the largest economies, the largest populations, that they have to work together.

Obviously, that potential exists. And since President Trump has again and again reiterated, in the election campaign and again after he became President, that he wants to improve the relationship with Russia, and the entire Russiagate was launched in order to prevent that from happening. Now, Russiagate, by now, is pretty much discredited, and despite the tensions with China on the trade issue, there are positive signs that both China and the United States may be willing to find an agreement to overcome the present war of tariffs.

That potential clearly exists, and it is very obvious, that on that hangs the question, will mankind be able, in light of existential dangers, be able to give itself a governance, structure of government, which allows the long-term sustainability of the world population. And that that is a very acute question you could see, for example, by the fact

that the present Chinese ambassador to the United States Cui Tiankai just yesterday issued a very clear warning that the world must learn the lessons of the Great Depression of the 1930s, resulting in World War II, and he warns that the inability to resolve the present tensions could lead to a new world war, and a new financial crisis worse than the Depression of '30s.

The same Ambassador Cui, already in a speech about a year ago in New York, had basically posed the question: What is going to be the relation between the United States and China? He said that in history, there were 16 cases where the dominant power was replaced by a rising power – referring obviously to the present situation between the United States and China – and that in 12 cases, this led to a big war; in 4 cases, it led to a situation where the rising power simply replaced the up to that point dominant power, and it did not lead to war. And he emphasized that China does not want, at all, either, naturally the situation of war, but it also does not attempt to replace the United States as a dominant power in the world, but that the policy of China is propose a completely new set of international relations of a win-win cooperation between sovereign powers and respect for the sovereignty of the other, respect for the different social system of the other country without interfering into the internal affairs, and simply have a cooperation for the mutual benefit of all participating in this new system.

And that is, in my view, what we have seen in reality in the last five years, since President Xi Jinping proposed the New Silk Road in Kazakhstan in September 2013. And we have seen the enormous development of the New Silk Road in the meantime, including more than 100 countries and having completely transformed the spirit in Africa, which has been caught by the Spirit of the New Silk Road due to massive investments in infrastructure, industrial parks, energy projects and similar things. The same is true for almost all of Latin America, many

countries in Asia and even some Europe countries which are absolutely seeing the advantages of cooperating with this new system.

Now, it took the West, or better, Western think tanks and media, almost four years before they even admitted that this was going on. I mean, this was going a spectacle: Because here you have the largest infrastructure project in history, ever, already now about 30 times as big as the Marshall Plan, and the Western media would not take note of it! Then, about a year ago, they realized this was absolutely unstoppable, so they started a whole barrage of slanders and attacks on this New Silk Road, and quite telling, was that the channel of the Anglo-American establishment, the New York Times, over the last weekend and the weekend before, had I think altogether some 10 or 12 articles on the New Silk Road, in which they admit, basically, well, it's unstoppable, it's here, the West was completely wrong by thinking that if you offer to China to be a member of the WTO and join the free trade system, that eventually China would take over the Western liberal system, Western democracy, or, if they would refuse that, they would simply collapse under the burden of an autocratic leadership.

And the New York Times begrudgingly admits that this was a wrong estimate, that China had not adopted the Western democracy model, and it for sure has not collapsed. But it has the astounding recording of 40 years of uninterrupted economic growth rates, which have completely transformed not only China, but also much of the world economy, and that China now has a middle-class, well-to-do part of the population of 400 million, and this will be doubled in the next 10 years. And basically, the Chinese model is attractive to many countries in the world.

They basically say, as a conclusion, that the only way to deal with that is the effort to contain China, and if need be, confrontation and even war. And some American general has already said a couple of weeks ago that a war between the

United States and China is more likely in the next 50 years, than not.

So this is obviously the famous “Thucydides trap”: This refers to the situation in ancient Greece, the rivalry between Athens and Sparta, which led to the Peloponnesian War, and as a consequence – which people don’t usually mention, when they talk about the “Thucydides trap” – the demise and collapse of ancient Greece.

That is the obvious question: Can the West relate to the fact that China is rising, that there is nothing you can do about it, because, first of all, China was a country which was the leading economic and cultural power over many centuries for the last millennia, with only a very short interruption. And it is deciding to go back, not to replace other countries, but to take a leading role on the world stage. And since the Chinese government has a policy which allows it to do that, mainly by putting the emphasis on continuous innovation, of leapfrogging to the most advanced technologies, of putting a lot of emphasis – they have the most advanced fusion power research program; they have a very, very advanced space exploration program; and they are putting a lot of emphasis on education, excellence in education for the young people, combined with Xi Jinping emphasizing the need to have especially an aesthetical education of the youth, and also the older people. Because aesthetical education goes in the direction of the beauty of the mind and the beauty of the soul.

And given the fact that China has a population of 1.4 billion people, the idea of the West that it would be possible to contain this without war is ludicrous. And if it comes to war, it should be noted that there are many military experts who make the point that once you start to use only one nuclear weapon, it is the logic of nuclear weapons, in complete contrast to traditional, conventional weaponry, that all weapons will be used. And that would obviously would mean the

annihilation of human civilization.

So, this paradox obviously exists, and it is the view of the Schiller Institute that it can only be overcome by winning the West, winning countries of the world over to join in the new paradigm in a win-win cooperation.

Now, that the danger of war is very real, we just saw in the incident involving provocation by Ukrainian warships in the Black Sea, close to the Sea of Azov and the Kerch Bridge. And some people in Ukraine already having proposed some weeks ago, that the newly built bridge between Russia and Crimea, should be blown up. This was obviously an incident a couple of days ago [Nov. 25], whereby Ukrainian warships did not follow the rules which are otherwise established between Russia and Ukraine, to announce their intention to pass through the Kerch Strait; so they were held up by the Russian military; the crews were basically arrested and interrogated, and in the meantime, written material has been found with this crew, which instructs them not to announce themselves, to go to this point of the Kerch Strait in secrecy, clearly indicating a provocation.

What happened, was, immediately, the war-hawks, like NATO General Secretary Jens Stoltenberg, immediately said NATO fully on the side of Ukraine; and some other hawks, immediately, like representatives of the Integrity Initiative – about which I will say something in a second – immediately said that NATO should send a whole flotilla into the Sea of Azov.

Now, this was absolutely denounced by President Putin yesterday, who waited a couple of days, and then basically said this was a clearly preplanned provocation, and the big fault lies with the nations of the West, who, without thinking immediately take the side of Ukraine. And in his typical Putin humor, even said, if Ukraine would demand to eat babies for breakfast, the West would immediately agree.

And this was also strongly denounced by the former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee, who had also been the Chief of Staff of the German military before that, Gen. Harald Kujat, who denounced Stoltenberg, and said he made a grave mistake: That in an incident like that, it is of the utmost importance that it be investigated and the other nations should not beat it up, but try to deescalate the whole situation. Fortunately, most of the West European governments did, because they obviously realized that a war between Ukraine and Russia could completely go out of control in no time and lead to a World War III.

So I think that this incident, in which the danger is not yet over because Poroshenko announced martial law in parts of Ukraine, and our dear friend Natalia Vitrenko, a Ukrainian politician, warned that this means Poroshenko is actually establishing a dictatorship in Ukraine – martial law, eliminating all kinds of civil rights, being an extremely hot situation.

Now, who is the instigator of this whole provocation? If you look at the fact that just recently, a couple of days ago, it was revealed that there is this thing called “Integrity Initiative.” This is a very strange institution. It’s basically run out of British embassies all over the world, and it is actually a subdivision of British intelligence. One of their spokesmen, Edward Lucas came out in the context of this Ukraine crisis, and immediately said: This is completely like Nazi Germany attacking Poland in 1939, and demanding an immediate escalation, sending warships into the Black Sea, in a clear provocation.

What is this Integrity Initiative? The new British Chief of General Staff Gen. Mark Carleton-Smith said Russia is a greater danger to the U.K. than ISIS or al-Qaeda, in a completely war-mongering statement. So what this Integrity Initiative outfit does, is they have defined so-called “cluster groups,” in all kinds of countries; and if you look

at their website and look at the names of the people involved, it is the Cold War faction all over the world. For example, in the United States, it involves Ian Brzezinski, the son of infamous Zbigniew Brzezinski, of the {Great Chessboard} infamy, and this Ian Brzezinski is a leading member of the Atlantic Council, which can be really regarded as one of these subdivisions of the Anglo-American empire, or the British intelligence. And in Germany, it involves Gen. Klaus Naumann, who is famous for his Cold War attitudes towards Russia. So it is this apparatus which is basically sticking to the idea that you need to have a geopolitical confrontation with Russia and with China. And this is the faction which brings about the war danger in the closest fashion.

Now, we have to get over the idea that the world forever needs to be divided into geopolitical blocs, where you have one nation, or one group of nations being in complete conflict with another group of nations. And unfortunately much of the European Union thinks that way; Macron thinks that way; Mrs. Merkel in the same way. When Macron recently demanded the establishment of a European army, to be able to defend Europe against Russia, China and even the United States, he said! That is typical for this kind of thinking, which under conditions of a financial breakdown crisis and general tensions is exactly a prescription for the danger of a repetition of the two catastrophes of the 20th century.

Now, the alternative is fortunately, also very clearly there. I already mentioned the New Silk Road Spirit having transformed Africa, where people for the first time have the legitimate hope that with the help of China, and now, more and more other countries, such as India, Japan, Indonesia, Turkey and many others, having recognized that Africa, which will have 2.5 billion people by the 2050, and as Xi Jinping at the Johannesburg BRICS summit in September correctly noted, Africa having the biggest development potential of all the continents on the planet, that one can say that Africa will be the "new

China with African characteristics.” That you will have a very young population, which if they are educated and provided with the necessary infrastructure investments, can really become the most productive continent on the planet.

That obviously, is a nightmare for those people who have tried to suppress the development of the developing countries, such as the IMF, with their “conditionalities,” which was the real debt trap. You know, the IMF conditionalities basically made sure that the developing countries would remain indebted, and that they were not allowed to use their income for either investment in social expenditures, education, infrastructure, but that they had to pay debt as a priority, and that was one of the main means how the development of these countries was suppressed.

And naturally, you had the very unholy role of the World Wildlife Fund, preventing infrastructure, for the sake of snails rather than human beings. And you had the whole unholy ideology of the Club of Rome that supposedly the resources on the planet were limited, and therefore development of the developing countries had to be suppressed.

When China launched the New Silk Road, all of that went out of the window, because, now, for the first time, there is the real possibility to overcome the underdevelopment of the developing countries, and that has been understood by the countries of the Global South – these are all the major organizations, such as the G77, the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC), Mercosur [Mercado Común del Sur], the African Union, all of these organizations are now basically inspired by the New Silk Road idea.

And even in Europe, this is dramatically quickly changing: You had the 16+1, Eastern and Central European Countries plus China, which very happy to be hubs between Europe and Asia, in the Silk Road development. You have Greece, which is completely transformed because of Chinese investments in



Piraeus and other infrastructure projects. The new Italian government had completely changed: They no longer listen to the EU in respect to China. The leading ministers, like Giovanni Tria, and the undersecretary for Economic Development Michele Geraci, Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte, himself, they all basically look to cooperation between China and Italy, not only for mutual investments, but especially to invest in joint projects in Africa. And one of the most glorious examples, is the agreement between China and Italy to jointly work together with the countries of the Lake Chad Basin Commission to implement the Transaqua project, which I'm sure Hussein already talked about.

But then you have also Spain, where President Xi was just there on a state visit, and having very far-reaching cooperation agreement between China and Spain, emphasizing the 2,000 years of cultural ties between the two countries. And then Xi Jinping will also go to Portugal when he comes back from the G20. And between Portugal and China there is an absolute agreement that Portugal, also, will become the hub – Spain and Portugal will not only be the hub for the Eurasian connection of the New Silk Road, but also the hub for all the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking throughout the world. So this is what the Schiller Institute emphasized in our “World Land-Bridge” report, to work on the so-called Atlantic route, and in this way, combining the Caribbean, Central America, South America, with those Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking countries and therefore Europe.

So the World Land-Bridge is coming into being. And we had just had a very interesting and hopeful even in Hamburg, between China and the Hamburg Chamber of Commerce, where, with the exception of one Greenie, who was completely beside himself, but all the other speakers were more or less very optimistic in talking about how Hamburg is the natural link not only for the land connection – and I think per week now, 23 trains are coming from China into Hamburg – but obviously, also a crucial

aspect of the Maritime Silk Road, given the fact that Hamburg is the largest port in Germany.

This is all very, very interesting. Then, I should not forget to mention Switzerland, which is also onboard. Austria: Austria's new government even has it in its coalition treaty that Austria wants to become a hub for the New Silk Road. So I think the development is actually, objectively very, very promising. But obviously, a lot more has to be done, because if you reflect on what I said in the beginning, what should become the outcome of the G20, a New Bretton Woods system and a new system in order to safeguard our nations against the danger of a new financial blowout, that has not yet been accomplished.

Otherwise, objectively, despite all the dangers I've referred to, I think we can be very optimistic, because a new system is within reach. And I just want to say, that economic development absolutely must be combined with a Classical Renaissance. Because, if you look at the values of the West right now, – I want to identify very briefly what I mean by that – the neo-liberal or liberal philosophy or ideology which has taken over in the West, it is correctly rejected by Russia and by China – it's the principle "everything is allowed." You have not two genders, but now you have about 49 genders; you have pornography without limits; children can go on the internet and see the worst-possible atrocities, the violence which is now, unfortunately having roots in the United States – you have the mass shootings in the schools almost every day. In the United States, there were already more than 300 mass shootings [this year]. You have the opioid epidemic in the United States. You have an increase of [inaudible 35:42] alcoholism, drug addiction; longevity in the United States has gone down for the first time in the last two years! If there is any parameter for a collapsing economy it is that the life expectancy goes down.

And in Europe, we are not that far behind, if you look at the

violence in the schools in Germany, just to name one element. I think we are in an absolute dire need to have a Renaissance of human culture, of Classical culture, of Classical music, poetry, and other areas of art.

This has been understood in China. I mentioned already Xi Jinping's emphasis on the need for aesthetical education, and the main Chinese speaker at this Hamburg conference yesterday, Vice Premier Liu He, who is the main economic advisor of Xi Jinping, he deviated from his written text and said that he wanted to share a story with the audience, that during the Cultural Revolution, when he was young, he had to hide in one of the hutongs in Beijing – these are the old buildings – and he had to listen in secrecy to the Violin Concerto in C-minor of Felix Mendelssohn, and that meant that he fell completely in love with Classical music and he has pursued that passion ever since.

I think this is very promising. Because as you know, we are convinced that human nature is that all human beings essentially are good, that man has the limitless capability to self-perfect, not only in terms of intellect, but also that the aesthetical education means that you can educate your emotions until you can blindly follow them because they would never tell you anything different than what reason commands. This is the Friedrich Schiller's definition of the beautiful soul. He says, necessity and passion, free will and duty all fall in one, and this is the condition where man is truly free: Because you do with passion what is necessary, because you cannot think in any different way other than on the level of reason.

And I think that is not a utopia, but that is something which can be absolutely accomplished and is inherent in the philosophy of Confucius, who also had almost the same idea of aesthetical education as Friedrich Schiller, that is, through music, through poetry, through learning [inaudible 38:49], that you can actually transform the character of people to

become beautiful characters, and to becoming wise and serve the common good.

Now, I think that if mankind is supposed to reach the New Paradigm, not only will the relations among nations be like that, that each nation will refer to the best tradition of the other and be enriched by discovering the beauty of the most advanced culture of the other nation, but that that will increasingly become the nature of relations among nations: that we will stop behaving like little four-year-old boys, kicking each other in the shins, meaning, conducting war and things like that, and we will become adult as a human species and renovate our relations, like the astronauts, who all, – all the astronauts who have been in space, who were on the ISS, they all report the same thing: That once you are in space, you recognize that you can only cooperate on the basis of reason, because otherwise you won't exist, and that when you look at our little, blue planet from space, you recognize that there is {so} much to be discovered! First of all, there are no borders, there are no races, there is only one humanity, and you recognize that our universe is so huge! And that we as a human species have to cooperate, to be able to have a sustained existence in this universe, over the next thousands and thousands of years.

And the Hubble telescope discovered that we presently know of the existence of 2 trillion galaxies! Now, that is boggling the minds – if I try to think of the Solar System, the Milky Way, the galaxy, that is already gigantic. But the idea of 2 trillion galaxies, that shows you that we as a human species have just made the first baby steps in the direction of the perfection of our species.

Anyway, I just think we are at the change of an epoch. I think we have a very good chance to leave the epoch of geopolitics behind us, that we can really create a system of governance which makes the coexistence in peace and development possible for all of humanity. And I would encourage you to be

optimistic about it, and join efforts with the Schiller Institute, because this has been our perspective for the past 40 or 50 years – in the case of my husband, 50 years – and I think we are on the verge of seeing the realization of that vision.

Thank you. [applause]

---

## **Det er stadig briterne, dumme!**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 23. april, 2018* – Med den britiske May-regerings udbrud om tvivlsomme anklager om kemiske våben og krav om krig og konfrontation med Rusland, står lederne af de nationer, der er mest afgørende for fremtidigt, menneskeligt fremskridt, over for at skulle træffe et valg.

Briterne kræver en ny Kold Krig, eller det, der er værre, med ikke alene Rusland, men også Kina. De nationer, vi længe har identificeret som nøglen til en bedre fremtid for menneskeheden, hvis de går i samarbejde – USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien – har fået det nye paradigme for dette samarbejde i form af Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, et potentielt globalt program for store projekter for ny infrastruktur.

Præsident Donald Trump er under trussel om at blive tvunget ud af embedet af angreb, oprindeligt sat i værk af britisk efterretning, pga. hvert eneste træk, han udfører hen imod samarbejde, eller blot forhandling, med præsident Vladimir Putins Rusland. Og Indiens premierminister Narendra Modi for hvert træk, han udfører, for at vende tilbage til et samarbejde med Kina.

Briterne har, tilskyndet af deres saudiske allierede og af Frankrig, været drivkraften bag hver eneste af de katastrofale og evindelige krige for »regimeskifte«, der har ødelagt Sydvestasien, fra Irak til Libyen til Syrien og Yemen. *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche udtalte efter mordet på Muammar Gaddafi i 2011, at det var briternes mål at få USA ind i en konfrontation med Rusland; og dette står nu klart for alle.

For at træffe dette valg – og for at vælge det nye paradigme for fremskridt, som Bælte & Vej repræsenterer – må disse nationers lederskab virkelig vende sig mod LaRouches forslag. Søndag sagde den yemenitiske regering i Sana'a's udenrigsminister, Hisham Sharaf, *»Jeg vil gerne personligt gøre honnør for fr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, præsident for Schiller Instituttet, og som gør en stor indsats i sin kampagne for solidaritet med os her i Sana'a, og som kræver en standsning af den militære aggression, genopbygning af Yemen og at gøre Yemen til en perle i den Nye Silkevejs og Verdenslandbroens perlekæde«.*

I USA udgøres LaRouches foreslåede »Fire økonomiske love for at redde nationen« af 1) en opbrydning af Wall Street-bankerne; 2) dannelse af en national kreditinstitution; 3) investering af denne kredit i den mest produktive, højteknologiske, nye infrastruktur; og 4) programmer som under »Apollo-projektet«, for at genoplive rumforskning og udvikling af fusionskraft.

Vi må vende os mod disse handlinger for at afslutte et årtis stagnation, der begyndte med G20-mødet i 2009 i London, hvor en politik for centralbankernes ubegrænsede bail-out af storbankerne i London og på Wall Street blev vedtaget af Barack Obama, arm i arm med premierminister Gordon Brown.

Dette forår har gjort det klart, at den alternative politik, som endda truer med atomkrig med Rusland og Kina, kommer fra London. Det er briterne, dumme!

*Foto: Den britiske premierminister Theresa May deltog i en middag på Buckingham Palace med 'Hendes Majestæt' dronningen. 1. april, 2018. (flickr / Number 10)*

---

# **Britiske løgne afsløret.**

## **Nyhedsorientering april 2018**

Det er ganske forbløffende, men der er flere og flere lande, regeringer og også politiske kræfter, der taler offentligt imod det faktum, at mange af disse britiske operationer var orkestreret. For blot at nævne den seneste af disse: den britiske regerings og MI6's rolle i Russiagate er helt fremme i rampelyset; dernæst stilles der nu også spørgsmål om hele Skripal-affæren mht. hvem, det var, der virkelig udførte angrebet; og dernæst, selvfølgelig, de seneste militære angreb på baggrund af Assad-regeringens angivelige brug af kemiske våben, og som nu også falder fra hinanden. Jeg mener, der er en voksende bevidsthed om, at der i realiteten kun er ét land, der er på krigsstien imod Rusland og, på trods af 'søde' ord, følgelig også imod Kina. Det er en meget vigtig vending i sagen.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Lavrov: Putin og Trump vil ikke lade en amerikansk-russisk militærkonfrontation finde sted

20. april, 2018 – I et interview med generaldirektøren for Rossiya Segodnya internationale informationsagentur, Dmitry Kiselev, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at præsident Vladimir Putin og den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump ikke vil lade spændinger mellem deres nationer blive til en væbnet konflikt.

»Med hensyn til risikoen for en militærkonfrontation, kan jeg med overbevisning formode, at de to landes militær ikke vil tillade dette, og det vil hverken præsident Putin eller præsident Trump selvfølgelig heller ikke. De er trods alt ledere, valgt af deres befolkning, og de er ansvarlige for deres fred«, sagde han.

Lavrov udtalte også, at, efter advarslen den 13. marts fra Ruslands generalstabschef, gen. Valery Gerasimov, en måned før missilangrebet mod Syrien fra USA, UK og Frankrig, om, at, »i tilfælde af en trussel mod vore militærfolks liv, vil Ruslands væbnede styrker træffe forholdsregler til gengældelse med både missilerne og deres affyringsmekanismer som mål«, afholdt det amerikanske og russiske militær drøftelser, hvor Rusland fremlagde sine »røde linjer«.

»Dette blev sagt meget klart og utvetydigt«, sagde Lavrov. »Bagefter var der kontakter på militært lederskabs- og generalniveau mellem vore repræsentanter og den amerikanske koalitionskommando. De fik besked om vore 'røde linjer', inkl.



geografiske 'røde linjer' på jorden. Som et resultat blev disse 'røde linjer' ikke overskredet.

Vores generalstab har et meget klart billede, vi har overvåget [angrebene] live, og statistikker, vores militær har udarbejdet. Vi er klar til at tage ansvar for dette. Hvis nogen hævder, at alle 105 missiler ramte deres mål, så vis jeres statistikker. Vore beviser, vore påstande og beregninger er i det mindste ikke grundløse og vil snart blive fremlagt af vort militær«, sagde Lavrov.

Lavrov udtalte også, at Rusland nu muligvis vil forsyne Syrien med S-300 luftforsvarssystemer.

»Vi har ikke længere nogen moralske forpligtelser [i denne henseende]« til ikke at forsyne dem, sagde Lavrov. »Vi lovede ikke at gøre det for omkring et årti siden efter anmodning fra vore [vestlige] partnere, og vi tog i betragtning deres argument om, at dette ville destabilisere situationen til trods for, at dette [S-300] er et rent defensivt system. Vi lyttede til deres opfordring. Men vi har ingen sådan moralsk forpligtelse.«

*Foto: Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov under interviewet.*

---

## **Premierminister Theresa May – Hendes historik for imperieretorik**

*17. april, 2018* – Et kig på Theresa Mays retorik, siden hun tiltrådte embedet, og på de militærpersoner, hun har valgt til

at lede landets forsvarsindsats, er særdeles afslørende mht. de igangværende bestræbelser fra Det britiske Imperiums side på at bruge den aktuelle globale krise – som også, vel at mærke, er en periode med et stort potentiale for forandring – til at gøre et komplet comeback på den globale scene.

Theresa Mays tale den 13. november, 2017 ved Lord Mayor's Banquet er totalt gennemskuelig i denne forbindelse. Hun annoncerede en ny rolle for et »Globalt Storbritannien« i den aktuelle verden »med store forandringer og udfordringer«. Hun proklamerede, »Vi er den femtestørste økonomi i verden ... vi har det næststørste forsvarsbudget i NATO ... Vi har ... det intellektuelle lederskab på vore fremragende universiteter, og det globale finanscentrum i denne storslåede City of London«.

I denne verden »er det globale Storbritanniens opgave klar ... at forsvare den internationale orden, baseret på regler, imod uansvarlige stater, der søger at udhule den ...« »De fremmeste blandt disse i dag, er naturligvis Rusland«, som hun beskyldte for illegal annektering af Krim, skabelse af konflikt i Donbass i Østukraine, krænkelse af europæiske landes nationale luftrum, cyber-spionage, og at gøre information til et våben.

»Så jeg har et meget enkelt budskab til Rusland«, sagde hun: »Vi ved, hvad det er, I laver; og det vil ikke lykkes jer. For I undervurderer vore demokratiers modstandskraft, den holdbare tiltrækning af frie og åbne samfund og de vestlige nationers forpligtelse over for de alliancer, der binder os.«

Blandt disse alliancer troede May i november, hun måske kunne smiske sig ind hos Kina imod Rusland: »Jeg er forpligtet over for bevarelse af den Gyldne Æra for vore relationer med Kina – ikke blot som en vital handelspartner, men også som en kollega som permanent medlem af FN's Sikkerhedsråd, hvis afgørelser sammen med vore vil forme verden omkring os.«

May lancerede en sluttelig salgstale til The City, Storbritanniens »bløde magt«. (Bemærk: Værten for

begivenheden, »Lord Mayor«, refererer til borgmesteren af den kvadratmil, som udgør City of London, og som er adm. dir. for City of London Corp., dvs. vores oligarkiske verdensfjende.) »I er bærere af en vis idé om økonomisk orden, på hvilken det seneste århundredes vækst er baseret: ekspertise ... juridiske tjenesteydelser ... regnskabsvæsen og finans, inden for hvilke områder denne storslåede City of London leder verden. Så, Lord Mayor, dette er tider med udfordringer. Men jeg er overbevist om, at et globalt Storbritannien har evnen til og ligeledes forpligtelsen til at leve op til øjeblikket.«

(Dette er uddrag fra en komplet CBI-rapport, udlagt på Slack, med titlen, » Global Britain, a Revival of the Empire?«)

Hele Mays tale kan læses her:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-to-the-lord-mayors-banquet-2017>

*Foto: PM Theresa May taler om 'Global Britain' ved middagen ved Lord Mayor's Banquet, 13. Nov., 2017.*

---

**Briternes løgnagtige  
manipulation afsløret.  
Vil Trump rive USA ud af  
briternes klør igen?  
Politisk Orientering 19.**

# april, 2018

»Vi lever i en fantastisk tid, hvor der sker tektoniske forandringer i verden. Og én ting er, denne fantastiske udvikling, vi har set, hvor vi har, en 'stormagt' er en underdrivelse; vi har et Kina, som er på vej til at blive den største, økonomiske faktor i verden, som har en femtedel af jordens befolkning, som bevæger sig i ekspresfart i en retning, hvor de vil udvikle sig, hvor de vil være og på alle områder vil sørge for at komme ikke bare resten af verden i kap, det er de i gang med; men de vil også sørge for at komme videre og blive den ledende, intellektuelle, videnskabelige magt i verden, koblet til, at de allerede er blevet den ledende produktionskapacitet i verden. Og det fantastiske er selvfølgelig, at Kina i den proces har taget Schiller Instituttets program til sig; at det, som vi som organisation har kæmpet for, allerede inden Schiller Instituttets grundlæggelse i 1982 i form af LaRouche-bevægelsen, men også som Schiller Instituttet fra 1982, nemlig, en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden, hvor alle nationer, alle folkeslag, alle mennesker får ret til udvikling og får mulighed for udvikling. Jamen, det er nøjagtig det program, som Xi Jinping satte i gang i form af Bælte & Vej Initiativet fra Kinas side; det er, hvad det drejer sig om, det er så at sige ikke, som man render rundt og snakker om i de vestlige forskellige seminarer og kredse, at det her er geopolitik fra Kinas side; at de bare vil forsøge at dominere og overtage USA's rolle. Nej, det Kina har gang i, det er eksplicit det, som vi hele tiden har ment, vores del af verden skulle have gang i; det er at erstatte den gamle geopolitik med en ny form for politik, hvor det ikke går ud på at få indflydelse for sig selv, på bekostning af de andre; men hvor det drejer sig om at samarbejde nationerne imellem, til alles fælles fordel ... «

Mellem del I og II mangler der omkring 1 minuts optagelse.

---

**Live via Facebook, tors. kl.  
19:15:**

**Det er briterne, ikke  
russerne!**

**v/formand Tom Gillesberg**

Sendes live torsdag den 19. april kl. 19.15 via Schiller  
Instituttets Venners' Facebook side.

Trump er blevet fanget i en britisk musefælde.

Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg holder et møde om  
de britiske løgne om Syrien og Skripal-sagen i London, som er  
blevet brugt til at forgifte forholdet mellem USA og Rusland,  
som Trump ønskede at forbedre.

---

**Chefen for Ruslands  
udenrigsefterretningstjeneste**

# kommer med en alvorlig advarsel om en ny Cuba-missilkrise

4. april, 2018 – Med bemærkninger, der faldt i stærke vendinger ved åbningsceremonien for den Syvende Moskva-konference om International Sikkerhed, sammenlignede Sergei Naryshkin, chef for Ruslands udenrigsefterretningstjeneste (SVR), Vestens konfrontation med Rusland, der har eskaleret over Skripal-forgiftningen, med den cubanske missilkrise i 1962, hvor USA og Sovjetunionen kom meget tæt på atomkrig.

»Vi må holde op med at forhøje indsatsen på uansvarlig vis og med at projicere magt over i relationer mellem staterne, for at undgå en ny krise«, sagde han. Den måde, hvorpå Vesten i dag projicerer magt, er »forbløffende hyklerisk«.

Naryshkin beskrev ligeledes forgiftningen i Storbritannien af den tidligere militære efterretningsofficer, der blev britisk dobbeltagent, Sergei Skripal, og hans datter Yulia, som »en grotesk provokation, der blev groft iscenesat af britiske og amerikanske efterretningstjenester«. Vesten, anklagede han, bruger »orwellsk tvetunge-tale« med anvendelse af ord, der betyder det modsatte af deres sande betydning, for at retfærdiggøre sine politikker. »Situationen strider imod almindelig sund fornuft er virkelig farlig«, advarede han, rapporterer RT.

I dag, fortsatte Naryshkin, er der et større behov for at »tilbageføre det internationale system for relationer, så det fungerer«. For at det kan ske, må lande opgive deres hykleri »og begynde at tale i et sandt fælles menneskeligt sprog, før det er for sent«. Så ofte, sagde han, blev »store ord om menneskerettigheder og demokrati ledsaget af militære interventioner ind i suveræne nationer. Disse nationer blev

kastet ud i et blodigt kaos, hvor der ikke var plads til så fundamental en rettighed som retten til at leve. I løbet af de seneste to årtier er hundrede tusinder af uskyldige mennesker blevet ofre for NATO's aggression i Europa, Mellemøsten og Nordafrika«.

I en antydet reference til fremvæksten af et nyt paradigme, som Vesten ignorerer, formanede SVR-chefen også, at de vestlige nationer »ikke kan og ikke vil konfrontere sandheden og erkende, at deres egen indflydelse, som plejede at være uantastet, nu er i færd med at mindskes. De forsøger stadig at bygge relationer med andre nationer, baseret på gamle principper, der har deres rod i kolonialisme og bygger på tvang og diktater«. Vesten retter vilde anklager mod Rusland, fordi det opfatter Rusland som »drivkraft bag forandring«.

Washingtons fiksering på kampen »mod en ikkeeksisterende, såkaldt russisk trussel ... har nået sådanne proportioner og fået sådanne absurde karaktertræk, at det er muligt at tale om en tilbagevenden til den Kolde Krigs mørke tider«, fremførte Naryshkin.

*Foto: Chefen for Ruslands udenrigsefterretningstjeneste Sergei Narushkin taler på den Syvende Moskva-konference om International Sikkerhed.*

---

**»Hvordan man udmanøvrerer  
gale Theresa  
Mays march mod Tredje**

# Verdenskrig«

## Helga Zepp-LaRouche i internationalt webcast; 29. marts, 2018

*Xi Jinping har, i alle sine skrifter, i alle sine taler, understreget, at dette »fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid« er baseret på total respekt for det andets lands suverænitet, total respekt for den andens samfundssystem, og der kommer ingen bestræbelse på at påtvinge noget andet land den kinesiske model. Det er ganske enkelt, at Kina har tilbudt især udviklingslandene at hjælpe dem til at overvinde deres underudvikling. Det er et win-win-samarbejde, hvilket er grunden til, at 140 lande i mellemtiden samarbejder med dette, for det er naturligvis i Kinas interesse – for det er en stor befolkning, et stort land, en meget rig kultur, 5.000 års meget rig kulturtradition, så det er et af verdens store lande, og måske endda det vigtigste, i betragtning af dets befolknings størrelse.*

*Men de påtvinger ikke nogen det, de anser for at være »kinesiske karaktertræk« – helt forskelligt fra de neokonservative og de neoliberale, der havde regimeskifte, 'farvede revolutioner', eksport af 'demokrati' og det, de kalder »menneskerettigheder«. Folk bør virkelig ikke være fordomsfulde, men bør se på det med friske øjne, selv læse Xi Jinpings taler. ...*

Download (PDF, Unknown)



---

# **Europæiske og amerikanske borgere køber ikke Hendes Sataniske Majestæts krav om krig med Rusland**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. marts, 2018* – Farcen med premierminister Theresa Mays krav om, at verden skal bøje sig for den britiske krone og acceptere den åbenlyse løgn, at Rusland gennemførte en »ulovlig magthandling« mod UK samtidig med, at Kongeriget nægter at fremlægge så meget som antydningen af bevis, overbeviser ikke mange borgere i USA eller Europa og stort set ingen uden for NATO. Organisatorer fra LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA, Tyskland (Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet; BüSo) og andre steder finder, at der er et dramatisk skift i befolkningens respons, siden PM May lancerede sin kampagne for krig med Rusland. De svingagtige britiske anklager mod Rusland – som minder stort set alle om Tony Blairs løgne om Iraks masseødelæggelsesvåben, og om denne løgns forfærdelige konsekvenser – er begyndt at vække et spirende had til denne imperieholdning, som udstråler fra briterne og fra de spytslikkere for briterne, som i 16 år sad på det amerikanske præsidentskab, før valget af Trump.

Lad os se på timingen i dette fupnummer:

- MI6-kampagnen for at bringe USA's præsident til fald gennem »Russiagate« er ikke alene kollapsedet, men dens

gerningsmænd i FBI, CIA og blandt de neokonservative i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske parti, står nu selv over for mulige anklager for kriminelle handlinger for deres løgne, læk, ulovlige brug af føderale myndigheder og mere endnu.

- Theresa Mays regering hang i en tynd tråd, alt imens Labour-partiets leder Jeremy Corbyn blev set som en sandsynlig vinder, hvis der blev udskrevet valg.
- De kombinerede britisk/Obama-bestræbelser på at vælte regeringen i Syrien og overgive landet til kaos under krigsførende terrorgrupper, ligesom i Irak og Libyen, er blevet alvorligt undermineret af præsident Trumps åbne samarbejde med Rusland omkring udslettelse af terroristerne.
- Flere europæiske nationer har afvist dæmoniseringen af Rusland, og Italien befinder sig i processen med at danne en ny regering, som sandsynligvis vil afvise europæiske sanktioner mod Rusland i det hele taget.

Så briterne forsøger at gøre det, de plejer at gøre qua deres imperienatur – opfinde en krise, der kan retfærdiggøre krig, få USA til at stå i spidsen og tyrannisere deres fordums »allierede« til underkastelse.

Men, planen virker ikke så godt. Alt imens det er sandt, at Trump-administrationen gik med i masseudvisningen af russiske diplomater, så er det imidlertid klart for briterne, at Trump ikke vil opgive sine planer om at arbejde sammen med præsident Putin. Hans telefonopringning til Putin 20. marts, hvor de diskuterede løsninger på globale problemer uden at nævne den britiske Skripal-sag med ét eneste ord, slog Dronningen og hendes britiske Lords med rædsel, såvel som også den ynkelige Theresa 'M' May, og som alle ser skriften på væggen: Enden på selve Imperiet.

Næsten et dusin europæiske lande har nægtet at udvise nogen russiske diplomater og har krævet først at se beviser. Briterne har omdelt seks power point-slides som »bevis«, som

ikke var andet end en liste over deres svigagtige anklager om russisk »aggression«. Ligesom Christopher Steele-dossieret, vil anklagerne måske narre nogle, for en tid; men briternes troværdighed er slidt ned.

Men, hvad der er meget vigtigt, så har millioner af mennesker i løbet af de seneste halvtreds år hørt Lyndon LaRouche advare om, at USA er blevet holdt for nar af briterne, med at udkæmpe deres kolonikrige siden Vietnam og med at gennemføre deres finanspolitikker med det »frie marked«, på bekostning af det Amerikanske System for dirigeret kredit til industriudvikling. Alt imens mange har fundet dette vanskeligt at tro på, så ser de pludselig de afskyelige løgne og Londons lige så afskyelige politik for anstiftelse af krige, og de reflekterer over, hvem, det var, der i alle disse år fortalte sandheden.

For en gangs skyld er briterne blevet tvunget til at stå i spidsen af deres fupnummer i deres eget navn – og det er deres sårbare punkt. Trumps plan om at arbejde sammen med Putin og med Xi Jinping og afslutte imperie-æraen for krige for regimeskifte og truslen om en atomar udslettelse, må støttes og fuldt og helt gennemføres, og det omgående.

*Foto: Dronningen og Prinsen af Wales forlader parlamentet efter dronningens tale, 2017. Copyright House of Lords 2017 / Photography by Roger Harris. This image is subject to parliamentary copyright. [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk)*

---

# **Rusland gør UK ansvarligt for Skripal-forgiftningerne,**

# med mindre de fremlægger bevis for det modsatte

28. marts, 2018 – Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium rejste i dag officielt spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt Storbritanniens efterretningstjenester var involveret i drabsforsøget på Skripal og hans datter »som en del af en massiv, politisk provokation« og nævnte den britiske regerings åbenlyse afvisning af at fremlægge nogen som helst beviser for at retfærdiggøre dens globale krav om krig mod Rusland, med baggrund i denne forgiftningsaffære.

Ruslands »Erklæring fra Udenrigsministeriet«, som i dag blev publiceret på ministeriets webside, afslører Det britiske Imperiums latterlige bluffnummer omkring Skripal-affæren på samme måde, som præsident Vladimir Putin afslørede Imperiets strategiske bluff i sin tale 1. marts, hvor han annoncerede Ruslands nye missiler, der kan undvige Vestens ABM-systemer. Læserne kan selv dømme ud fra de følgende uddrag:

»De britiske myndigheder har mere en én gang demonstreret deres manglende evne til at sikre russiske borgeres sikkerhed ...

I det seneste tilfælde [med Sergei Skripal og hans datter, Yulia, idet sidstnævnte stadig er russisk borger], handlede London i modstrid med alle normer for international lov, etik og endda sund fornuft. London har anklaget Rusland for at forgifte russiske borgere uden at levere nogen beviser eller noget komplet billede af forbrydelsen. Samtidig har det leveret det angivelige navn på den giftige substans, som aldrig er blevet brugt i Rusland, og de har lanceret en storstilet politisk kampagne og mediekampagne mod Rusland. Det har indledt kampagnen for udvisning af russiske diplomater fra en række lande og repræsentative kontorer og internationale organisationer og har annonceret en pakke af andre sanktioner

...

De britiske myndigheders handlinger rejser mange spørgsmål. Den britiske offentlighed holdes hen i mørke med hensyn til hovedelementer i denne hændelse, som er blevet beskrevet som ekstremt farlig, og antallet af personer, der er blevet ramt, holdes hemmeligt. Ingen information er blevet givet om aktiviteterne i Storbritanniens hemmelige forskningsfacilitet i Porton Down i nærheden af Salisbury, hvor man udfører forskning i kemiske substanser. Der er ikke frigivet information om 'Operation Toxic Dagger', en årlig øvelse i kemisk krigsførelse, der gennemføres på Porton Downs faciliteter sammen med UK's militær, og som afsluttedes umiddelbart forud for forgiftningen af Skripal og hans datter.

I mellemtiden har London indledt en global kampagne for at sprede antagelsen om Ruslands skyld. Vi ser en overlagt og målbevidst eskalering af konfrontation og demonstration af militærmagt på Ruslands grænser. Det er en åbenlys bestræbelse på at underminere den politiske og diplomatiske interaktion, som kunne føre til en objektiv og omfattende efterforskning af Salisbury-hændelsen.

Analysen af alle disse omstændigheder viser, at UK's myndigheder ikke er interesseret i at identificere de virkelige årsager og de virkelige gerningsmænd til forbrydelsen i Salisbury, hvilket indikerer en mulig involvering af UK's efterretningstjenester. Med mindre vi modtager overbevisende bevis for det modsatte, vil vi anse denne hændelse som værende et drabsforsøg på russiske borgere som en del af en massiv, politisk provokation. Vi understreger, at bevisbyrden udelukkende hviler på Storbritannien.«

*Foto: Fra venstre: Ruslands forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu, udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og præsident Vladimir Putin. Foto fra 2015.*

---

# UK's Nationale Sikkerhedsstrategi tilsigter krig med Rusland og tankepoliti på hjemmefronten

28. marts, 2018 – Briterne udgav i dag en ny **Strategic Security Capability Review**, der reviderer deres nationale sikkerhedsstrategi fra 2015, med en isnende opfordring fra selveste premierminister Theresa May til mobilisering for krig med Rusland, såvel som også udvidelse af »tankepoliti-kontrol« over sociale medier, forklædt som modspil mod russisk »fake news«.

I introduktionen, skrevet af May, erklærer hun, at, siden 2015, »er truslerne fortsat blevet intensiveret og udviklet, og vi står over for en række komplicerede udfordringer hjemme og i udlandet: en genopblussen af statsbaserede trusler og voksende konkurrence mellem stater; underminering af den internationale orden, baseret på regler; fremvæksten af cyberangreb fra både statslige og ikkestatslige aktører og den generelle indvirkning af teknologiske udviklinger; og den voksende trussel, som udgøres af terrorisme, ekstremisme og ustabilitet.« Uden at efterlade nogen tvivl om, hvem målet er, fortsætter hun: »I løbet af det seneste år har vi i UK været vidne til oprørende terrorangreb i London og Manchester. Men også til fræk og uansvarlig aggressionshandling i Salisburys gader: mordforsøg ved at bruge et ulovligt, kemisk våben, som er en ulovlig magthandling mod UK.«

I dokumentets hovedtekst lyder det: »En opblussen af statsbaserede trusler, en intensivering af mere udbredt statslig konkurrence og udhuling af den på regler baserede, internationale orden, som gør det vanskeligere at bygge konsensus og takle globale trusler ... Den vilkårlige og ansvarsløse brug af nervegift til militærbrug på britisk jord var en ulovlig magtanvendelse fra den russiske stats side. Det skete på baggrund af et veletableret mønster af russisk statsaggression. Ruslands ulovlige annektering af Krim var første gang, siden Anden Verdenskrig, at én suveræn nation med magt har taget territorium fra en anden nation i Europa. Rusland har anstiftet konflikt i Donbass-området og støttet Assads regime, inklusive, da dette regime med overlæg ignorerede dets forpligtelse til at standse al brug af kemiske våben. Rusland har ligeledes krænket europæiske landes nationale luftrum og etableret en vedvarende kampagne for cyber-spionage og opbrud, inklusive indblanding i valg.«

Med hensyn til »tankepoliti«, erklærer dokumentet: »Kommunikationer bliver i stigende grad, både af vore partnere og vore modstandere, brugt til at opnå strategiske fordele i den virkelige verden. Traditionelle kanaler er i vid udstrækning blevet tilsidesat til fordel for digitale og sociale medieplatforme. Dette kombineres med en nedgang i tiltroen til traditionelle informationskilder og den såkaldte »fake news«-æra. Parallelt hermed er spillereglerne ændret. Demokratiseringen af information, og midlerne til at udnytte det, har gjort det muligt for aktører at udøve uforholdsmæssig indflydelse, som er i konkurrence med offentlighedens interesse.«

*Foto: Storbritanniens premierminister Theresa May har skrevet introduktionen til UK's nye Strategic Security Capability Review.*

---

# **Briterne satser på konfrontation med Rusland i overensstemmelse med 'The Great Game' – det store spil; Det er modbydeligt og usikkert og kan give bagslag**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 27. marts, 2018* – For enhver, der ikke er en sinke, er den modbydelige natur af premierminister Theresa Mays og kohorters Skripal-forgiftnings- og anti-Ruslandsmobilisering en åbenlys »Great Game«-manøvre for at forhindre den potentielle realisering af en amerikansk-russisk hældning over mod »Nye Silkevejsrelationer«, for fred og for udvikling. Hele Mays anti-russiske, internationale mobilisering er blot en ny fase af det igangværende Trump-gate kupforsøg, med det formål at bringe det amerikanske præsidentskab til fald. Briterne er ligeledes i centrum for gennemførelsen af denne fase: MI6, Christopher Steele, Richard Dearlove, Sir Andrew Wood, Robert Mueller og andre håndlangere.

Der er ingen legale belæg for Theresa Mays kampagne for at anklage Rusland for forgiftningen i Salisbury den 4. marts –



ingen beviser, ingen analyse, ingen juridiske standarder. May selv var politisk på vej ned og ud, inden for ganske få dage, indtil denne beskidte operation blev lanceret; og nu forventes verden at hylde hende som en »anti-Ruslands-heltinde«.

»Det er modbydeligt; det er usikkert«, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag og bemærkede, at dette tydeligvis er briterne, der anstifter konfrontation. »Vi kan få det til at give bagslag«, sagde hun. Hold fast i sandheden og brug ethvert middel til at afsløre den onde hensigt og dens gerningsmænd.

Det er rent strategisk meget vigtigt, at den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov i dag gentog, at den forpligtelse stadig er aktiv, som fornylig blev indgået af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin og præsident Donald Trump, til en dialog om stabilitet og sikkerhed. Det forholder sig således, på trods af gårsdagens amerikanske, pro-britiske ordre til udvisning af 60 russiske diplomater og lukning af det russiske konsulat i Seattle. Ryabkov sagde i dag, rapportret i Sputnik, »Vi har brug for denne dialog, præsidenterne for vore lande talte om det i en telefonsamtale for et par dage siden. Vi opgiver ikke denne dialog, vi vil bevare den.« Herudover fordømte Ryabkov USA's udvisninger.

I løbet af de seneste 24 timer har ledere i andre lande udtalt sig imod denne briternes 'udsmidning af bumser'. Den østrigske kansler Sebastian Kurz sagde i dag, at hans nation ikke ville udvise russiske diplomater. Han sagde, at Østrig traditionelt er et neutralt land; det er en bro mellem Øst og Vest. Diplomater er velkomne og nødvendige i Østrig.

Der høres også udtalelser imod det britiske/EU-fremstød for konfrontation med Rusland internt i selv Tyskland, og ligeledes i Italien. Det rapporteres, at på EU-topmødet for statsoverhoveder i Bruxelles den 22.-23. marts, fremlagde May og den tyske kansler Angela Merkel krav om nye, skrappe sanktioner mod Rusland, men at dette blev blokeret som værende forkert af den italienske premierminister Paolo Gentiloni.

Dernæst rejste han hjem, og på trods af, at han er afgangende leder, udviste han to russiske diplomater og demonstrerede således det intense pres, der lægges på de europæiske ledere af briterne og deres kohorter internt i USA. Denne handling blev prompte fordømt af andre i Italien som værende forkert og som en »præmatur« dom.

Torsdag vil Trump besøge det nordøstlige Ohio for at tale om infrastruktur. Dette er i hjertet af Rustbæltet, som ville blive transformeret til et kraftcenter under betingelser, der afgøres af USA's samarbejde med USA og Rusland og Kina under Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og med **LaRouches Fire Love**.

*Foto: Premierminister Theresa May mødtes med præsident Trump på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum, 25. jan., 2018.*

---

## **Talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium advarer om »Giftige Londons« Atomare Lege**

*17. marts, 2018* – I et interview den 13. marts til Rossiya-1 Tv's »60 Minutes«-program, dagen efter den britiske premierminister Theresa Mays absurde ultimatum til den russiske regering i sagen om den »forgiftede eks-spion«, sagde talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, til sine værter, at hun *ikke* ville tale om London og gift, men snarere »om et giftigt London«.

Zakharova kaldte den britiske PM's »cirkusnummer« i parlamentet for »et klassisk eksempel på den britiske

propagandamaskine ... som insinuerer, at 'det kunne have været Rusland, var måske Rusland'«. Men, dette er et meget farligt »cirkus«, gjorde Zakharova det klart. May fremlagde ingen beviser, ingen kendsgerninger, og beordrede dog den russiske regering til at komme med svar inden for 24 timer, sagde hun. »Sådanne udtalelser kommer fra en premierminister, der er et medlem af et land med atomvåben og permanent medlem af FN's Sikkerhedsråd.«

Zakharova mindede alle seerne om præsident Putins afsløringer den 1. marts af de defensive, strategiske våbensystemer, Rusland har udviklet. »Står det klart for alle, hvorfor vi har brug for disse våben? Efter dette show i Det forenede Kongeriges parlament, må alle forstå, at, efter det, præsidenten har talt om, kan ingen person i parlamentet bare sige, 'jeg giver Rusland 24 timer'.

Jeg gentager. Vi taler om London, hovedstad i et atomvåbenland. Hvem gav de 24 timer? For hvad gav de 24 timer?  
...

Lad os kalde det, hvad det er. Kald det ikke en hændelse. Det er en storslået, international provokation«, advarede hun.

Hun nævnte Tony Blairs såkaldte undskyldning for de falske efterretninger, der blev brugt til at starte Irakkrigen, og spurgte: »Hvordan skal vi kunne tro på folk, som allerede har undskyldt for hundrede millioner af ødelagte liv?« En »overfladisk undskyldning«, bemærkede Zakharova, som kun blev givet til »dem selv, fordi det hele handler om britiske skatteydere og tab af britiske liv. De har stadig ikke undskyldt over for ét eneste land, hvor deres soldater satte fødderne, hvor civile døde, hvor almindelige liv forvandlede til ruiner pga. deres sammensværgelser og intriger ... Ikke én eneste historie af samme art er resulteret i nogen som helst form for sandhed.«

Det samme gælder for tidligere anklager om, at den russiske

stat havde dræbt andre russere, der boede i UK (Litvinenko, Berezovskij osv.), bemærkede hun. »Først lancerer de en sindssyg propagandakampagne, og så forsegler de data. Så afsiger domstolene en afgørelse, men der er ingen, der ved, hvad de er, for alting er klassificeret. Hvorfor er de så klassificeret, at vi ikke engang kan diskutere dem?«

Zakharova gjorde det ligeledes klart, at den russiske regering fortsætter med indtrængende at opfordre USA til ikke at bøje sig for »giftige London«. Til en af værternes klage over, at USA, med hvem Rusland har en mekanisme for at dele efterretninger, ikke engang spurgte Rusland, om den nervegift, der angiveligt skulle have været brugt, var Ruslands, svarede hun:

»Hør her, der er terroristangreb i Syrien, så de to sider, Moskva og USA, er kokke i samme køkken. Terrorisme er et fælles problem; det er overalt. Så de forsøger at bringe den form for tillid, vi plejede at have i vore dialoger, tilbage.« Hun nævnte russisk efterretnings tidligere indsats med at advare deres amerikanske kolleger om Boston Maraton-bombemanden, hvor USA desværre »ikke tog denne information alvorligt. Lad os se på de nylige begivenheder ... Disse data blev korrekt behandlet, og et terrorangreb blev forhindret. Disse forsøg kritiseres omgående i Washington. Hvorfor? Til hvilket formål? Almindelige mennesker, der intet har med politik at gøre, som går på indkøb, går i skole, går i teatret; de blev reddet. Det er godt!«

*Foto: Talsperson for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova.*

---

# Fr. »M« trækker vestlige allierede ind i farlig konfrontation med Rusland

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. marts, 2018 – I sin artikel den 17. marts, skrevet til den tyske avis *Neue Solidarität*, der udkommer ugentligt, advarede Schiller Instituttets stifter og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche om, at vestlige lederes kapitulation til Det britiske Imperiums sindssyge provokationer mod Rusland har forværret den strategiske krise og forhøjet faren for krig. Vi citerer uddrag af hendes artikel her:

*»Blot en enkelt dag efter, at kansler Merkel i sit embedsløfte svor at 'beskytte det tyske folk mod ondt', støttede hun fuldt og helt den britiske regerings uansvarlige provokation mod Rusland i en fælles erklæring fra den franske, amerikanske, britiske og tyske regering. Macron, Trump, May og Merkel enedes om, at der 'ikke var nogen troværdig, alternativ forklaring' på giftangrebet mod den tidligere dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal og hans datter Yulia ud over, at Rusland var ansvarligt for det. Men denne operation er så åbenlys, at der kun er én troværdig forklaring på den: Det britiske Imperium ønsker at trække hele Vesten ind i en optrapning af en ny Kold Krig, og muligvis mere. Og fr. Merkel er med til at støtte det, uden tøven.*

*I mellemtiden har en række kendte eksperter påpeget, at ultimatummet på blot én dag, som Theresa May gav den russiske regering til at forklare, hvordan nervegiften 'Novichok' kom fra Rusland til Storbritannien, er et klart brud på reglerne i OPCW [Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben], som også UK er medlem af. Det ville have været nødvendigt, bemærker de, at udlevere en prøve på giften til OPCW for en uafhængig efterforskning, og den anklagede part, i dette tilfælde*

Rusland, skulle have fået ti dage til at svare på anklagerne. Den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Usbekistan, **Craig Murray**, karakteriserede 'Novichok'-historien, for hvilken den britiske regering ikke har præsenteret den mindste smule bevis, som et svindelnummer i samme tradition som anklagerne om Iraks angivelige masseødelæggelsesvåben.

(Man vil huske, at et memo fra den britiske efterretningstjeneste MI6 fremlagde dette forslag).

Murray udtalte, at chefen for UK's eneste facilitet for kemiske våben, dr. Robin Black, i et prestigøst videnskabeligt magasin i 2016 havde understreget, at beviserne for eksistensen af denne gift var sparsomme, og at dets kemiske sammensætning var ukendt. Ikke desto mindre påstod Theresa May, selv om Storbritannien selvsagt ikke havde nogen prøver, dvs., at de ikke havde noget, med hvilket de kunne have sammenlignet den giftige substans, som blev brugt i angrebet på Skripal, at Rusland alene bar ansvaret for det. Storbritanniens facilitet for kemiske våben ligger tilfældigvis i Porton Down, som interessant nok blot er 12 km fra Salisbury, hvor angrebet fandt sted. I betragtning af den tvivlsomme karakter af Novichoks eksistens, besluttede OPCW ikke at føje det til listen over kemiske våben.

Tingene bliver endnu mere interessante, når det kommer til Christopher Steeles rolle i denne affære. Sergei Skripal, der dengang arbejdede for den russiske militære efterretningstjeneste, blev angiveligt 'vendt' i 1995 af en MI6-agent ved navn Pablo Miller i en operation, som blev koordineret af Steele, der dengang arbejdede i Moskva under diplomatisk dække. Da Steele 'forlod' MI6 i 2009, stiftede han det private sikkerhedsfirma Orbis Business International, hvis varemærke er at markedsføre anklager imod Rusland i PR-stil. Et af firmaets operationer var 'Operation Charlemagne', om den såkaldte russiske indblanding i valgene i Frankrig, Italien, Storbritannien og Tyskland, såvel som også den angivelige finansiering af Marine Le Pen, Silvio Berlusconi og partiet

*Alternativ for Tyskland (AfD) og en russisk kampagne for at ødelæge EU.*

*Men hans absolutte mesterværk som spion er kupforsøget mod Donald Trump via det aftalte spil mellem Obama-administrationens efterretningschefer, DNC [Democratic National Committee], Hillary Clintons kampagne og de britiske efterretningstjenester, og som udelukkende var baseret på det 'slibrige dossier' om Trump, som Steele et Orbis havde fremstillet. USA's Repræsentanternes Hus' efterretningskomite har netop udgivet resultaterne af sin ét år lange efterforskning, som fandt, at der ikke fandt noget 'aftalt spil' sted mellem den russiske regering og Trump-teamet.«*

Senere i sin artikel nævner Zepp-LaRouche, at en anden aktør i Orbis-operationen var Andrew Wood, den tidligere britiske ambassadør til Moskva på netop det tidspunkt, hvor Skripal blev rekrutteret af Miller i en operation, der blev koordineret af Steele. Desuden var Steele selv den ansvarlige MI6-officer for anklagerne mod Rusland i sagen om den tidligere KGB-, FSB-agent Alexander Litvinenko, der døde i London i 2006.

Med andre ord, den samme kreds af 'tidligere' MI6-agenter, der står for propagandaoperationen om angiveligt 'aftalt spil' mellem Trump og Rusland, som nu er blevet miskrediteret som 'fake news', var og er i centrum for Skripal-angrebet. Hvis det går som en and, rapper som en and og ser ud som en and, så er det efter al sandsynlighed at dømme, en and; dvs., en operation på vegne af britisk efterretning.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer indtrængende Tyskland til at nægte at gå med på den hysteriske kampagne mod Rusland, og ligeledes mod Kina, og til i stedet at slutte sig til det Nye Paradigme. Hun konkluderer, at, hvis premierminister Theresa nu forestiller sig, at hun må imitere den britiske skuespillerinde Judi Dench, der spillede rollen som 'M' i James Bond-film – den chef, som Bond rapporterede til – så er

det et tilfælde af ekstremt dårlig smag. »At tillade sig selv at blive trukket ind i en konfrontation med Rusland af en sådan rollemodel, er uansvarligt.«

*Foto: Genvælgte kansler Angela Merkel (højre) og britiske PM Theresa May (midten) enedes tirsdag 13. marts om, at allierede burde handle samstemmigt for at imødegå »Ruslands aggressive adfærdsmønster« efter giftangrebet på UK's territorium af en tidligere russisk dobbeltagent, Sergei Skripal. Frankrigs præsident Emmanuel Macron (venstre), såvel som også USA's præsident Donald Trump, har ligeledes givet deres støtte til briternes udlægning af sagen; at Rusland er den ansvarlige. (Arkivfoto).*

---

# **Mere end nogensinde før er det presserende nødvendigt at afslutte geopolitik. LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 16. marts, 2018. Fuldt dansk udskrift**

*Vi befinder os nu i en situation, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche tidligere i dag beskrev som »ildevarslende«; det var det ord, hun brugte. Hun sagde, »Dette kan kun forstås som et miljø med førkrigs-propaganda«. Hun sagde, at den respons, vi har set fra Vesten, fra flere lande i Europa og inkl. her i USA, til den bizarre sag med forgiftningen i Salisbury, Storbritannien, af en russisk eksspion, der blev britisk spion, ved anvendelse af en angivelig nervegift; hun sagde, at dette nu har skabt*



det, der kun kan betegnes som en ekstremt farlig situation, som meget let kunne eskalere hurtigt og føre til krig. Hun sagde, »Man må stille sig selv det indlysende spørgsmål: Hvor fører alt dette hen?«

Nøglefaktoren her, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har understreget, er timing. Denne begivenhed, og alt det, der efterfølgende har udviklet sig med den, kom direkte i hælene på: 1) præsident Putins annoncering i sin tale for den føderale forsamling den 1. marts af denne nye generation strategiske våben, der totalt har ændret den internationale, geopolitiske struktur; og 2) annonceringen fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der præsideres af kongresmedlem Devin Nunes, nogle få dage senere af, at de havde afsluttet deres efterforskning og konkluderet, at der absolut ikke fandt noget 'aftalt spil' sted mellem Trump-kampagnen og russerne. Dette var absolut hele grundlaget for Christopher Steeles Russiagate-narrativ.

Download (PDF, Unknown)