

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 Dnipropetrovsk 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 Yanukovich, 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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich'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 Yanukovich 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 Yanukovich, 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.

Putin og Xi tager tyren ved hornene

Den 15. december (EIRNS) – Den russiske præsident, Vladimir Putin, og den kinesiske præsident, Xi Jinping, afholdt det som svarede til et hastetopmøde i dag i en videokonference. Topmødet, offentliggjort for kun to dage siden, tog fat om to forskellige slags »atomkrige«, som de to lande trues med gennem det krigsgale og bankerotte britisk-amerikanske finansetablisement:

1) Opfordringen den 7. december fra senator Roger Wicker (republikaner fra Mississippi) om at overveje militære angreb baseret på »førstebrugen af atomvåben« (»first-use nuclear action«), og bruge krisen omkring Ukraine som retfærdiggørelsen. Wicker er den næsthøjst rangerende - republikaner i Senatets Komité for væbnet Tjeneste. På trods af den storm af protester, fra venstre og højre side af det politiske spektrum, som hans udtalelse udløste, har senatoren stadig ikke trukket sin hovedløse provokation tilbage. Samtidig fortsætter NATO sin østlige udvidelse, samt

at væbne Ukraine og andre nationer der ligger helt op til Ruslands grænse – en udvidelse, som ifølge Ruslands advarsler, krydser en rød streg og vil føre til et svar fra russisk side.

2. Gentagne opfordringer til at aktivere den »atomare - valgmulighed« i finansiel krigsførelse mod Rusland – at smide dem ud af det globale finansielle betalingsssystem, SWIFT. Dette ville svare til en finansiel belejring af Rusland for at forsøge at sulte dem til at underkaste sig, som dette i øjeblikket gøres mod Afghanistan. Den amerikanske viceudenrigsminister, Victoria Nuland, arkitekten af det nazistiske kup i Ukraine i 2014, opfordrede blot forrige uge til denne »atomare valgmulighed«, og udenrigsminister Tony Blinken truede offentligt med dette lige efter topmødet mellem Biden og Putin den 7. december. Lignende trusler blev udtrykt af præsident Biden selv umiddelbart før sit møde med Putin i juni 2021.

Hvad diskuterede Putin og Xi i dag, efter pressens kameraer var blevet slukket? De gennemgik naturligvis krigsfaren og deres fælles forpligtelse i at hjælpe med at styrke hinandens sikkerhed i lyset af truslerne omkring Ukraine og Taiwan. Dertil giver den offentlige gennemgang, leveret af Kreml-rådgiveren, Yuri Ushakov, yderligere indsigt: »Særlig opmærksomhed blev givet af de to ledere på nødvendigheden af at intensivere anstrengelserne for at skabe en uafhængig, finansiel infrastruktur for at muliggøre handelsoperationer mellem Rusland og Kina. Det vil sige at skabe en infrastruktur, som ikke kan påvirkes af tredje lande.«

Betyder dette, at Rusland og Kina snart vil meddele, at de er i færd med at træde ud af dollarsystemet og afkoble deres økonomier fra Vesten? Sandsynligvis ikke. Betyder det, at de har forberedt defensive tiltag for at kunne håndtere en finansiel »atomar valgmulighed«, igangsat mod dem? Sandsynligvis.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche kommenterede i dag, at hvis Rusland og Kina tvinges til at vedtage storstilede modforanstaltninger imod SWIFT-systemet, da kunne dette meget vel være dråben, der fik hele det transatlantiske finanssystems bære til at flyde over. Heldigvis eksisterer potentialet i forbindelse Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ til at overtage dettes rolle, og at erstatte nutidens malthusianske afindustrialiserings- og affolkningspolitik med et nyt system, fokuseret på højteknologisk, fysisk-økonomisk vækst.

Tag et skridt tilbage og overvej Putins nylige diplomatiske initiativer – den samme Putin, som Lyndon LaRouche ofte beskrev som et »strategisk geni«, der ikke burde undervurderes. Putin sørgede for at flankere sit kritiske topmøde den 7. december med præsident Biden: inden dette, med et topmøde den 6. december i New Delhi med Indiens premierminister Modi, og efter dette, med dagens hastetopmøde med præsident Xi. Et andet emne, diskuteret mellem Putin og Xi, ifølge Ushakov, var intentionen om at afholde et topmøde mellem Rusland, Indien og Kina i den nærmeste fremtid.

Og USA? Præsident Biden, sammen med kredse, der måske kunne beskrives som »realisterne« i Washington, virker tilbøjelige til at søge en forhandlet løsning til krisen omkring Rusland og Ukraine. Men hans politiske paladsgarde – Blinken, Sullivan, Nuland, m.fl. – er ikke, og indtil videre er de de dominerende skikkelser i Washington. Ej heller er ejerne af det vestlige, spekulative finanssystem i forhandlingsstemning – det er ikke en mulighed for dem. Deres system er i gang med at bryde sammen, og deres eneste håb er at gennemtvinge en overgang til en fascistisk, malthusiansk verdensorden.

For at Amerika skal kunne overleve og blomstre, må det vedtage retningen, længe foreslået af Lyndon LaRouche, der etablerer en firemagts-alliance med magten til at indlede et Nyt Paradigme i global udvikling – en alliance

blandt USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, som handler på vegne af hele menneskeheden.

Billede: www.kremlin.ru

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 15. december 2021:

Kun samarbejde kan besejre pandemien og forhindre atomkrig

Se også 2. del: 3 min.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

2. del: 3 min.

lyd:

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

At skabe en mulighed ud af

katastrofen: Tilblivelsen af en katalysator for et nyt paradigme

(2. december (EIRNS) – Rusland og Kina er flankeret mod vest og øst af truslen for militærkonflikt gennem brændpunkterne, Ukraine og Taiwan. Varslingerne om et angiveligt forestående angreb på Ukraine fra Rusland, bruges af NATO's ledere som undskyldning til at presse på for at tropper og våben bliver stationeret i Ukraine. Præsident Putin har gjort det klart, at dette fuldstændigt ville overskride en rød linje for Rusland. Og udtalelsen tidligere i denne uge fra den forhenværende japanske premierminister, Shinze Abe, at Japan og USA ville forsvare Taiwan militært i tilfælde af en invasion fra det kinesiske fastland, blev mødt med yderst stærke fordømmelser fra Folkerepublikken Kina.

I tirsdags forklarede Putin truslen, som hans land står over for: »Den russiske Føderation har også visse bange anelser, hvad angår de storstilede militærøvelser, afholdt nær dets grænser, , herunder dem som ikke var planlagte, såsom de nylige øvelser i Sortehavet, hvor strategiske bombefly, der er kendt for at bære præcisions- og sågar atomvåben, fløj indenfor 20 km fra vores grænse.« Med NATO's udvidelse mod Rusland i løbet af de sidste 20 år, inklusive placeringen af angivelige missilforsvarssystemer i Polen og Rumænien – udstyr som også er i stand til at affyre Tomahawk- og andre missiler – advarede Putin, at der er en absolut rød linje fra truslen af missiler fra Ukraine. »Jeg vil gentage det endnu engang, at spørgsmålet omhandler den mulige opstilling på Ukraines territorium af missilsystemer med en flyvetid på 7-10 minutter til Moskva, eller 5 minutter i tilfældet af hypersoniske systemer...«

»Så, hvad skal vi gøre? Vi ville blive nødt til at skabe

lignende systemer, som kan bruges mod dem, der truer os... [V]i har afholdt succesfulde testninger, og tidligt næste år vil vi gøre et nyt sø-affyret, hypersonisk missil med en tophastighed på 9 mach klar til brug. Flyvetiden for dem, der udsteder ordrer, vil også være 5 minutter.«

»Hvorfor gør vi dette?« spurgte Putin. »Skabelsen af sådanne trusler er en rød linje for os.«

Udenrigsminister Sergej
Lavrov fortalte udenrigsministrenes OSCE-møde i Stockholm, at NATO's involvering i Ruslands umiddelbare nærområde (vigtigst af alt Ukraine) ville »have de mest alvorlige konsekvenser og vil tvinge [Moskva] til at svare igen«. Det væbnede konflikts monster er vendt tilbage indenfor Europas grænser.

Kinas viceudenrigsminister, Hua Chunying, påmindede Japan: »Gennem dets koloniale herredømme over Taiwan for et halvt århundrede siden, begik Japan talrige forbrydelser, for hvilket det bærer et alvorligt, historisk ansvar overfor det kinesiske folk. Ingen bør undervurdere det kinesiske folks stærke viljestyrke, beslutsomhed og de evner de har for at garantere nationens suverænitet og territoriale integritet. Dem, som vover at forfølge en gammel vej med militarisme og udfordre vores grundlag, vil være på kollisionskurs med det kinesiske folk!«

Og det er ikke blot krig! Det ideologiske foretagende, som søger at bruge truslen om en militær konfrontation for at destabilisere udvikling, og kontrollere væksten og suveræniteten af nationer, der er uafhængige af den angloamerikanske slimede skimmelsvamp, er den samme magt, der fremmer den åbenlyse malthusianske dagsorden bag Den store Nulstilling. En pandemi løber amok i det meste af verden uden vacciner til rådighed i tilstrækkelige mængder til at dække behovet og efterspørgslen i de mindre udviklede lande. Men i stedet for at løse dette problem, og udvikle en

dybdegående sundhedsinfrastruktur, fortælles verden at den må mobilisere ti eller endog hundreder af billioner af dollars i investeringer for at forhindre relativt små forandringer i klimaet. Dette umenneskelige paradigme må erstattes omgående med et nyt paradigme for vækst og udvikling.

Selve den dødelige corona-pandemi skaber en mulighed. Ved at kaste lys over vores ekstreme mangel på beredskab, både imod nyfremkommende virusser og i form af sundhedsinfrastruktur samlet set, viser det behovet for et moderne, avanceret sundhedsvæsen for alle mennesker, som en motor for at skabe infrastrukturel, industriel og kulturel udvikling, samt uddannelse, i sin helhed.

Deltag med Schiller Instituttet denne lørdag i en diskussion om, hvordan den fulde udvikling af sundhedsinfrastruktur kan tjene som en motor for at feje den umenneskelige malthusianisme og geopolitik til side, og erstatte dem med en tilgang, der er i overensstemmelse med hvert individs værdighed.

Billede: chess-Pixabay, FelixMittermeier

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 23.
juli 2021:
Vi kan løse problemerne –**

men kun hvis vi bryder fri af den mentale spændetrøje

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Schiller Institutttet · Vi kan løse problemerne – men kun hvis vi bryder fri af den mentale spændetrøje

**Atomkrig er ikke en mulighed
– Mobiliser for Schiller
Institutttets konference d. 8.
maj:
"Den transatlantiske verdens
moraliske sammenbrud råber på
et nyt paradigme"**

6. maj (EIRNS) – I forbindelse med organiseringen af Schiller Institutttets konference førstkomende lørdag har arrangører fra den internationale LaRouche-bevægelse i stigende grad erfaret, at det slør af uklarhed, som regeringer og de prostituerede medier har trukket ned over befolkningerne i de transatlantiske nationer, er begynder at trevle op. Den snigende ondskab af den malthusianske 'grønne nye deal' trænger ind – til dels på grund af den vide cirkulation af

pjecen "Det store spring tilbage – LaRouche knuser bedraget med den nye grønne aftale". Fremstormen mod militær konfrontation med Rusland og Kina – af endnu mindre bevæggrunde end de ulovlige og umoralske krige, der ødelagde Irak, Libyen og Syrien – er baseret på lignende løgne, og disse løgne bliver i stigende grad tydelige for seriøse mennesker. Selv den krigeriske New York Times bragte en ledende artikel, der kalder Biden-administrationens provokationer mod Kina over Taiwan "dumdrigt", og at man risikerer en "katastrofal krig". Og vigtigst af alt spørger forfatteren krigshøgene, hvor mange amerikanske liv de er villige til at risikere, idet han bemærker, at højtstående amerikanske statsmænd (nævner Stapleton Roy og Chas Freeman) nu har advaret om, at en krig med Kina kunne være med kernevåben.

Medierne får heller ikke frit spil. Caitlin Johnston, der i sidste måned udsendte en artikel med titlen: "Den stigende trussel om atomkrig er den mest presserende sag i verden", rapporterede onsdag om det modbydelige interview med udenrigsminister Tony Blinken af Norah O'Donnell på CBS '60 minutter den 2. maj, hvor det var umuligt at sige, om interviewer eller den interviewede, var mest afskyelig. Johnston anklager O'Donnell med hendes egne ord, ved blot at nævne spørgsmålene, som omfattede: "Har du nogensinde set Kina være så selvsikker eller militært aggressiv?" Og "Beskriv hvad du ser finder sted i Xinjiang, som resten af verden måske ikke ser". Og "Kineserne har stjålet forretningshemmeligheder og intellektuel ejendom for hundreder af milliarder, hvis ikke billioner, af dollars fra USA. Det lyder som fjendtlige handlinger". Betragt hykleriet når den kinesiske og russiske presse beskyldes for at være underlagt deres regeringer.

Men krigsfaren er håndgribelig. Blinken er i Ukraine og diskuterer processen med at bringe Ukraine ind i NATO, placere krigsmaskinen direkte på Ruslands grænse. Rusland indkaldte til et møde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd onsdag for at fremlægge

beviser og vidner om grusomhederne begået af morderiske nazi-bander i Ukraine siden Maidan-farverevolutionen i 2014. Første stedfortrædende faste repræsentant, Dmitry Polyansky, kaldte dem "afskyelige begivenheder, som ingen normal person kan være ligeglad med". Svaret fra USA og briterne var en fælles erklæring: "Vi beklager dette bevidste forsøg på at aflede det internationale samfunds opmærksomhed på Ruslands igangværende destabiliserende aktiviteter mod Ukraine gennem de seneste syv år".

Tilskyndelsen til militær konfrontation mellem atombevæbnede magter, repræsenterer sammen med Green New Deal den koordinerede indsats for at genetablere det britiske imperium til sin fordums blodige herlighed, nu med USA som den "dumme gigant", der tilvejebringer musklerne til den forstyrrede britiske hjerne. Malthusiansk affolkning er stadig det erklærede mål for den britiske kongefamilie og dens håndlangere, hvad enten det er ved krig, ved epidemi, ved hungersnød eller med tvungen økonomisk ødelæggelse gennem kolonial plyndring eller dets moderne form i Green New Deal.

Krisen er så enorm, at folk begynder at opgive den vrangforestilling, at "de", 'the powers that be', ikke vil lade en sådan katastrofe ske. At skabe den krævede mobilisering af borgere, internationalt, der bryder disse vildfarelser og aktiverer deres kreative kræfter på vegne af menneskeheden og vores eftertid, kræver aktivering af de ideer, der er skabt af Lyndon LaRouche i løbet af de sidste halvtreds år. Bring så mange du kan til videokonferencen på lørdag, hvor disse ideer vil blive drøftet af ledere fra hele verden.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 16. april 2021: Vestens civilisationskrise: krig eller fred gennem udvikling

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Schiller Institutet · Vestens civilisationskrise: krig eller fred gennem udvikling

Vær ikke diplomatisk: Vi står over for en civilisationskrise, der må vendes

13. april (EIRNS) – Med Ukraine-krisen, der bevæger sig hurtigt mod et strategisk opgør, ringede præsident Joe Biden tirsdag til præsident Vladimir Putin for at foreslå, at de to ledere afholder "et topmøde i et tredjeland i de kommende måneder for at diskutere hele spektret af spørgsmål, som USA og Rusland står over for," ifølge et referat fra Det Hvide Hus. Hensigten ville være, at "USA og Rusland skulle forfølge en strategisk stabilitetsdialog, om en række våbenkontrol- og nye sikkerhedsspørgsmål."

Men selv da Biden talte med Putin, var hans udsending, udenrigsminister Tony Blinken, i Bruxelles, og han opfordrede Ukraine til et dumdrigt krav om straks at tilslutte sig NATO, som alle sider ved, er en snubletråd for Rusland. Samtidig har USA udsendt to krigsskibe til Sortehavet, som den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov beskrev som en provokation "designet til at teste Ruslands nerver." Han advarede om, at amerikansk militærstøtte til Kiev gør Ukraine til en "krudttønde", og at "hvis der er nogen forværring, vil vi naturligvis gøre alt for at sikre vores sikkerhed og vores borgeres tryghed."

Hvad der mere ligger bag Biden-Putin-telefonopkaldet er uklart i skrivende stund. Men to ting er klare: 1) at Ukraine-brandpunktet og den større krigsfare er drevet af det systemiske sammenbrud af hele det transatlantiske finanssystem, som også har frigjort en pandemi, hungersnød og massearbejdsløshed over hele planeten; og 2) at ingen løsning på en enkelt krise vil fungere, medmindre hele civilisationskrisen behandles og vendes.

"Jeg tror, det går op for flere og flere relevante mennesker, at vi har at gøre med en civilisations potentielt omfattende og fuldkomne svigten", sagde Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i dag. "Man kan ikke reagere på en enkelt krise eller sammenbrud eller fare som et individuelt fænomen; man må virkelig tage fat på hele billedet som et. Fordi, enten kan vi katalysere nogle moralske reaktioner fra mennesker, der er villige til at erkende, at det der foregår, er et civilisationssammenbrud, ellers tror jeg, at vi er på en kort vej mod katastrofe."

Zepp-LaRouche tilføjede: "Det er ganske bemærkelsesværdigt, at dette civilisationssvigt er ved at blive et spørgsmål for mange vigtige mennesker, hvor den seneste er FN's generalsekretær, Antonio Guterres, som i går gennemgik den globale reaktion på COVID-19-krisen og situationen med verdens hungersnød, fattigdom og arbejdsløshed. Han fortalte en

samling af FN's ECOSOC, at intet element i den multilaterale reaktion er gået som det skulle. Han sagde, at sidste år døde mere end 3 millioner mennesker af COVID-19, 120 millioner er faldet ned i ekstrem fattigdom, og det der svarer til 255 millioner fuldtidsarbejdspladser er gået tabt. Og krisen er langt fra overstået. Han sagde, at krisen 'sætter multilateralisme på prøve, og indtil videre har vi dumpet.' Han tilføjede, at der er behov for et komplet paradigmeskifte."

Zepp-LaRouche fortsatte med at trække en moralsk linje i sandet: "Der er disse helt utrolige billeder af børn, der dør lige foran verdens øjne i Yemen og andre steder, men det forhindrer ikke de rigeste mennesker i verden i at have forøget deres formuer med 5 billioner dollars i løbet af det sidste år. Hvordan kan en Jeff Bezos (Amazon) eller en Bill Gates eller alle disse andre skiderikker som George Soros leve med sig selv, når de ved, at deres rigdom er bygget ovenpå ligene af så mange millioner mennesker? Jeg synes, vi skal sige det på den måde," insisterede hun.

Hun opfordrede LaRouche-bevægelsens organisatorer til ikke at være diplomatiske, men at ruske op i folk. "Jeg tror, at enhver, der ser kombinationen af krigsfaren som vokser, hungersnød, der dræber millioner af mennesker i flere lande, COVID-19 der raser – de må reagere. Og i forhold til dette viser de førende eliter, at de er fuldstændig ude af stand til at håndtere denne krise."

"Men jeg er overbevist om, at denne kamp kan vindes", konkluderede Zepp-LaRouche, "fordi den slår alternativet". Det gamle paradigme styrter sammen, men hvis vi udfører vores opgave rigtigt, kan et nyt paradigme vindes, sagde hun. Men for at gøre dette, "tror jeg at det moralske spørgsmål må adresseres."

'Motsætningernes sammenfald' – den eneste modgift imod krig

7. april (EIRNS) – Den gamle, makabre vittighed lyder: "Ved du hvordan man laver ukrainsk kyllingesuppe? Man lægger en flok ukrainere i en gryde, og derefter fodrer man kyllingerne med dem". Under illusionen om at NATO, anno 2021, ikke vil opføre sig som Atlanterhavsalliancen i 1956 i tilfældet Ungarn, placerer Ukraines præsident Volodymyr Zelensky, muligvis ubevidst, Ukraine i en stor, dampende gryde, der bliver varmere for hvert minut. Ikke at NATO nu i det hele taget har nogen eksistensberettigelse: Når alt kommer til alt, må selv den mest inkarnerede geopolitiker indrømme, at Atlanterhavet ligger langt fra Sortehavet.

Russiske embedsmænd har med noget nær sympati observeret, at Zelensky muligvis ikke engang har kontrol over de skøre elementer i det ukrainske militær, der nu bomber landsbyer nær Donetsk. Senator Vladimir Jabarov, første næstformand for 'Federation Council's International Affairs Committee', sagde til TASS: "Hvis (Zelensky) mener, at NATO agter at komme til hans forsvar såfremt han går i konflikt med Rusland, tager han meget fejl. Lad ham foretage et telefonopkald til [Georgiens tidligere præsident Mikheil] Saakashvili og bede ham om råd. Han vil fortælle ham, hvordan det kommer til at foregå".

Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin gjorde i en telefondiskussion Ruslands stilling klar, ikke alene over for Angela Merkel og Frankrigs Emmanuel Macron; Putin afholdt også et telefonmøde med Jair Bolsonaro fra Brasilien...

Uanset hvad de ellers diskuterede, er de to præsidenter kendt for at have beskæftiget sig med den type "vaccinediplomati", som Schiller Instituttets Komité for Modsætningernes Sammenfald har opfordret til. Den brasilianske coronakatastrofe, der hidtil er blevet behandlet af præsident Bolsonaro på samme måde, som den dødsdømte prins Prospero "trodsede smitten" i Edgar A. Poes *The Masque of the Red Death*, kan være den største enkeltstående krise i nationens historie – indtil videre. Men aksiomer bliver også ofre for plager. En ny vej fremad er påkrævet og tilgængelig.

I går talte Kinas Xi Jinping med Tysklands Angela Merkel om sin økonomiske udviklingsvision. Han fremkaldte hendes erklærede intention om, at styrkelse af dialogen mellem EU og Kina er gavnlig for verden. Merkel sagde, at Tyskland er villig til at spille en positiv rolle i denne henseende. Kinas støtte til El Salvador ved at sende mere end 2 millioner doser vaccine til denne nation med 6,4 millioner indbyggere, og dets samarbejde med Cuba om oprettelse af PanCorona-vaccinen, en af 15 der nu arbejdes på i denne "terrorist"-nation med 11 millioner indbyggere, er endnu et eksempel på, at Rusland og Kina gør i Sydamerika, hvad USA, i billedet af Kennedys Alliance for Fremskridt (Alliance for Progress) og FDR's Gode Nabo-politik (Good Neighbor policy), kunne have været forventet at gøre.

Potentialet for en verdensomspændende anti-malthusiansk alliance spiller også ind i forbindelse med Indiens minister for ny og vedvarende energi, Raj Kumar Singhs, nylige forsvar af det afrikanske kontinent den 31. marts: "Der er 800 millioner afrikanske mennesker, der ikke har adgang til elektricitet. Vi (Indien) vil opnå det, der skal opnås, fordi vi får investeringer. Hvad med disse (afrikanske) lande?... Disse lande vil udvikle sig, og det vil kræve mere stål, og det vil de fremstille; det vil kræve mere cement, og det vil de fremstille... Og det kan ikke stoppes... De vil også bygge skyskrabere. De ønsker også en høj levestandard for deres

befolkning". Hans udtalelser var en gentagelse af Fred Wills ord på Schiller Instituttets New Bretton Woods-konference i 1988 om forhåbningerne hos den oprindelige Bevægelse af alliancefrie Lande fra 1955, hvor Indien indtog en ledende rolle: "Vi troede dengang, og det gør vi stadig, at livet er den grundlæggende essens ved naturlige processer. Liv skal opstå, liv skal overleve, liv skal vokse, livet skal udvikle sig. Dengang som nu er jeg sikker på, at grundvilkårene vor nuværende eksistens er unacceptable".

Fra Schweiz advarede Marc Chesney, leder af bank- og finansafdelingerne ved Zürich Universitet, om et kommende sammenbrud af det finansielle system, og opfordrede til genindførelse af bankseparation. Selv det schweiziske BNP er nu pantsat 26.000 gange på derivatmarkederne. "Hvordan kan man tro, at bankkunder i Schweiz kan stå inde for risici på 26.000 gange bruttonationalproduktet?" Chesney påpegede også, at hen ved to gange den finansielle likviditet, der hver dag strømmer i hænderne på Amazons Jeff Bezos, cirkulerer blandt 1,3 milliarder afrikanere i den samme 24-timers periode. Ikke reel velstand, sandt nok, men alligevel en manifestation af den sande imperialistiske/koloniale karakter af den finansielle 'Great Reset'. Der kan og må organiseres billioner af \$ i produktiv kredit til den fysiske produktion, hvilket er nødvendig for hurtigt at sammensætte en flerstrengt global sundhedsplatform, samt dens pendant i form af vand-, kraft- og transportstøtte, hvorved det bliver muligt at overvinde de nuværende sygdomsudbrud, herunder nye varianter.

Præsidenter og repræsentanter for Rusland, Kina og Indien har alle forfægtet suverænitet og fornuft i den sidste uge. Hvor er USA i alt dette? Der må ske en ændring i de fremherskende aksiomer. Umiddelbart er der to måder at angribe dette på. For det første må vi intensivere kampagnen for at udrulle oberst Richard Blacks modige "anklage" med hensyn til det amerikanske militærs samarbejde om ødelæggelsen af Syrien gennem krig mod civilbefolkning, også kaldet "sanktioner". Kardinal Zenaris

fulde erklæring er tilgængelig via 'Vatican News', og vi bør fortsætte med at indsamle erklæringer om støtte hertil. For det andet vil en hurtig, målrettet distribution af LaRouche-Organisationens pjece, "Det store spring tilbage", de kommende dage, inden Bidens uformelle drøftelser den 22.-23. april på 'Earth Day', kunne katalysere en seismisk reaktion i dette land på svindlen med klimaforandringer, som ingen mistænker nu.

Ikke at "LaRouche-effekten" vil "toppe" og derefter falde efter den 22. april. Hensigten er snarere at fremkalde en intensiverende proces med bevidst afvisning af den anti-russisiske/kinesiske propagandamaskine, der drives gennem den britiske 'Joint Threat Research Intelligence Group' (JTRIG) – en førhen hemmeligholdt enhed fra efterretningsbureauet 'Government Communications Headquarters' (GCHQ) – og dens juniorpartner, Global Engagement Center (GEC), der ved hjælp af opdaterede metoder fra Tavistock Institutet har taget sigte på enhver organisation samt adskillige enkeltpersoner, som udgør en trussel mod den globale dagsorden for affolkning, herunder LaRouche-Organisationen. De sidste ord i LaRouches essay, "Videnskaben om det menneskelige sind", formulerer bedst vores øjeblikkelige udfordring: "Mental sundhed er ligesom videnskabelig opdagelse altid polemisk i karakter. Sandheden eksisterer kun i form af polemik mod ondskab og falskhed".

Sorte liv betyder noget – så stop Holocaust i Afrika, skab

1,5 milliard job.

Den 7. juni (EIRNS) – Mens hele verden nu oversvømmes med slagordene 'sorte liv betyder noget' (black lives matter), må man spørge: Hvad er det ønskede resultat? At skabe et anstændigt liv for de fattige i Amerika, hvoraf mange er sorte og latinoer? De fleste mennesker anerkender, at de massive demonstrationer i USA og i store dele af verden i dag er drevet af mere end racistisk politibrutalitet – de er resultatet af det katastrofale sammenbrud i økonomien midt i en dødbringende pandemi – begge omstændigheder der påvirker den sorte befolkning mere intenst, men som er universelle katastrofer.

Hvorom alting er, bortset fra EIR-programmet, der blev udgivet i sidste uge, og som kræver en hurtig skabelse af 1,5 milliarder job og et lige så presserende topmøde med lederne af USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien for at iværksætte det nødvendige hasteprogram, ser der ud til at være ringe opmærksomhed omkring de faktiske forbrydelser, der bliver begået imod de fattige i USA og langt de fleste lande i Afrika og Sydamerika, fra de mere end tredive års finansielle og økonomiske politik. Under slagordene om "globalisering", "fri handel" og "miljøbeskyttelse" er de virkelige industrielle økonomier blevet ødelagt, infrastruktur har fået lov til at rådne, og udviklingslandene nægtet enhver industriel udvikling, bortset fra Kinas soloindsats for at tilvejebringe fysisk udvikling gennem Den nye Silkevej/ Bælte- og Vejinitiativet.

FN's direktør for verdens fødevareprogram, David Beasley, har råbt op så højt han kan om, at Afrika i løbet af kun få uger eller højst måneder vil have en mulig sultedødelighed på 300.000 pr. dag i forbindelse med coronavirusset, med fødevareforsyningskæder der også knækkes af den økonomiske krise, kombineret med et af de værste græshoppeangreb i moderne historie. Betyder disse sorte liv noget?

At male "Black Lives Matter" med ti meter høje bogstaver i gul maling på Washingtons 16th Street vil ikke gøre noget for at løse disse reelle problemer. Faktisk skal det bemærkes, at den officielle 'Black Lives Matter'-bevægelse blev finansieret med 60 millioner dollars fra George Soros, og i alt over 400 millioner \$ fra andre Wall Street-fonde, mens terroristorganisationen Antifa og andre åbenlyst voldelige bander – mange af dem primært hvide – har opereret under dække af demonstrationerne.

Det drivende fokus for "bevægelsen" er fjernelsen af Donald Trump fra embedet, mens indsatsen i vid udstrækning styres af de samme kræfter, som orkestrerede fase et og fase to i kupforsøget – Obamas korrupte efterretningsteam, hvoraf mange nu selv står overfor fængsling for deres forbrydelser; af deres kontrollører i det britiske imperium, MI6 og GCHQ, og af de prostituerede i pressekorpsset, der svor på, at Trump samarbejdede fordækt med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, og at Putin stjal valget.

To medieartikler i denne weekend demonstrerer den faktiske hensigt med denne såkaldte bevægelse. Tysklands *Der Spiegel*, det mest udbredte magasin i Europa, har en forsidehistorie med Trump der holder en tændstik, med en brændende by bag sig, under titlen: "Pyromanen – en præsident sætter sit land i brand. Den ledende artikel lægger hele skylden for krisen på Trump, alt imens den antyder, at Trump planlægger en "Rigsdagsbrand" for at gøre sig selv til diktator efter samme model som Hitler, og muligvis vil nægte at anerkende valgresultatet, hvis han taber. Man antyder et militærkup for at stoppe den formodede fare.

Her i USA indrømmer magasinet *The Atlantic* åbent, at "bevægelsen" faktisk er en "farverevolution" efter samme model som Maidan-kuppet i Ukraine i 2014. Læsere af *EIR* ved, at det var nøjagtigt den samme anglo-amerikanske bande – Soros, Obama og hans vicepræsident Biden og hans efterretningsteam, sammen med pressen, der åbent iscenesatte det voldelige nynazistiske

kup mod den demokratisk valgte regering i Ukraine, som det er dokumenteret i *EIR*'s "Hvordan Obama og Soros bragte nazisterne til magten i Ukraine."

Den globale orden har brug for helt nye principper for at sikre verdensfreden, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Den 18 januar. I timerne efter mordet på Qasem Soleimani, Irans vigtigste general og i praksis nummer to i den iranske regering, ved et droneangreb nær Bagdads lufthavn, holdt verden vejret i nogle timer. For de fleste tænkende mennesker stod det klart, at vi befandt os på kanten af en potentielt ukontrollerbar eskalation. Derefter fulgte den iranske regerings »moderate« reaktion – et raketangreb på en militærbase i Irak, der benyttedes af de amerikanske tropper, hvor der takket være den iranske advarsel til den irakiske regering ikke var nogle amerikanske tropper, der mistede livet – og for mange mennesker var krisen så overstået. Mit krise-oprøb fra den 3. januar omhandler, at kun et topmøde mellem de tre vigtigste kernevåbensmagters regeringschefer – præsident Putin, Xi Jinping og Trump – vil kunne skabe grundlaget for en overvindelse af den akutte fare og for en varig fredsløsning i Sydvestasien. Venner af Schiller-Instituttet har viderebragt dette under en international aktionsdag den 15. januar i form af meddelelser, pressekonferencer og interventioner i dusinvis af byer i Nord- og Sydamerika, Europa og Australien til mange hundrede institutioner med den hensigt at skabe et verdensomspændende

kor af mennesker, der vil kræve et sådant krisetopmøde.

Men under denne mobilisering for sådant et nødtopmøde mellem de tre præsidenter optrådte der et andet fænomen: Den allerstørste del af befolkningen i de forskellige lande har absolut intet begreb om den akut eksisterende fare for, at den strategiske situation nu som før kan eskalere til en tredje verdenskrig. Slige advarsler er ikke andet end »forsøg på at skabe panik«, Trump har »styr på det hele«, eller »det er alligevel for sent, den tredje verdenskrig finder sted alligevel«: Hele spektrumet fra virkelighedsfornægtelse til pessimistisk resignation udgjorde folkets røst, der i mindre grad udgår fra nogen gennemtænkt analyse, men snarere fra ideologisk motiverede antagelser eller fra en mere kontemplativ end en aktiv politisk holdning.

Men opretholdelsen af verdensfreden i brintbombens tidsalder er det vigtigste eksistentielle tema for menneskeheden overhovedet. Det drejer sig altså ikke om at fremkalde panik, men om uden illusioner at gøre sig farerne klart for så konsekvent at søge efter veje til at sikre en varig fred i verden. Lad os engang tænke tilbage på dengang under Cubakrisen i oktober 1962, hvor verden efter udstationeringen af amerikanske mellemdistanceraketter på et NATO-støttepunkt i Tyrkiet, og den derpå følgende transport af sovjetiske mellemdistanceraketter mod Kuba befandt sig på randen af en atomkrig i 13 dage. Hvilket offentligheden var fuldt bevidst om – men hvor kommunikationen mellem præsidenterne Kennedy og Khrusjtjov og militære eksperter på begge sider, og dermed krisestyringen, befandt sig på et helt andet niveau end i dag, hvor der mellem juni 2019 og 15. januar 2020 har været omfattende »radiotavshed« mellem USA og Rusland.

Under missilkrisen i 1983, da Pershing II og SS20-missilerne i Europa befandt sig i et konstant affyringsberedskab med en flyvetid reduceret til tre minutter, talte politikere som Helmut Schmidt gentagne gange om faren for 3. Verdenskrig, og der var hundredetusinder af mennesker på gaderne, der

protesterede mod denne fare.

I dag er den strategiske situation langt mere kompleks og farlig, men offentlighedens bevidsthed om det, eller endda bare en debat af det, er praktisk talt ikke-eksisterende.

Det grænser til en hån og en fordømmelse af befolkningen, når vestlige tænketanke, politikere og medier taler om behovet for at forsvare de demokratiske landes »regel-baserede orden« imod diktaturer og autokratiske regimer i verden. Det vigtigste skridt i retning af dagens strategiske kaos var Tony Blairs tale i Chicago 1999, hvor han udskiftede den internationale lov, der er fastlagt i FN-pagten med »Blair-doktrinen«, dvs. retten til såkaldt »humanitære interventioner«, som i USA igen førte til »Responsibility to Protect«-doktrinen (Forpligtelsen til at beskytte). Som Rusland og Kina imidlertid har insisteret på, og som Trump selv fremhævede i sin FN-tale i 2019, er det alene respekten for absolut suverænitet, der garanterer en fredelig sameksistens mellem staterne.

Blair-doktrinen dannede baggrunden for de efterfølgende interventionskrige, der alle var baseret på løgne, og som førte til regimeskifte, farverevolutioner, kaotiske tilstande og tab af millioner af liv, hvilket vi i dag oplever i Sydvestasien. Under påskud af at forsvare demokrati og menneskerettigheder fortsætter repræsentanter for denne »regel-baserede orden« med en politik med at »regimeskifte« regeringer, der ikke ønsker at underkaste sig diktaterne fra en »unipolær verden«, hvad enten det er den britiske ambassadør i Iran, der var modig nok til at lede studerendes demonstrationer mod Rouhani-regeringen (!) eller tænketanken for den tyske regering, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (Det Tyske Udenrigsråd, DGAP), der skriver: »Først Hong Kong og derefter Taiwan – demokratiet indtager Kina.« Det har længe været åbenlyst, at regimeskifte-operationer mod stedfortræder-stater ultimativt er rettet imod regimeskifte i Rusland og Kina.

Når man dertil lægger de af USA indførte og af dets

forbundsfølger accepterede ændringer i militærdoktrinerne, altså USA's »Prompt Global Strike«-doktrin der indførtes nogenlunde samtidigt med Blair-doktrinen, opbygningen af et globalt raketforsvarssystem, som Rusland ser som en klar inddæmningspolitik, USA's ensidige opsigelse af INF-aftalen om mellemdistanceraketterne, USA's ensidige udtræden af JCPOA-atomaftalen med Iran, NATO's udvidelse østpå og for eksempel den provokerende planlægning af den forestående NATO-manøvre »Defender Europe 2020«, hvor der sidst i februar skal sendes op til 40.000 soldater til Polen og De baltiske Lande, og hvor Rusland omvendt installerer nye våbensystemer, der svækker USA's raketforsvarssystem voldsomt, så bør det stå klart for enhver, hvor usikker verdensfreden er.

Og når geopolitikere taler om kappestriden mellem de vestlige demokratiers højt priste idealer og de autoritære diktaturer, så er dette også drevet af panik over, at det transatlantiske finanssystem står foran et »frygteligt sammenbrud«, sådan som George Soros' tidligere kollega Jim Rogers for nyligt udtrykte det. Kinas program med Den Nye Silkevej, som 157 lande efterhånden samarbejder med, er derimod yderst succesfuldt trods alle advarselsråb.

Den iranske revolutionsgardes nedskydning af det ukrainske fly ved en fejltagelse oven på mordet af general Soleimani, bør få det til at stå klart for enhver, hvor stor ret den tidligere øverste general i Bundeswehr Harald Kujat har, der gentagne gange har advaret om faren for en atomkrig udløst af uheld, af cyberangreb, hacking, tekniske svigt eller af misforståelser. Præsident Putin reflekterede over denne fare i sin nylige tale om nationens tilstand og fremsatte et ekstremt vigtigt forslag. Putin understregede:

»Vi kan se, hvordan uforudselige og ukontrollerbare forhold udvikler sig i verden, sådan som det i de sidste uger og dage har fundet sted i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, hvordan regionale konflikter hurtigt kan udvikle sig til fare for hele det internationale samfund. Jeg er overbevist om, at det er på

høje tid med en alvorlig og direkte diskussion om grundprincipperne for en stabil verdensorden og om de øjeblikkelige problemer, menneskeheden står over for..... De stater, der stiftede De Forenede Nationer bør gå foran som et eksempel. De fem atommagter bærer et særligt ansvar for menneskehedens eksistens og efterfølgende udvikling. Disse fem nationer bør begynde med at gennemføre forholdsregler, der kan tilsidesætte forudsætningerne for en verdensomspændende krig og udvikle tilløb til at sikre den stabilitet på planeten, der kan tage fuldt hensyn til de politiske, økonomiske og militære aspekter af de moderne, internationale forhold«.

Denne alvorlige diskussion af de principper, som en varig orden for hele menneskeheden må hvile på, er bydende nødvendig. I stedet for at holde fast i Geopolitikens og i den nyeste tid også »Geoøkonomiens« tilbageskuende og farlige begreber bør de europæiske stater tage del i Den nye Silkevejs store muligheder.

Blot to eksempler på, hvad dette kan medføre: Kina har i de forløbne 40 år ikke blot bragt 850 millioner af sine egne borgere ud af fattigdommen og givet udviklingslandene et perspektiv for håb om at overvinde deres underudvikling. Kina har i det samme tidsrum virkeliggjort det største skovplantningsprogram i menneskehedens historie. Den nationale folkekongres forpligtede i 1961 alle kinesere i en alder fra 11 år og opefter til hvert år at plante tre nye træer, hvad der har haft til følge, at Kina har plantet flere træer end hele resten af verden tilsammen; alene mellem 2000 og 2010 plantede kineserne 56 milliarder træer.

De principper, som verdensordenen nødvendigvis må opbygges på, er menneskehedens fælles mål. Den liberale elite i Europa og USA ville gøre klogt i at nytænke præmisserne for deres eget, mod profitmaksimering indrettede system og et samarbejde med Den Nye Silkevejs program om økonomisk opbygning af Sydvestasien og Afrika. Det Europæiske Industri- og Handelskammer i Beijing frygter, at Europa blot vil blive et

påklistret, ubetydeligt marked i den ene ende af Eurasien, dersom det ikke indtager en konkurrencebetonet rolle til Den nye Silkevej. Lige det modsatte er tilfældet: Europa har kun et fremtidsperspektiv, dersom det opgiver geopolitikken og i stedet samarbejder aktivt med Rusland, Kina og USA på grundlag af principperne af den menneskelige verdensorden.

Det er derfor nødvendigt, at alle kræfter i Europa, der er interesseret i at sikre verdensfred, støtter op om et hastetopmødet mellem Putin, Xi Jinping og Trump.

Et hastetopmøde mellem Trump, Putin og Xi er den eneste løsning for at undgå krig. Dansk oversættelse af vigtigt webcast fra 8 januar 2020.

STUDIEVÆRT HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hej, jeg er Harley Schlanger fra Schiller Instituttet: Velkommen til den ugentlige webcast med vores grundlægger og præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I dag er den 8. januar 2020, og man kan sige, vi er gået ind i det nye år med både et enormt potentiale for positiv udvikling, men også en ildevarslende advarsel om faren for atomkrig. Dette har at gøre med mordet i sidste uge på Soleimani, lederen af den iranske »Revolutionsgardes Quds Styrke«. Der er sket meget i de sidste par dage omkring dette, så vi vil starte med en opdatering fra Helga om, hvad der udspiller sig mellem USA og Iran.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Vi er i en meget alvorlig situation, hvilket meget vel kunne være optakten til 3. verdenskrig. Jeg

tror, at alle fornuftige parter i verden vil erkende dette, og kun krigsmagerne jubler over mordet på general Qasem Soleimani. Jeg vil henlede jeres opmærksomhed – publikum og tilhørere – på en meget vigtig video, som blev optaget med min afdøde mand, allerede for mere end 20 år siden: Den blev kaldt »Storm Over Asien.« Og jeg vil gerne, at man vil tage sig tid til at se den. For her peger han med forbløffende erkendelsesmæssig klarhed på »the great game« – det store [geopolitiske] spil, som Det Britiske Imperium kører imod Rusland og Kina, og det som vi ser udspille sig lige nu, er faktisk netop dette scenarie.

[<https://youtu.be/-695NtUNSII>; <https://larouchepac.com/20200107/video-three-times-larouche-forecast-todays-crisis-and-way-out>]

Se, der er mange ting, der kan siges om det, og vi vil komme ind på noget af det; der florerer mange historier, fortolkninger og så videre, men lad mig starte med et andet punkt: Der er en løsning. Det lyder måske vanskeligt, men efter min opfattelse er der kun én løsning, og det er et hastetopmøde mellem præsidenterne Trump, Putin og Xi Jinping med henblik på at diskutere og planlægge en intervention. Fordi jeg mener, at intet mindre kan gøre det... intet mindre vil være tilstrækkeligt til at nedtrappe denne ekstremt komplekse situation.

For indeværende har den iranske respons været forholdsvis behersket. De advarede den irakiske regering 30 minutter før de foretog deres begrænsede gengældelses-angreb mod to irakiske baser, der er hjemsted for amerikanske og, tror jeg, også Nato-styrker. Se, dette korte øjeblik giver faktisk mulighed for en nedtrapning, fordi iranerne foretog en gengældelse, så de kan redde ansigt internt og sige, at de ikke lod dette attentat forblive ubesvaret. Det kan også give præsident Trump en chance for at nedtrappe; faktisk holder han lige nu – mens vi taler – selv en tale, så vi kan ikke tage hans ord med i betragtning. Men Trump har mange gange sagt, selv efter attentatet imod Soleimani, at han ikke ønsker krig og ikke ønsker regimeskifte; så vi er nødt til at vente og se. Vi ved endnu ikke, hvad han vil sige.

Men, hvad jeg foreslår, er faktisk en løsning. Fordi, naturligvis er situationen meget rodet. Det iranske folk er absolut i oprør. Der er en meget stor anti-amerikansk stemning lige nu, så alt, der alene kommer fra amerikansk side, er sandsynligvis ikke tilstrækkeligt. Men, hvis vi fik et topmøde mellem præsidenterne Xi Jinping, Putin og Trump, og de udarbejdede en plan, en omfattende plan med udstedelse af sikkerhedsgarantier til iranerne – og dette vil være nødvendigt, fordi den eneste grund til, at iranerne ønsker et atomvåbenprogram, er, fordi de ved, at Israel har omkring 200-300 atomspræghoveder, og de føler sig ubeskyttet. Så hvis der kunne tilvejebringes en sikkerhedsgaranti for Iran, ville det absolut være en vigtig ingrediens.

Men så skal der også etableres et samarbejde med disse – de tre vigtigste magter i verden – for at lægge en omfattende fredsplan for hele Sydvestasien på bordet; en plan som ret let kunne udformes, fordi Kinas politik med den Nye Silkevej allerede spiller ind på forskellige aspekter af regionen. Der er investeringer i så henseende i Iran og i Pakistan, og kineserne har forpligtet sig til at hjælpe med genopbygningen af Syrien; Assad har netop sagt, at den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan rekonstruere Syrien, er ved hjælp af den Nye Silkevej. Og der eksisterer allerede en plan mellem den irakiske premierminister og Kina, et aftalememorandum for en olie-for-teknologi-aftale, hvor Irak sælger olie til Kina, og Kina på sin side vil opbygge infrastrukturen, industrien og landbruget i Irak.

Så der er allerede elementer af dette til stede. Men for at sikre, at der absolut ikke kommer en anden provokation, og at der ikke er andre ting, der går galt, fordi det er egenskaben ved store krige, og i særdeles verdenskrigene, at de aldrig opstår som en følge af, hvad folk har planlagt, men at der er stor fare for en fejlkalkulation, for at ting går galt. Så for at forandre det nuværende paradigme tilbundsående, og få et hastetopmøde mellem de tre præsidenter, må folk gøre sig klart, at vi befinder os på randen af 3. verdenskrig. Og jeg appellerer faktisk til Jer, vore seere og lyttere, om at I hjælper med denne mobilisering: Vi har startet en international mobilisering med en erklæring, som jeg fremlagde

sidste fredag, umiddelbart efter mordet på Soleimani, hvori vi opfordrede til præcist dette hastetopmøde. Denne opfordring er blevet til en underskriftsindsamling. Underskriftsindsamlingen udsendes bredt i USA og internationalt, og jeg vil bede Jer om at få den via linket [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2020/01/09/call-for-presidents-trump-putin-xi-to-convene-emergency-summit-to-address-danger-of-war/>] – og downloade den, cirkulere den i jeres egne netværk, e-mails, Facebook, Twitter, sociale medier; få det rundt til venner og kolleger. For kun hvis vi har et internationalt kor af mennesker og kræfter, der kræver, at et sådant topmøde finder sted, kan vi sammen skabe momentum for at vende denne situation: Så dette er min øjeblikkelige appel til Jer. Der bør ikke finde nogen diskussion sted, som ikke kræver dette topmøde. Dette er et vigtigt, internationalt fokus for at vende denne situation.

SCHLANGER: Helga, jeg blev interviewet på Radio Sputnik fra Washington DC i dag, og værterne støttede denne idé, men de var meget fascinerede af, at du tog initiativet til den, og de ønskede især at vide, hvad du mener Putin kan gøre, som ikke kan udføres af en anden. Og jeg sagde til dem, at jeg ville spørge dig for at få dit svar på det.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: For det første har Putin vist sig at være en glimrende strateg. Allerede for fem måneder siden bragte han hele regionen sammen; han lagde pres på saudierne, på Israel, på Tyrkiet – faktisk er Putin i Tyrkiet i dag; han er der for at deltage i en ceremoni med åbning af »TurkStream«-gasledningen. Han var også i Damaskus. Han har selvfølgelig forbindelser til alle relevante regeringer, og de har alle en interesse i at have et godt forhold til Rusland.

Jeg tror, at iranerne på nuværende tidspunkt under ingen omstændigheder vil stole på Trump eller USA alene uden garantier fra Putin og Xi Jinping; men med en kombination af disse tre ledere, mener jeg, at de reelt repræsenterer lederskabet i verden, og at det er en intervention af den kaliber, der kræves for at afvende faren for krig. Så jeg mener, at enhver, der tænker over det, kan forstå, at det er, hvad der skal til for at nedtrappe en situation, der næsten er

ude af kontrol, og som har et enormt potentiale for at eskalere – at kun med den tillid, som nogle lande har til Kina, andre til Rusland, og atter andre til USA... men som du kan se det på »dødvandet« i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, hvis man ikke bryder det, vil den ene part altid stå hårdt over for den anden part, og man vil ikke kunne løse det.

Der er brug for dette hastetopmøde. Og jeg tror, at der på præsidentniveau er en klar intention om at løse det; ikke nødvendigvis overalt på regeringsniveau i Washington, som er meget splittet, og det kan vi vende tilbage til om et øjeblik. Men jeg mener, at Trump adskillige gange har gjort det meget klart, at han ønsker at have et godt forhold til Rusland, på trods af alle vanskeligheder med at forsøge at forbedre situationen i forholdet til Kina. Og jeg tror, at hele kuppet, og alt fra Russiagate til rigsretssagen, blev udarbejdet netop for at afspore Trumps intention. Så hvis man tænker det igennem, mener jeg, at det er den eneste duelige løsning på problemet.

SCHLANGER: Du nævnte før den video din mand lavede, »Storm over Asien«. Selv før det, 15-20 år tidligere, i 1975 mener jeg, rejste han til Irak og fremsatte et forslag om olie for teknologi. Så dette nye forståelsespapir mellem Irak og Kina er i virkeligheden noget, han lagde frem for mange år siden. Hvordan tror du, at sådan noget kunne fungere?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Det er meget enkelt: Det, som min mand udviklede i 1975 efter hans rejse til Irak, blev kaldt »Oasis-planen«, og det var idéen om den nøgleingrediens, der mangler i hele regionen... hele ørkenstrimlen fra den atlantiske kyst i Afrika gennem Sahel, Sahara, gennem Saudi-halvøen og Mellemosten, og derefter ind i Kina og helt op til det nordlige Kina... man har denne utrolige strimmel af ørken, der vokser. Og der er ingen planter i hele regionen. Jeg fløj en gang over det, og jeg kiggede ud af vinduet, og det er forbløffende – man skimter efter en oase, og der er bare ingen. Så dette forslag fra min mand [tilbage] i 1975 var ideen om, at man er nødt til at tilvejebringe en masse nyt vand ved hjælp af moderne midler. Umiddelbart kan man aftappe grundvandsmagasinerne, men de er begrænsede. Sidenhen er der

brug for fredelig energi, små atomreaktorer, for afsaltning af enorme mængder vand, som kan bruges til kunstvanding; der kan også anvendes moderne teknologier såsom ionisering af atmosfæren, som allerede bruges i nogle af Golfstaterne og Israel. Jeg tror også, der kan skabes masser af nyt, frisk vand til kunstvanding, til landbrug, til genplantning. Og så kan der bygges infrastruktur som en forudsætning for industrialisering.

Og hvis man tager den eksisterende kinesiske plan for den Nye Silkevej, Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, som blev foreslået af præsident Xi allerede i 2016, da han besøgte Iran, Saudi-Arabien og Egypten, og hvor han allerede da foreslog at udvide Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet til hele regionen. Og i mellemtiden har man Kina-Pakistan-Økonomiske Korridor (CPEC); man har Assad og Kinas løfte om at rekonstruere Syrien på denne måde; Der var adskillige store konferencer i Golfstaterne, hvor det står klart, at de arabiske stater også har en enorm interesse. Iran har også gode forbindelser med Kina. Og naturligvis har Tyrkiet mange gange udtrykt, at de ønsker at være en integreret del af det.

Så hvis blot man udvider Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet til hele regionen, ville det være meget let. Og jeg sagde for mange år siden – lige som min ægte mand, vi har altid arbejdet sammen om dette – at med de store naboer i regionen, Rusland, Kina, Indien, Iran, Egypten, og også Tyrkiet, endog Saudi-Arabien og selv Israel... alle kunne de indse, at det er til deres fordel at arbejde sammen for udviklingen af hele regionens velstand.

Hvis USA ville indtage en positiv holdning til dette, kunne investorer tjene så mange flere penge på at skabe det største »boom« man kan forestille sig, snarere end at tillægge kontrollen med olien alt for stor betydning. Fossile brændstoffer, olien, er begrænset, den burde alligevel ikke bruges til energi, og hvis man havde et reelt økonomisk investeringsprogram, der var mange, mange gange større end Marshall-planen, kunne der opnås langt større overskud, og det ville være et incitament for mange iværksættere til at engagere sig. Desuden er europæerne – Tyskland, Italien, Frankrig, alle disse lande er opsplittede på grund af

flygtningekrisen: Hvis man ville starte en fælles udvikling af alle de store lande, som jeg lige har nævnt, inklusive Indien, der har en interesse i det, f.eks. i Afghanistan, og naturligvis også situationen omkring Kashmir, Pakistan, som kun kan løses, hvis man har en integreret udviklingsplan. Flygtningekrisen kunne løses meget let, hvis man udvikler Sydvestasien og naturligvis Afrika. Så jeg tror, at en sådan intervention er nødvendig.

Nogle gange, har man brug for et chok: Der er brug for den chokerende bevidsthed om, at vi er ved at sprænge verden i luften, hvis vi ikke ændrer paradigmet; et chok, der kan forvandles til en mulighed. Og mange mennesker har nævnt, at det kinesiske skrifttegn for »krise« er det samme som for »mulighed«. Og jeg tror, at hvis vi nu har et kor af mennesker rundt om i verden, folk der er bekymrede over faren for krig, som er bekymrede over de uendelige krige, der må afsluttes; ja, så arbejd sammen med os! Lad os slutte os sammen og skabe en atmosfære, hvor det folkelige pres for et sådant topmøde er så overvældende, at det finder sted.

SCHLANGER: I forlængelse af, at du har præsenteret løsningen på krisen, er en af de ting, der er kommet op, at præsident Trump tog skridt til... hans meddelelse for flere måneder siden om tilbagetrækning fra Syrien, [hvor] alle forudsagde forfærdelige konsekvenser, men det fungerede, og blev koordineret med Erdogan, med Putin og selv med Assad. Derefter rejste han til Afghanistan og talte om at trække tropper tilbage fra Afghanistan. De mennesker, der forsøger at afsætte ham med rigsretssag, gik amok, krigshøgene i Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet i begge partier modsatte sig det. Jeg tror, at vi ud fra dette synspunkt er nødt til at se på spørgsmålet om, hvordan denne nylige, denne nuværende krise blev fremskyndet. Hvad var rækkefølgen af begivenheder, der førte til den? For der er nogle meget klare indikationer på, at det er de samme mennesker, der er ude efter at afsætte Trump og som er imod hans fredsprogram, og som der støtter en krig med Iran. Kan du gennemgå en lille smule af denne rækkefølge, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Ja. Der er faktisk en meget interessant artikel af Patrick Lawrence, der er en meget fængslende person; han var den første, der allerede i 2017 i det amerikanske magasin The Nation bragte historien af William Binney om, at der ikke var noget russisk hack. Og så for to dage siden havde han havde en artikel i Consortium News [<https://consortiumnews.com/2020/01/06/patrick-lawrence-the-iranian-generals-intent/>], som jeg også vil opfordre vore lyttere til at læse, fordi der er mange tvivlsomme kilder man ikke kan stole på; men læs denne artikel og dan jeres egen mening: For det, han siger, er en meget interessant hypotese. Han siger, at der faktisk er omstændigheder, som tyder på, at det ikke var Trump, der beordrede mordet. Nu ved jeg, at der overalt er mange mennesker, der reagerer stærkt på, hvad Trump sagde, og nogle af disse udsagn er ganske vist også utilgivelige – jeg mener, man kan ikke sige, at et lands kulturarv nu skal ødelægges. De forsøgte at trække i land på det punkt, og det er fint, men Trump er bare undertiden lidt uberegnelig, og jeg tror, at alle i hele verden ved det. Men det betyder ikke, at han organiserede dette snigmord.

Hvad Patrick Lawrence antyder, og han er selvfølgelig en kilde med gode forbindelser i efterretningskredse, er at det var en »paladsrevolution«, at det var den samme kombination af mennesker, der allerede forsøgte, og gentagne gange effektivt saboterede Trumps politik over for Nordkorea, Syrien, den Persiske Bugt generelt – han peger på aksen mellem Pompeo, forsvarsminister Esper og Milley, formanden for generalstaben. Jeg tror, at Milley var den person, der præsenterede Trump for »muligheder« for, hvad der kunne gøres, og drabet på den øverste militære leder i et andet land, som tilfældigvis også er nummer to i det pågældende land, sætter naturligvis gang i en række af begivenheder; der, hvis der ikke er en seriøs indgriben for at nedkøle konflikten, potentielt kunne gå helt ud af kontrol. Ingen ved deres fulde fem ville give præsidenten for USA en sådan valgmulighed, men der burde have været bestræbelser for med bestemthed at sige: »Dette er IKKE en mulighed.« Men det skete ikke.

I stedet fortalte Pompeo og Esper tilsyneladende Trump, at der var fare for et umiddelbart forestående angreb på amerikanske

installationer og personale; for da Trump derefter offentliggjorde denne meddelelse, var det det, han sagde.

Hvis man nu ser på forløbet, hvordan det udviklede sig 10 dage før snigmordet, var der adskillige bombeangreb på en militærbase i Irak, som tilhørte Kataib Hezbollah, hvilket ikke er det samme som det libanesiske Hezbollah, men det er en irakisk paramilitær organisation, der var meget involveret i at bekæmpe IS. Efter disse angreb, som var en reaktion på en granatbeskydning – de var anklaget for at have beskyttet en irakisk base tidligere – efter disse bombeangreb, var dernæst demonstrationerne foran den amerikanske ambassade, som blev afblæst. Men dette var forspillet til angrebet på general Soleimani.

Adskillige personer, der inkluderede den irakiske statsminister Abdul-Mahdi, fortalte det irakiske parlament, at Soleimani var på vej til at mødes med Abdul-Mahdi, og at han var på en diplomatisk mission for at forhandle mellem Saudi-Arabien og Iran for at forsøge at finde en eller anden måde at forsones sunni- og shiamuslimerne på, og dette var faktisk beordret af det Hvide Hus, af Trump selv. Med det samme stod Pompeo frem i går og sagde: »Nej, der var ingen sådan mission«, men Abdul-Mahdi sagde, at der var en sådan mission, og hvem end der nu udførte dette angreb, vidste tydeligvis præcis, hvor denne drone skulle ramme, fordi de vidste, at Soleimani ville være til stede på dette tidspunkt, ligesom den stedfortrædende leder af en vigtig militær, der også blev dræbt, og flere andre personer.

Men som vi hørte fra andre militærekspertter, sker denne slags angreb ikke bare ud af den blå luft. Der er faktisk en liste med mål, hvilket, i dette tilfælde, er blevet udarbejdet af USA's CENTCOM (USA's centralkommando) Afdeling Orange, som vidst nok er placeret i South Carolina lige nu. Og disse er, med andre ord, lister på mulige mål, og dette skulle aldrig nogensinde være sket. Og Trump blev simpelthen stillet i en situation, hvor han var nødt til at redde ansigt, fordi alt var allerede forberedt.

Pompeo har ikke fremlagt nogen beviser, og naturligvis er

dette alt sammen stadig hypotetisk. Jeg synes, at der er brug for en seriøs efterforskning; jeg mener, at der må fremlægges beviser. Men jeg tror, at dette er en meget plausibel hypotese af, hvordan det skete, og konklusionen, som Patrick Lang drager, er, at det er de samme personer, som er involveret i retsforfølgelserne – dette kommer faktisk også fra en række Trump-tilhængere, og folk som ikke støtter Trump – som siger: »Hvorfor skulle vi lytte til de samme aviser og samme kredse, som folk generelt kalder den »dybe stat«, der er involveret i »Russiagate«, i retsforfølgelserne, og imod Trump, og som tydeligvis nu udbreder dette syn? Hvorfor skulle vi pludselig tro på disse personer?«

Så jeg opfordrer jer til at betragte situationen: Det er mere komplekst end det ses ved første blik, og i betragtning af de absolutte uhyrligheder omkring Trump, hvilket sker som et resultat af dette, tror jeg, at et klinisk syn på alt dette er desto vigtigere.

SCHLANGER: Jeg synes, at et af de mere overbevisende argumenter om dette kom fra oberst Lawrence Wilkerson, den tidligere stabschef for Colin Powell, da Powell fremlagde de falske beviser om Iraks masseødelæggelsesvåben i FN. Wilkerson kom med en kort erklæring, hvor han sagde: »Ubestridelige beviser?« Har vi ikke hørt dette før? Ønsker vi at gentage de samme fejl igen og igen?

Og jeg tror at vigtigheden af en undersøgelse af dette er afgørende, men for folk, der ønsker at støtte præsidenten, er det bedste ikke, at lade som om dette er en amerikansk brydekamp, og at hoppe op og ned og heppe, hver gang der er nogen som bliver ramt. Man må begynde fra det højere strategiske standpunkt. Og jeg tror, Helga, at dette er det vigtige ved at kigge på ting som videoen »Storm over Asien« og på, hvem der på længere sigt drager fordel af sådanne slags krige. Og du har været meget oprigtig i din beslutsomhed om at overvinde den geopolitiske doktrin. Er det ikke i sidste ende det, som vi har at gøre med, og det, som Præsident Trump må affinde sig med?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jo. Jeg mener, at Det Britiske Imperiums kontrol, hvis vi går tilbage til »The Great Game«, til Sykes-

Picot-aftalen, til Bernard Lewis-planen, til Samuel Huntington, til Brzezinski; alt dette var geopolitik, som udtænkt af Mackinder, af Haushofer-doktrinen, den ondskabsfulde idé, at man måtte forhindre en sammenhængskraft af den eurasiske landmasse, fordi det ville være til skade for de atlantiske magter, nemlig USA og Storbritannien – og at denne doktrin, at man bliver nødt til at manipulere – og da briterne efter 1. verdenskrig opdelte regionen, med Sykes-Picot-aftalen, gjorde de det bevidst! Samuel Huntingtons latterlige bog »Civilisationernes sammenstød«, som jeg for mange år siden pinte mig selv med at læse, – denne fyr havde intet kendskab til nogen af de kulturer og religioner, som han snakkede om – men dette er en håndbog for manipulationer.

Dette må nu ophøre. Og grunden til, at jeg siger, at vi har brug for et samarbejde i denne krise, nu, mellem Putin, Trump, Xi Jinping, og forhåbentlig vil Narendra Modi også deltage i dette samme topmøde – og senere, det er ikke en eksklusiv klub, men andre lande er bestemt også velkomne til at samarbejde – men vi har brug for en kernegruppe, USA, Rusland og Kina som et minimum, forhåbentlig tilslutter Indien sig, men de tre førstnævnte er de vigtigste; hvis de ville gå sammen og sige: Vi forstår at menneskeheden har nået et punkt, hvorfra der muligvis ikke er nogen vej tilbage, og at vi derfor må overvinde dette, og udvikle en fredsplan for regionen, som har været plaget af 19 års krig i Afghanistan, hvor mange millioner af mennesker har mistet livet. Trump sagde, at dette har kostet USA syv billioner dollars, det har kostet millioner af civile livet, mange tusinde amerikanere, og det bliver nødt til at stoppe. Og jeg er absolut sikker, 100 % sikker på, at hvis der kunne skabes et internationalt miljø, hvor man havde et kor af stemmer, af lande, af fredsgrupper, af religiøse grupper, som – der er allerede flere som er mobiliserede gennem underskriftsindsamlinger m.m. – hvis alle disse ville sige: Vi har brug et højere niveau for samarbejde, da er det muligt.

Men jeg mener at vi har brug for en sådan verdensomspændende mobilisering for at få dette til at ske, og det er derfor at jeg appellerer til Jer: Deltag i vores bestræbelser, tilmeld Jer vores nyhedsbrev, del underkriftsindsamlingen med alle I

kender, og lad os virkelig få en sådan mobilisering. Fordi det er et meget alvorligt øjeblik i historien.

SCHLANGER: Lad mig bare gentage hovedpointen igen: Løsningen er til stede, men det kræver din aktive medvirken. Gå ind på vores hjemmeside, dér findes appellen fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche; du kan underskrive denne, udbrede den, indsende den som leder til aviser, gøre alt hvad du kan for at skabe en modpol til krigskampagnen, som kommer fra de samme folk, der forsøger at afsætte præsidenten. [<https://schillerinstitute.>]

Med dette sagt, så ses vi igen i næste uge.

Følg med i Schiller Instituttets ugentlige internationale webcasts med Helga Zepp-LaRouche på:

www.schillerinstitut.dk

Aktionsdag for en enestående løsning: Skab fred gennem et Trump-Xi- Putin-topmøde, inkl. afskrift Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 15. januar 2020

Helga Zepp-LaRouche bragte klarhed til en situation, som har efterladt mange mennesker forvirrede, desorienterede og/eller

fatalistiske, mens de prøver at forklare den strategiske fare i kølvandet på USA's snigmord på den iranske leder Soleimani. Begyndende med Putins stærke advarsler i løbet af hans tale til nationen, påpegede hun, at der er betydningsfulde personligheder, som forstår hvorfor et hastetopmøde mellem Trump, Putin og Xi er nødvendigt, såsom den tidligere tyske forsvarsebedsmand Willy Wimmer, der sagde, at snigmordet satte verden på randen af tredje verdenskrig.

Hun gennemgik den britiske rolle i denne krises udvikling, fulgte dens rødder tilbage til midten af det 19. og det 20. århundredes imperiale geopolitik, frem til deres rolle i at forme krigsfraktionen i USA i dag. Krigskampagnen finder sted samtidigt med, at det neoliberale finanssystem accelerer mod et kollaps. I denne sammenhæng er det indtrængende nødvendigt, at vores seere og støtter forstår hvordan et samarbejde imellem stormagterne, på de strategiske og økonomiske områder, er den eneste måde hvorpå farerne skabt af imperiet kan overvindes.

Hun opfordrede seerne til at deltage i mobiliseringen, og at mestre de store idéer der er nødvendige for at forhindre at blive fanget i de fælder, der stilles af dem der nægter at erkende, at hvis vi forbliver i deres paradigme, vil det føre til menneskehedens udryddelse.

Afskrift på engelsk:

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, January 15, 2020

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Day of Action for a Unique Solution: Build Peace through a Trump, Putin, Xi Summit

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the

Schiller Institute, welcome to our webcast today with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is Jan. 15th, 2020: Today is an International Day of Action by the Schiller Institute and LaRouche PAC, to bring together the forces in the United States and around the world to insist upon an emergency summit of Presidents Trump, Putin and Xi to address the crisis that's emerged between the United States and Iran. Helga, this was your call: You made this emergency resolution. How would you think this is going to function? It's going to require the American people, especially, to demand this, isn't it?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. Because, as we have gone into this mobilization to try to suggest to many people in the world, and in the United States and Europe, that such a summit must occur, to get out of the danger of confrontation which is now clearly escalating, and not really resolved at all between the United States and Iran, that you have to have a different level of approaching this whole question. We were talking to many, many people in the streets, in other discussions

<https://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/jens-Joergen-interview.mp3>

... remarkable confusion in the population. You had people who said, there is no war danger, Trump has it all under control; or, it's too late anyway. So people had absolutely emotional reactions and very little understanding of why we are saying this war danger exists.

So, today as you mentioned, we have an International Day of Action: We had friends of the Schiller Institute and associates mobilizing on five continents. We were in New York, near the Trump Tower, the United Nations; many other cities in the United States, but also Stockholm, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Berlin, Paris, even in Australia; and Latin America, Lima, Peru. We tried to put this same focus on the agenda on five continents around the globe, trying to intersect with many

political forces around the world, with the idea to create a chorus, a chorus of people demanding that we were on the verge of World War III, and that is not an exaggeration at all. And we absolutely must change the agenda, because if you leave things as they are right now, the danger that things could go out of control completely is imminent.

This was, by the way, not only our view: Today, Putin gave his state of the nation address before the Federal Assembly, and there he basically picked up on the same line, saying that if you look at the developments in the recent weeks in Southwest Asia and North Africa – clearly referring to Libya – that we are in a situation where a regional conflict very clearly could become something affecting the whole global security situation. And he said it's absolutely high time that the five founders of the United Nations, start to really establish a new order which makes these dangers impossible, and start to discuss the principles on which such a new order has to be built. I don't disagree with that: If you have a meeting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, the important thing is that you have the three most powerful nations sitting already at the table – namely, the United States, Russia, and China. You have, then two others, France and Great Britain, which I understand Putin's position that he would make a suggestion like that. I think given the fact that Macron, in the recent period, has made several statements and taken action to make the point that no solution can be found without Russia, I think France could even play a positive, or at least neutral role. The big question, naturally, is the British role, but having three of the most powerful nations, they would have less opportunity to do their usual kind of destabilization.

So I think the important thing about it is that Putin, obviously, in the same way, sees the danger of this escalation. Lavrov, the Foreign Minister, suggested Russia to mediate in the relationship between the United States and

Iran; and so, I think that is all going in the right direction.

But, it's really important that people do not just say, "this is my opinion, there's going to be war, or Trump has it all under control." I have studied, and I know you have, Harley, we have studied this matter of how the situation in Iran, in particular, could be the cockpit for a global nuclear escalation, and this is not something we are saying on the top of our head, just saying it like that, but there are certain principles: Because if you target Iran, it is really Russia and China, and anybody who has studied the history of the region, and looked at the question of geopolitics, going way back to the inventors of geopolitics – Haushofer, Mackinder, Milner – before that, you know that it's not Iran which is at stake, but it is really Russia and also nowadays, China.

I would urge people not to be opinionated about this: Study military history, study what we have published in many articles about it in the past; study why even the use of even one nuclear weapon has immediately the danger of an uncontrollable global nuclear war. And take it seriously, because it is.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned that there are some people who think that this kind of statement from you is an overreaction. But I think we're actually getting some very interesting reflections of people who are saying something very close to what you are: for example, Willy Wimmer, a former official in the German Defense Ministry for many years; even Wolfgang Ischinger of the Munich Security Conference, issued a strong statement talking about why Putin is the one who should be involved in this. This is actually reflecting that there are some people who see what you're saying.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes. I think that Willy Wimmer put out a new statement today, on the day of Putin's address to the nation, where he said that with the assassination of Gen. Qasem

Soleimani, we are on the verge of a global war, and that is completely appropriate to talk about the danger of an imminent third world war. I think this is really important, because we're not saying this to scare people, or to just create panic. But unless you realize that that danger exists, and I think also the fact that Angela Merkel went to Moscow with Foreign Minister Heiko Maas, and then very quickly – not all of a sudden, but relatively quickly, they have now organized a conference on the Libya situation for this coming Sunday in Berlin, where Merkel has invited both Trump and Putin! Now, there is so far no confirmation that either one of them is coming. From the U.S., it's only Pompeo and O'Brien, but I think this also reflects a recognition that you have to bring people to the negotiation table.

Now, concerning the Libya issue as such, the military leader of the Libya National Army Khalifa Haftar, has not signed the ceasefire agreement, which he could have signed in Moscow, but it's not ruled out that he will attend the Berlin conference. But I think there is a general recognition among older people who have the experience of world war, in Europe for sure – I think in the United States it's different for the very reason that the United States has not been involved in any international war which would have affected American soil; the United States obviously was involved in many foreign wars, but they never had the experience of having a war on American territory since the Civil War. And that is very different in Europe, where especially Germany, I think there is a deep, deep – I would almost say a genetic memory in the Germany population, at least the older ones, who know what the horrors of world war are. And I think therefore, this whole push by Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer, the German defense minister, to now push to send German troops to Iraq, German troops in Africa, German Navy in South China Sea – this goes very much against the experience of Germany in two world wars.

The French and the British have a slightly different attitude

because of their colonialist background, but I think that there are many people who really understand that this is a very grave situation – and Wolfgang Ischinger, of all people, he's the head of the Munich Security Conference, he's a completely dyed-in-the-wool Atlanticist, and he says Putin is absolutely crucial to get him involved in this situation. So, this all reflects that people really got shocked when this assassination of Soleimani happened. I know some people in the United States also don't have that same view, but this has a very erosive effect on the international order: It has a bad effect on Kim Jon Un, for sure, because he will now remember what Bolton had said about Saddam Hussein and Qaddafi, and the North Korea thing is at a halt in any case. But it also has a bad effect what should young people around the world think, if you can simply do these kinds of things.

And I'm not blaming Trump, because Trump is in a completely difficult situation, because he's surrounded by the same people whom he had attacked not very long ago as "the military-industrial complex," and the Articles of Impeachment could be introduced into the Senate today.

But I think it's also very clear, we cannot continue on this line, especially because it *clearly* shows the hand of the British in the design of this whole escalation.

SCHLANGER: And one of the obvious points is that President Putin is very active, at this moment. You see him with the Libya situation; you see him intervened in Syria – he was just in Syria recently to meet with Assad; he's intervening in Ukraine with Zelensky; and also now offering to mediate in Iran. One of the major points in the attack on Trump, was to keep him from working with Putin, which brings me to this question you raised about the British role: The British were caught in the act of stirring up some of the regime-change sentiments in Iran, and the Iranian Foreign Ministry called them on that. What was that about, Helga – the British ambassador in Tehran?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Before I say something about that, let me just add, that Putin, in his speech of today, also said that Russia would open *all* historic archives concerning the Second World War, because it was extremely important to reestablish truth and facts, instead of the lies going around the globe on these issues. Which brings me to remind people that President Trump could *also* release all documents, because the role of the British in Russiagate, in the whole Christopher Steele affairs – I mean, there is the weapon of releasing documents, and I think that that is absolutely crucial.

Now, the Iranian Foreign Ministry completely attacked the role of the British ambassador in Tehran, who apparently even started the demonstrations against the Rouhani government. As you remember, there were hundreds of thousands of people in the streets in Tehran and other Iranian cities, after the assassination of Soleimani, but then, when the Ukrainian aircraft was shot down by mistake by the Iranians, and it now looks and that's what the Iranians have vowed to totally investigate, you had students in Tehran and many other cities, in anti-government/pro-American stance, which apparently was led, or triggered, or at least manipulated by the British ambassador. And the Iranian government – I think Rouhani himself – said the British should not forget that they're no longer the Empire, where the Sun doesn't set around the globe, and they basically threatened retaliation if this would not stop.

I think this is very important: Because if you look at it, at the surface, naturally, it's Trump, it's Pompeo, it's the U.S. government who's in this showdown with Iran. But, it goes back, way back – we had talked about this already last time, but I want to repeat it – it goes back to the doctrine of geopolitics, of absolutely preventing the countries of the so-called Eurasian land-mass to cooperate economically; it goes back to the "Great Game" of the 19th century against Russia; it goes back to the Bernard Lewis doctrine, the Samuel

Huntington "Clash of Civilizations," Brzezinski playing the Islamic card – there is a long historical tradition of trying to manipulated this region. The Sykes-Picot agreement during World War I was set up to create the conditions after the war for future manipulation. So you have to take all of that into account to then see how this recent escalation was set up: I mentioned it in my statement from Jan. 3: [<https://larouchepac.com/20200103/helga-zepp-larouche-statement-assassination-qasem-soleimani>] that the whole setup was prepared, when Bolton, in April of 2019 put the entire Revolutionary Guard – that is, the Iranian army – on the terrorist list. Because, according to that logic, then, any kind of attack would be sufficient to make such strikes. You know, they have a long drone list anyway. So, then Trump, after the Iranians shot down the drone, I think it was June, in the Strait of Hormuz, Trump said (who knows what egged him on, or what was the environment), he said, if one more American is killed, then he would consider strikes against Iran. Now, that is a difficult and dangerous thing to say for any state leader – remember, this was Obama saying this red line concerning Syria, which almost led to an attack on Syria by the United States in 2013; and we now know, through the cables which were leaked, that the British ambassador in Washington at that time, Sir Kim Darroch, he wrote in cables back to London that it just takes an attack on one more American, and then there will be war, or strikes against Iran. He also, in these same cables, wrote that it was his job, as British ambassador in Washington, to "flood the zone," meaning that they should influence all the people Trump is talking to, that Trump would have a habit of telephoning in the evening to people in Washington and elsewhere to try to find out what their thinking was, this Darroch basically said, we have to control this entire environment; we have to whisper into Trump's ears, so that we create a completely controlled environment. And that was the setting!

And then, if you look how, even after Bolton is out, Pompeo is

essentially continuing exactly the role Bolton had before. And if you look at the speech he gave at the Hoover Institution in Stanford University on Jan. 13, it is an incredibly bloodcurdling speech, which clearly is not the same intention as Trump. But people should watch this Pompeo speech in Stanford, to get a sense of what is the environment Trump is in.

[<https://www.hoover.org/news/secretary-state-pompeo-addresses-stanford-universitys-hoover-institution-following-strike-irans>]

SCHLANGER: I think one of the important things in Darroch's cables, was a reaction when Trump stopped the attack against Iran, when the U.S. drone was shot down: That angered the British terribly, because they thought that was going to cause a reaction, but Darroch wrote: One more act like that could cause another turnaround for Trump.

I wanted to mention one other thing about this British ambassador to Tehran, who was apparently at one of the memorial services when he was involved in leading a walkout of students in a demonstration, very much reminded me of Victoria Nuland handing out cookies and \$5 billion in Maidan square in the Ukraine situation in 2014.

Helga, one of the important things which is also part of the context for this situation, is the ongoing disintegration of the neo-liberal economic system, and this is something which there's been very little focus on, because with the impeachment, with the danger of war, there has hasn't been a whole lot said about it. But you've been following this thing very closely – what's the latest with the helicopter money and the insane effort to try and keep this system going?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think we are in clearly approaching the helicopter money phase of this meltdown of the system. Yesterday, alone, the Federal Reserve pumped into another \$82 billion in repo money, and it is now reported that this will

go on, probably, until mid-February at least, but it may go on until summer. Jim Rogers, who is the cofounder of the Quantum Fund – together with Soros, he's now separated from Soros – but he said, that the debt after 2008 has “skyrocketed” everywhere, and that he foresees a “horrible end,” that the central banks will keep pumping money up to the point where many investors will say, look, we don't want this anymore, and then there will be a big crisis, and they will pump even more money, and then it will come to a horrible end. And he said, this will be the worst thing I have ever experienced in my whole life.

Now, take it for what it is – it's the opinion of somebody who's part of this same system, but I think it is useful to remind people that we absolutely need the Four Laws suggested by my late husband: Glass-Steagall globally, immediately; we need a national bank in every country; we need an international credit system, a New Bretton Woods system; and if there is such a UN Security Council meeting, it's either that body or the G20, or some combination thereof, but since they will not do it, this is why we push for the summit of Xi Jinping, Putin, and Trump, as an absolute, urgent intervention to bring the world into order, not only on the question of the war danger, but also to say this system is about to blow, we have to have this package proposed by Lyndon LaRouche.

One immediate situation is Argentina. Yesterday, the largest province of Argentina, the Buenos Aires, on Jan. 6, this happened already, they could not pay \$250 million. The federal government in Argentina said they couldn't bail out that province, either, and there's more money coming due. And if this turns out and develops into a complete debt crisis, you will have the derivatives problem with the swaps, and this could be the trigger for the collapse of the system. And there are many other such triggers.

So that all underlines the absolutely urgent need to really go for a reform, a reorganization for this entire financial

system before it is too late.

SCHLANGER: I think it's important, also, that if you look at the fourth of the LaRouche's Four Laws, the science-driver side of it, it's a perfect opportunity for the United States to work with China, with the Belt and Road Initiative, with space cooperation, and also what you've called for, in terms of dealing with Southwest Asia, these new platforms of infrastructure. And yet, we see, again, the crazed anti-China lobby in the United States Congress and the media, saying that China's the enemy, when, in fact, working with China would be the solution, wouldn't it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the whole world would greatly profit: Instead of trying to contain China, – Pence, for example, made another raving speech against China; Pompeo compared China again to, I think Stalin, or something – it's just completely out of this world.

If you look, really, at what China is doing, naturally, they're growing, their economy is doing better than the economies of many other countries, but why? Because they continue to put emphasis on innovation, they just announced that they have now the first smart, high-speed, autonomous railway – I find this completely fascinating, because they have prepared this new railway, which will go between Beijing for the Winter Olympics and Paralympics in 2022, to all the different cities where the actual Olympics are taking place. Normally it would take 3 hours by train to get to these places in some mountainous regions; but with this smart, fast train, it will go down from 3 hours to 1 hour and even 45 minutes. This will be a train which will have an automatic driver – there is a human in it for emergencies who can intervene, but otherwise, it's full automated; robots will help passengers to check in; there will be G5 technology, everything will be completely digitized. And I think this is really incredible.

So rather than trying to contain that, which you will not be

able to do, unless you want to have World War III and extinguish the whole human species, why not cooperate with China? China has offered this many times, and even in his recent New Year's speech, Xi Jinping offered to all nations to participate and cooperate, and I think that's the only way to go.

If you look at Southwest Asia, we have had many discussions, and people have a hard time to imagine, what is "building the peace." There are left groups who are anti-war, and while it is important to be anti-war and to warn against the dangers, that is not sufficient: You have to know how to build the peace. And if we would really work together with the United States, Russia, China, India, hopefully the European countries, to reconstruct the war-torn areas of Southwest Asia, from Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, it would be really easy to have a gigantic reconstruction. And my husband, in a video some years ago, said, look this region has been at war for thousands of years, because we have this historic tribal, and ethnic, and religious contradictions. But is that the condition for mankind for eternity? I don't think so. There are also incredible traditions in this region, for example, the Persian history had an incredibly rich culture! The Caliphate of Baghdad of al-Mansur and Harun al-Rashid, they turned Baghdad at that time into the most developed city of the world, around 800 BCE. They brought in all the knowledge from around the world, all the people who would bring discoveries, and technologies, they would be weighed in gold, and at that time Baghdad was the most knowledgeable and most developed city.

So there are ways how you can reconnect, with Persian history, with the whole tradition of the ancient Silk Road, which went through this entire region. So there is absolutely the possibility to create peace. It would only function if – the first condition is Trump, Putin, and Xi Jinping have to take the initiative, because otherwise there is no credibility;

only if the three work together is there any hope that you can accomplish that. And therefore, I would actually ask all of you, our viewers, make sure this program, and also Harley's morning update, which he does every day, is spreading – get it to your contacts, your friends, your social media. Help us to make this mobilization. Because while we have the Day of Action today, we are not stopping at that: because you have a tremendous social ferment. For example, the Yellow Vests, the strikes in France are continuing, there will be on Thursday, tomorrow, after three days of strikes, there will be huge demonstrations in France: We will intersect them, we will bring in this perspective of the summit of the three Presidents. There will be many demonstrations in Germany, among the German farmers, and other groupings. And this will not stop.

So I'm asking you, join this international chorus, and help us to build it, of people who say, "we have to overcome geopolitics, we have to establish a higher level of reason, and that is very, very urgent," because nobody knows if the next time you have some incident, that the whole thing can be stopped. We were absolutely close to World War III, and we are not out of the danger zone, at all: So join our efforts.

SCHLANGER: Helga, I have nothing to add to that summary. I think it's very important that people recognize: This is a moment where action must be taken – not talk, not being a spectator. You can go to our website and get the resolution that was drafted by Helga on the call for the emergency summit, and make sure it gets out widely to everyone. [<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2020/01/09/call-for-presidents-trump-putin-xi-to-convene-emergency-summit-to-address-danger-of-war/>] And have the discussions that are necessary.

Is there anything further you want to add, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think, today is Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, and King was one of the people who knew that peace

is only possible through development. He was about to push that for the entire world, not just for the United States, when he was assassinated. He should have been President of the United States, and as my husband should have been President of the United States, but it's these ideas which will determine if the human species will exist in the future or not. So, shape up and get on that level of thinking.

SCHLANGER: OK, Helga. Thank you very much, and we'll be back next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Hopefully.

Britiske paralleller til det amerikanske oprør

Den 19. december (EIRNS) – Vanviddet fortsætter i den amerikanske rigsretsproces og demonstrerer endnu en gang, at det ikke er andet end et orkestreret kupforsøg af ophavsmændene til "Russiagate" i de britiske efterretningscirkler og deres aktiver i det Demokratiske Parti. Nancy Pelosi, der selvfølgelig er klar over, at de latterlige rigsretssagspunkter er usande, og ikke engang ville være forbrydelser selv om de var sande, venter nu med at overføre sagen til retsbehandling i Senatet indtil det nye år, i håb om at der skal opstå et mirakel, der kan retfærdiggøre deres faktiske kriminelle hensigt. Justitsminister William Barr gjorde det her til aften klart på Fox News, at der er begået alvorlige kriminelle handlinger af kupmagerne, og at den særlige anklager John Durhams efterforskning agter at gribe fat om nældens rod, ikke kun i FBI og

justitsministeriet, men også i CIA og andre agenturer. Durham har nu udbedt sig mange af de relevante dokumenter vedrørende tidligere CIA-direktør John Brennan, der kørte en stor del af Russiagate-svindlen.

Hensigten – at forhindre Trumps bestræbelser på at etablere venskabelige forbindelser mellem USA og Rusland og Kina og således opbryde den britiske imperialistiske opdeling af verden i uforsonlige blokke – er den samme som i "Ukraine", udvidelsen af kuppet, eftersom de britiske samt Obamas efterretningsfolk er hektiske for at dække over deres direkte rolle i det kriminelle kup mod den valgte Ukrainske regering i forbund med åbenlyse nazi-bander, med det formål at starte en krig med Rusland. Da det ukrainske folk overvældende stemte imod det nynazistiske regime til fordel for præsident Volodymyr Zelenskys intention om at genoprette forbindelserne med Rusland, arbejder Trump nu sammen med Zelensky i dette øjemed. Den falske rigsretsanklage om "magtmisbrug" for Trumps bestræbelser på at afsløre denne massive forbrydelse er latterlig, men alligevel ekstremt farlig.

Situationen i Storbritannien har mange ligheder – selvom man skal være varsom her, da det er det britiske imperium, der står på spil. Boris Johnson og hans toprådgiver, Dominic Cummings, har appelleret til arbejderklassen i Storbritannien, der traditionelt er på linje med Labour-partiet, for at genoprette Storbritanniens historiske industrielle kapacitet og dens styrke inden for videnskabelig forskning og infrastruktur, med et resultat svarende til Trumps 'jordskredssejr' i traditionelle 'Demokratiske' stater ved valget i 2016. De lag indenfor både arbejderpartiet og det konservative parti, der kæmpede imod Brexit-afstemningen i 2016, som var stærkt støttet af Johnson, blev stort set fejlet ud af embederne ved det nationale valg, som gav Johnson hans historiske flertal.

I både Storbritannien og USA ignoreres det hastigt fremstormende økonomiske sammenbrud. Det er aldeles muligt, at

præsident Trump, når boblen brister, vil ty til LaRouche-løsningen, det amerikanske systems politik efter Alexander Hamiltons principper, snarere end til Wall Street-slænget omkring ham. Det er mindre sandsynligt, at Johnson vil gøre det samme, men hvis USA går sammen med Rusland og Kina, hvilket Trump forsøger at gøre, kan denne kombination, med Indien og andre der måtte tilslutte sig, indføre et nyt paradigme for verden, og trække selv briterne med. Dette har været LaRouche-bevægelsens hensigt igennem adskillige årtier – det ligger nu direkte på bordet, hvilket kræver fuld mobilisering af denne nations patrioter og verdens borgere.

Vi kan forme en ny æra for menneskeheden! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Tidspunktet for strategisk omvæltning: Vil Europa være i stand til at hjælpe med udformningen af det nye paradigme?

Vi kan forme en ny æra for menneskeheden!

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Helga Zepp-LaRouche er grundlægger og formand for Schiller Instituttet. Vi præsenterer her hendes redigerede hovedtale fra Schiller Instituttets konference, "Menneskehedens fremtid som en kreativ art i Universet" (The Future of Humanity as a Creative Species in the Universe), i Bad Soden, Tyskland, den 16. november, 2019. Der er tilføjet underoverskrifter.

Link til grafik og fotos

her:https://larouchepub.com/hzl/2019/4646-we_can_shape_a_new_e_ra-hzl.html

Kup og kupforsøg

Jeg kan ikke indlede mine bemærkninger uden at tage fat på de uhørte begivenheder, der finder sted i USA lige nu. Hvad der sker i dette land med den såkaldte rigsretshøring er faktisk et kupforsøg mod den valgte præsident, og forsøg på regimeskifte udført af de samme kræfter, der står bag indsatsen for regimeskifte i Hongkong og i Bolivia.

Det er meget klart, de ønsker at få Trump ud af embedet med alle mulige midler. Hensigten fremstår meget klar, hvis man ser på vidneudsagnene fra sådanne mennesker som diplomaten William B. Taylor, Jr., George Kent, Fiona Hills og andre, der under ed fremsatte utrolige påstande, som absolut ikke har noget med virkeligheden at gøre. Taylor, for eksempel, løj og sagde, at præsident Trump i samarbejde med Ukraines præsident Zelensky forsinkede leverancen af tungt militært udstyr til Ukraine; og på den måde var skyld i, at mange ukrainske liv gik tabt ved ikke at afskrække den russiske aggression.

Dette er den helt omvendte situation. Hvis man tænker i baner af hvad der skete med kuppet i Maidan i 2014 – som jeg tror, Natalia Vitrenko vil tale om, eller kan besvare eventuelle spørgsmål der måtte være – er det desto mere uforskammet, hvad George Kent sagde. Han sagde, at de kræfter i Ukraine der er imod Rusland kan sammenlignes med 'the Minutemen' fra den amerikanske revolution, og er at sammenligne med revolutionshelte som Marquis de Lafayette og Baron von Steuben. Dette er så absolut skandaløst; det står 100% i modsætning til Lafayettes og von Steubens stolte tradition.

Hvis man i den grad vender sandheden på hovedet, og forvandler den til det stik modsatte, kan det kun betegnes som satanisk. De mennesker der begik kuppet i Ukraine, og som er Ruslands

fejender, er mennesker i tradition af nazisten Stepan Bandera. Vi husker alle de berygtede ord fra Victoria Nuland, der sagde, at udenrigsministeriet brugte 5 milliarder dollars til at finansiere denne opposition i Ukraine.

Mindre vigtigt, men stadig betegnende for den nye ånd i de neokonservative og neoliberale kredse i USA, er rapporten i 2019 til Kongressen fra Undersøgelsesudvalget for Amerikansk-Kinesisk Økonomi og Sikkerhed', der netop er udgivet, som benægter at Kina [er en] nationalstat ved at henvise til Xi Jinping som 'generalsekretær for det kinesiske kommunistparti' og ikke længere som præsident for Folkerepublikken Kina. Dette er værre end McCarthyisme, og den eneste gode ting er, at udfaldet af dette kup ikke er givet, idet kupmagerne er under kriminel efterforskning af justitsminister William Barr; og de kan alle ende med at blive retsforfulgt og i sidste instans blive fængslet.

Se, det der foregår i USA er som sagt en politik for statskup og regimeskifte, som vi har set det i mange lande over hele verden – hvad der for indøvende sker i Hongkong og Bolivia. Hvis man sammenligner det med, hvad massemedierne i Europa siger, kunne det ikke være mere utroligt... det er virkelig en slags – jeg vil næsten sige "Goebbels-lignende" propaganda. Det er meget tydeligt, at tiden er inde for det endelige opgør. Hvad der ligger bag alt dette er, at det gamle, oligarkiske paradigme sætter [alt] ind imod fremkomsten af et helt nyt paradigme i menneskehedens historie.

Denne konference er tilegnet Lyndon LaRouche

Denne konference er viet til mindet om min afdøde mand, den store statsmand, økonom, visionære og menneske, Lyndon LaRouche. Dog ikke som noget, der hører fortiden til, men som en højtidelig forpligtelse til at holde hans ideer i live og få dem til at sprede sig, fordi de repræsenterer de

uomgængelige løsninger på de eksistentielle problemer, som den menneskelige civilisation står overfor i dag. De løsninger, som han har fremsat, er absolut realiserbare, men de kræver en helt anden tankegang end de fleste europæiske regeringer og befolkninger har i dag. For at transformere denne tankegang, der kun kan føre til katastrofe, til et alternativt tankesæt hvor løsningerne kan realiseres, er forståelsen af Lyndon LaRouches videnskabelige metode absolut uundværlig.

Det er denne metode der er grunden til, at han var den mest succesrige prognosemager. Ud af de mange tilfælde hvor han fik ret, og alle hans kritikere tog fejl, lad mig vælge et af de mest vidtskuende eksempler. I august 1971, da præsident Nixon ødelagde Bretton Woods-systemet ved at erstatte det faste valutasystem med flydende valutakurser, sagde LaRouche profetisk: "Hvis denne tendens i pengepolitikken fortsattes, vil det [enten] føre til faren for en ny [økonomisk] depression og fascisme, eller en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden." Det er nøjagtigt det tidspunkt, hvor vi befinder os i dag.

Kontrolleret opløsning af nationalstaterne

Ved enhver given lejlighed advarede LaRouche om konsekvenserne, og selvom den transatlantiske sektor afviste hans løsninger, foreslog han hver gang et middel til at forme historiens forløb. Denne tendens fortsatte med 1970'ernes politik fra 'Council of Foreign Relations' med den såkaldt "kontrollerede disintegration" af verdensøkonomien, hvilket resulterede i en fuldstændig ødelæggelse af den industrielle produktion og relaterede forsyningskæder i USA, og den form for 'chilensk' model', som vi i dag ser eksplodere i mange lande over hele verden.

Outsourcing af indenlandsk produktion til billige udenlandske arbejdsmarkeder; højrentepolitikken fra Paul Volcker, den

daværende formand for den amerikanske centralbank, Federal Reserve; overgangen fra en fysisk økonomi til et samfund baseret på aktieværdier; Thatcherisme og Reaganomics; ophævelse af Glass/Steagall-loven; deregulering af de finansielle markeder; politikken med kvantitative lempelser efter sammenbruddet i 2007-2008; og nu, de negative renter; samt til sidst helikopterpenge og hvad direktøren for Bank of England, Mark Carney, foreslår: et paradigmeskifte med eliminering af suveræne regerings magt og overgang til et globalt diktatur af centralbankfolk, som agter at indføre lovgivning om at kanalisere al finansiering over til grønne investeringer kombineret med bankredningspakker og brutal nedskæringspolitik, der vil føre til en massiv befolkningsreduktion.

Vi har set denne sidste fase siden midten af september. Venligst giv mig billedet med den "tredobbelte kurve", Figur 1. Dette er en pædagogisk graf, som Lyn udviklede i 1995, og som viser Jer det punkt, hvor de finansielle aggregater er fuldstændig ude af kontrol.

I henhold til de seneste tal fra 'Bank for International Settlements' steg den nominelle værdi af 'over-the-counter-derivater' med 20% fra 2018 til juni i år, til 640 billioner \$. Den er generelt mindst det dobbelte af det officielle tal, og skal sammenlignes med en stigning i den globale handel på 3% og BNP på 2.9%.

Ifølge data fra den amerikanske centralbank, der er citeret i bloggen *Economica*, er Federal Reserves aktiver steget med 300 milliarder dollars, til 4,04 billioner dollars siden 17. september. Men da megabankernes overskydende reserver, der er deponeret i Federal Reserve, er lavere end i august, betyder det, at de nyligt trykte penge er gået direkte til al slags spekulation: til aktier, obligationer, gældssekurisering, rentederivater og så videre. Derfor er den tidligere Fed-formand Ben Bernankes påstand om, at kvantitative lempelser alene ville opbygge overskydende bankreserver, og aldrig

forårsage hyperinflation, helt klart en løgn. Globale finansielle aggregater er nu over 1,8 billarder \$, og er på vej mod forventede 2 billarder \$ ved udgangen af året.

Figur 2, Man kan faktisk se, at vi befinder os på et punkt der toppede i 2008, og så fik man sammenbruddet, og nu er vi faktisk på samme niveau, men fortsætter derudaf. Så alle instrumenterne i den "værktøjskasse", som den tyske forbundskansler Angela Merkel talte om i 2008, er brugt op. Hvorfor ændrede Frau Merkel sin holdning til ideen om en europæisk bankunion og en EU-indsødsгарантиfond under hendes nylige rejse til Rom? Jeg tror, at Fed, Draghi, Lagarde, Carney, Scholz, Merkel, alle er de klar over, at systemet er ufatteligt bankerot. Men de er betonhoveder, huleboer, som formand og administrerende direktør for JPMorgan Chase, Jamie Dimon, netop demonstrerede i en efterligning af Erich Honecker, der den 14. august 1989 talte om, at socialismen ville eksistere tusinde år endnu, da han erklærede: "Den amerikanske økonomi er den mest velstående økonomi verden har set, og den vil være meget velstående i de næste 100 år".

Vi skal huske på, at det tog kun to måneder, før Honecker blev væltet efter hans berømte udtalelse, tre måneder før Berlinmuren faldt, om at socialismen ville eksistere i yderligere 1.000 år.

Dette system er absolut ikke holdbart. Vi befinder os på randen af en generel sammenbrudskrise i verdens monetære system, nøjagtigt som Lyndon LaRouche advarede om. Vi er på det punkt, som han forudsagde i 1971: depression og fascisme, eller en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden.

Massedemonstrationer mod nedskæringer. Men hvem vil føre an?

Man ser lige nu oprør overalt i verden i form af massedemonstrationer mod denne politik i Chile, Haiti, Irak, Pakistan, Libanon og blandt de tyske landmænd. Dernæst havde

vi, på den ene side, valgsejren til præsident Alberto Fernandez og vicepræsident Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner i Argentina mod denne nyliberale politik, og på den anden siden en gentagelse af det af udenrigsministeriet støttede Maidan-kup, men denne gang rettet mod præsident Evo Morales i Bolivia – fordi Morales turde følge det kinesiske eksempel med at løfte befolkningen ud af fattigdom ved hjælp af videnskabelige fremskridt og endda forsøgte at springe frem til de mest avancerede teknologier.

De sociale virkninger af denne neoliberale økonomiske politik ødelægger landenes sociale strukturer over hele kloden. Fordi adskillige lande i G20 faktisk forsvare det britiske imperium – City of London, Wall Street og centralbankerne – er jeg bange for, at løsningen ikke kommer fra G20, der som den repræsentative organisation normalt forventedes at påtage sig omorganiseringen af systemet, da den systemiske krise udbrød i 2008.

Men det gjorde de ikke; de har gjort det værre siden da med deres politik. Dette er grunden til, at Lyndon LaRouche allerede i 1997 insisterede på, at kun kombinationen af USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien som de centrale repræsentative nationer vil være stærke nok til at indføre et nyt kreditsystem, et Nyt Bretton Woods system. Det strategiske samarbejde mellem Rusland og Kina er faktisk blevet styrket til et uhørt niveau, som et resultat af den mislykkede indsats for at påtvinge en unipolær verdensorden – som den nye inkarnation af det britiske imperium efter opløsningen af Sovjetunionen – og det vil vi høre mere om fra professor Ostrovskii.

Indien er rykket nærmere, og der er flere organisationer, der har udviklet sig – i virkeligheden som en modreaktion til dette imperium, nemlig BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Bælte- og Vejinitiativet og andre. Så potentialet for et sådant samarbejde findes, men jeg er ikke sikker på, om man har en beredskabsplan til at lægge den

rigtige løsning – et nyt Bretton Woods-system – på bordet, inden systemet sprænger. Man træffer alle slags foranstaltninger – bevæger sig væk fra dollaren; organiserer handel i bilaterale valutaer; opkøber guld; opretter cybervalutaer. Men det er ikke tilstrækkeligt i forhold til problemet, fordi – og dette er ikke et punkt der kan diskuteres – hvis USA ikke er en del af løsningen, vil det kollapse. Og jeg tror ikke, at et sådant sammenbrud ville ligne Sovjetunionens opløsning. Det er mere sandsynligt, at der ud af et uorganiseret sammenbrud af det globale finanssystem ville opstå krig.

LaRouches fire love og præsident Trump

Hvad der i stedet kræves er iværksættelsen af Lyndon LaRouches fire love. Et globalt Glass/Steagall-system – bankadskillelse, hvor så godt som alle de udestående derivater og ubetalte gældsposter afskrives. De kommercielle banker ville blive underlagt regeringsbeskyttelse, og derefter oprettes der i hver nation en nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton og Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau i Tyskland i efterkrigstidens genopbygningsperiode. For det tredje, et nyt internationalt kreditsystem; et nyt Bretton Woods. Og for det fjerde, internationalt samarbejde om et lynprogram for udvikling af termionuklear fusionskraft, rumforskning og -rejser, der fører til kolonisering af kosmos.

Jeg ved, at ledende skikkelser i Rusland og Kina er meget skeptiske over muligheden for at få USA med i den slags samarbejde jeg taler om. Jeg er bekendt med de nuværende forhindringer, men potentialet er der absolut.

Dette er hele årsagen til, at den britiske efterretningstjeneste, især GCHQ (Government Communications Headquarters), allerede i efteråret 2015 blev "alarmeret" om Trump-kampagnens pro-russiske holdning og kontakter. De

sammensvor sig med Obamas amerikanske efterretningsapparat, fordi de med Trump opdagede potentialet for [amerikansk] deltagelse i et nyt system med suveræne nationalstater. I henhold til retningslinjerne fra H.G. Wells 'åbne sammensværgelse', der er dybt indgroet i tankegangen hos det britiske imperium, som har overtaget det amerikanske nyliberale etablissement – lugtede man den trussel, som Trump kunne udgøre for deres system. I disse kredse – det angloamerikanske militærindustrielle kompleks – som Trump for nylig angreb med navns nævnelse, har man givetvis haft mareridt efter at have hørt Trumps tale på FN's generalforsamling i år. Trump sagde: Ved at kigge rundt på denne store og flotte planet, er sandheden tydelig at se. Hvis du vil have frihed, så vær stolt af dit land. Vil du have demokrati, hold fast ved din suverænitet. Og hvis du vil have fred, hold af din nation. Kluge ledere prioriterer altid deres eget folk og deres eget land først. Fremtiden tilhører ikke globalisterne. Fremtiden tilhører patrioterne.

Denne anskuelse hænger faktisk perfekt sammen med ånden fra den Nye Silkevej, som er baseret på ideen om fuld respekt for hver nations suverænitet og accept af andres sociale systemer. Trumps erklærede syn er i harmoni med, ikke i modsætning til, Præsident Xi Jinpings vision: Et fællesskab for menneskehedens fremtid.

Imperialisterne reagerer med rædsel, søger krig

Denne form for tankegang er imidlertid en rædselsvækkende vision for kræfterne bag det britiske imperium, fordi den overvinder geopolitik, og den lægger grunden til en stræben efter det almene vel for menneskeheden.

Jeg mindes reaktionen fra Tysklands forsvarsminister, Ursula von der Leyen, dagen efter Trumps valgsejr i 2016. Hun sagde, at hun var dybt chokeret over at denne mand havde vundet. Den

1. december bliver hun formand for EU-Kommissionen. I en nylig tale i Konrad Adenauer Stiftelsen i Berlin fremstillede hun sin britisk inspirerede imperialistiske holdning ved at vende tilbage til en konfronterende koldkrigsretorik for afskrækkelse: "Europa må lære magtens sprog. Det må opbygge sine militære muskler" Mod hvem? Imod det hun kalder "autokratiske regimer", hvis "uhæmmede indkøbsture må stoppes", i en åbenbar reference til Kina. Von der Leyen lovede også at gennemføre en Ny grøn Aftale i løbet af de første 100 dage i embedet, ved at presse på for at brandbeskatte CO₂-udslip, så folk vil ændre deres adfærd. Med andre ord, på et tidspunkt hvor Merkel er i færd med at overdrage de sidste rester af suveræniteten over Tysklands egen økonomi til EU, til skade for den tyske befolkning, agter von der Leyen at påtvinge en grøn økonomisk politik, der vil ødelægge enhver industriel økonomi i Europa, af årsager belyst af Lyndon LaRouche, og som vi kan tage op i diskussionen.

I lyset af den forestående finansielle/økonomiske katastrofe, er det ligeså vanvittigt som ugennemførligt, når den tyske forsvarsminister, Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer, meddeler, at hun ønsker at sende "Bundeswehr", Tysklands militærstyrker, til Stillehavsområdet som en modvægt til Kina, som hun for nyligt erklærede på Bundeswehrs akademi i München, hvilket passer perfekt med det koldkrigeriske syn, der blev udtrykt i det amerikanske forsvarsministeriums rapport, Indo Pacific Strategy, den 1. juni, 2019. Bundeswehr er ved at kollapse, så hvis den tyske økonomi bryder sammen, vil Bundeswehr have problemer med at udføre denne politik. Det er simpelthen rent vanvid.

Så, hvorfor sker alt dette? Er denne politik, der blot vil føre til krig med Rusland og Kina, er det i Tysklands interesse? Det er ikke andet end det britiske imperiums gamle geopolitiske dagsorden for "the Great Game" mod Rusland, under lord Palmerston og hans efterfølger, Halford Mackinder, den officielle ophavsmand til "geopolitik", den imperiale ide om

at den som kontrollerer Eurasiens centrale dele styrer verden på bekostning af Atlanterhavets randstater. Hvilket blandt andet var det britiske imperiums reaktion på den transsibiriske jernbane i slutningen af det 19. århundrede.

Dette bras, ligesom Samuel Huntingtons onde bog, *The Soldier and the State*, hører til det påkrævede pensum for uddannelse af USA's kampstyrker, samt underholdningslitteratur for imperiefraktionen på begge sider af Atlanterhavet. Dette er det forældede tankesæt for et system i opløsning. Det er den tilbagestående geopolitiske tankegang om, at relationer mellem nationer er et nulsums spil. Når fortalere for dette system insisterer på en "regelret lov og orden" i stedet for international lov under FN's charter, mener de i virkeligheden Thrasymachos' retfærdighed i Platons "Republikken": At de love der gavner den stærke må gælde, og at denne magts dominerende rolle derfor må fastholdes.

Den Nye Silkevej ændrer historien

Efter at præsident Xi Jinping satte den Nye Silkevej på dagsordenen i Kasakhstan i 2013, et program der hænger nøje sammen med de udviklingsprogrammer som Lyndon LaRouche have arbejdet på siden begyndelsen af 1970'erne, er der blevet etableret en helt anderledes model for internationale relationer. Bælte- og Vejinitiativet (BVI) har udviklet sig til historiens største infrastrukturprogram. Omkring 157 nationer og 30 store internationale institutioner deltager i dette projekt, som har til hensigt at kopiere det program for at bekæmpe fattigdom, der med stor succes blev indført i Kina og andre udviklingslande.

Til trods for den voksende anti-Kina-kampagne fra de samme politikere, efterretningstjenester og tænketanke, der støtter kuppet imod præsident Trump, og som lægger en dæmper på EU, så havde Kinas Statsbaner, ifølge den kinesiske nyhedsportal

Sina.com, 6.300 togrejser fra Kina til Europa i 2018, en stigning på 72 % sammenlignet med året før. Ud af disse returnerede 2.690 tog til Kina, en stigning på 111 %. Siden 2011 har Kina sendt mere end 11.000 godstog til Europa som del af BVI. I alt er 65 godsruiter blevet åbnet mellem kinesiske byer, samt udvalgte ruter i 44 byer i 15 europæiske lande, sammenlignet med næsten ingen for 10 år siden (Figur 3)

Den travleste rute er Chungking-Duisburg, med 39 ankomne tog hver uge i Duisburg. Blandt byer i Europa, der betjenes af godstog fra Kina, er Hamburg, Nürnberg, Lyon, Madrid, Wien, Prag, Trieste, Budapest, Tilburg, men især Duisburg, der har fungeret som et center for godstrafik i Europa med adskillige destinationer derfra.

Foruden godstog, der kommer direkte til Europa fra Kina, bliver gods også fragtet ind på Europas landmasser via jernbaneruter fra de europæiske havne, hvoraf Piræus, Rotterdam og Hamburg i dag er de vigtigste med hensyn til søgående containere, der ankommer fra Kina (Figur 4).

Så, i stedet for at modsætte sig BVI, burde de europæiske nationer og USA benytte sig af Xi Jinpings tilbud om win-win-samarbejde, ikke kun på et bilateralt grundlag, men især om fælles operationer for store projekter, såsom den økonomiske genopbygning af det sydvestlige Asien, industrialiseringen af Afrika og Latinamerika, og ikke mindst moderniseringen af infrastruktur i USA og Europa.

Det monetaristiske finanssystem er ved at sprænges

For at tage fat på den umiddelbare fare for et sammenbrud af finanssystemet, må der gøres præcis hvad LaRouche i årtier har forlangt: Et nyt system må indføres af de amerikanske og europæiske nationer, som tilbageviser alle de ændringer af den globale monetaristiske finans- og handelspolitik efter 1971, som jeg indledningsvis nævnte. Og de må omgående indføre et

nyt kreditsystem, et nyt Bretton Woods-fastkurssystem.

Ligesom det gamle Bretton Woods-system, som Churchill og Truman havde fordrejet væk fra Franklin Roosevelts intention om at afslutte kolonialisme, må det eftertrykkeligt omfatte langfristet kredit til lav rente for industrialiseringen af udviklingssektoren. Den kendsgerning at Kina, Rusland, Indien og mange andre lande allerede samarbejder med BVI, skaber grundlag for, at en sådan forandring absolut er gennemførlig. Hvis præsident Trump, der har afvist den britiske doktrin for geopolitik, kan bekæmpe det igangværende kupforsøg mod ham, og hvis justitsminister William Barr fortsætter sin efterforskning af kupmagerne, så vil det faktum, at der er en amerikansk præsident, som tilslutter sig princippet om suverænitet og patriotisme, bane vejen for at Europa slutter sig til perspektivet for en eurasisk økonomisk integration fra Vladivostok til Lissabon, som nyligt omtalt af præsident Putin.

LaRouches opdagelse

For at dette kan ske kræves den form for ændring af tankegangen i en betragtelig stor del af befolkningen i USA og Europa, som går til kernen i Lyndon LaRouches livsværk. Det kræver en afvisning af de underliggende aksiomer for den oligarkiske models tankemåde, og at erstatte dem med ideen om at mennesket adskiller sig fra alle andre arter i kraft af en åndelig egenskab, der nemmest kan betegnes kognition. Det er denne egenskab ingen dyr har, som gør mennesket i stand til igen og igen at gøre kvalitative opdagelser af hidtil ukendte fysiske principper, der øger menneskets magt over universet per person og per kvadratkilometer.

Den store russiske videnskabsmand Pjotr Kuznetsov anerkendte betydningen af LaRouches opdagelse af begrebet om potentiel relativ befolkningstæthed og den beslægtede ide om en stigning

i energi-flux-tætheden i den produktive proces, som en målestok for samfundets varige bæredygtighed. Han forudså, at eftersom mange opdagelser har fået navn efter deres opdagere/opfindere, som Watt og Ampère, ville LaRouches begreb blive betegnet som "La" i fremtidens videnskab. At mestre denne videnskabelige metode er nøglen til at forstå hans succes med økonomiske prognoser.

Med en klarhed, uforlignelig med enhver anden vestlig videnskabsperson, identificerede Lyndon LaRouche den afgørende begrebsmæssige strid mellem den åndsforladte dårskab i de rene matematiske og lineære fysiske doktriner i den euklidiske tradition af Galilei, Ptolemæus, Kopernicus, Tycho Brahe, Newton, Euler og Cauchy, op til det 20 århundredes Russell, Wiener og von Neumann, i modsætning til den platoniske tradition af den anti-euklidiske videnskab fra Cusanus, Kepler, Fermat, Huygens, Leibniz m.fl.

LaRouche pegede på betydningen af det misforståede og angiveligt selvindlysende princip om den korteste afstand for brydning af lys, sammenlignet med det fysisk eksperimentelle princip om korteste tid, og Leibniz' udvidelse af dette til sit eksperimentelle almengyldige mindste aktionsprincip, som beviset på at enhver, virkelig ny, opdagelse af hidtil ukendte fysiske principper kun kan komme fra den anden tradition.

Grunden til at LaRouches værker er så afgørende for videnskab i dag er, at de anviser en metode til at fastlægge en vej til det næste, absolut nødvendige, højere niveau af opdagelse, ved at sætte en videnskabsmand ind i en riemannsk tankemåde, der giver en ikke-deduktiv løsning på paradokser i almindeligt anerkendte antagelser.

Lyndon LaRouche er helt enestående, ved at han har påvist overgangen mellem relativistisk fysik og det menneskelige sinds kreativitet, som sådan, og forbindelsen af dette domæne til klassiske former for kunst og statskundskab. LaRouche beviste til fulde, at det kun er gennem klassiske former for

poesi, drama og musik, at disse åndsevner, der er i stand til at skabe gyldige hypoteser om nye indsigter i universets lovmæssighed, udvikles. Thi, det er i musik, poesi og drama, at de samme kampe mod reduktionistiske og deduktive begreber må udkæmpes, og det er derfor, at egenskaben ved metafor, ironi og Wilhelm Furtwänglers ide om at "spille mellem noderne" er så afgørende for at opløfte sindet til denne højere riemannske tankemåde.

Med dette følger opøvelsen af følelserne ud af den sanselige og verdslige verden, op til niveauet af "agapisk", menneskekærlig lidenskab.

Mens den oligarkiske samfundsmodel og menneskesyn reducerer individet til et hedonistisk, begærligt væsen, der nemt kan manipuleres og acceptere rollen som en undersåt af Thrasymachos' lov og ordensbaserede magt, er det den kognitive, erkendelsesmæssige, oplevelse forbundet med klassiske former for komposition, der frigør individet ved at fremmane åndens skønhed og slippe den form for agapisk menneskekærlighed løs, som er nødvendig for at vælge det Nye Paradigme for én menneskehed, og forlade den snæversynede, onde søgen efter en privilegeret klasses påståede geopolitiske interesser på bekostning af de lavere klasser.

Stiftelsen for LaRouches Arv

Det er for den rigdom, der er uden sidestykke, og betydningen af Lyncs livsværk for at løse vor tids eksistentielle udfordringer samt visionen for en sand menneskelig fremtid for menneskeheden, at jeg vil bekendtgøre, at vi netop har oprettet Stiftelsen for LaRouches arv, hvis mål er at offentliggøre hans samlede værker, samt at skabe en renæssance med studier af hans ideer overalt i verden.

Jeg vil invitere Jer alle til at tage aktiv del i dette foretagende. Lyndon LaRouche var den mest menneskekærlige,

agapiske, person jeg nogensinde har mødt. Han var en mand der lod forsynet råde, fordi han levede sit liv i samhørighed med historien og universets love. Han lever i evighedens samtidighed.

Et særdeles værdifuldt historisk øjeblik

Vi er ved et meget værdifuldt historisk øjeblik, og det er fuldt af utrolige udfordringer. Det Nye Paradigme, visionen om en fuldstændig ny epoke for menneskeheden, er imidlertid inde for rækkevidde. Lad os være den afgørende faktor til at virkeliggøre dette. Lad os udkæmpe denne krig for en smuk fremtid for menneskeheden med en lidenskabelig kærlighed til mennesket, ligesom Lyn havde. Han er ikke sammen med os i dag i egen person, men hans ånd er med os. Og på dette utrolige tidspunkt, fordi et imperium er ved at bryde sammen, og slår fra sig for at ødelægge verden, snarere end at tillade det Nye Paradigme at vokse frem.

Vi tror imidlertid på menneskets iboende godhed, og lad os derfor kigge frem på menneskeheden om 100 år; lad os kigge på menneskeheden med Lyndon LaRouches sind.

Vi vil have fusionskraft, energisikkerhed, råstofsikkerhed. Vi vil have landsbyer på Månen, vi vil have byer på Mars. Og vi vil have etableret et fællesskab for menneskeheden. På trods af alt det ukendte i vores meget store univers – to milliarder galakser er hidtil blevet opdaget – med denne metode vil menneskeheden blive en udødelig art.

NYHEDSORIENTERING NOVEMBER- DECEMBER 2018:

**Kun Glass/Steagall-
bankopdeling og et Nyt
Bretton Woods-kreditsystem
kan håndtere et nyt
finanskrak**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**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-LAROUCHE: 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 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 will be 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]

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 6.
september 2018:
53 afrikanske lande kommer
til Beijing for at
samarbejde med Kina om at
bygge fremtiden.
Se også 2. del.: diskussion.
Klik her.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video 1. del:

Video 2. del, diskussion:

Lyd:

**Den russiske udenrigsminister
Lavrov:
MH17-efterforskningen er
ligesom Skripal-sagen:**

Der er ingen beviser!

26. maj, 2018 – Med henvisning til resultaterne af den hollandsk/australske efterforskning af nedskydningen af det malaysiske fly MH17 i 2014, og som gør Rusland til den ansvarlige part, sammenlignede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov disse resultater med sagen om Skripal-forgiftningen i London.

»Der er ingen beviser«, sagde Lavrov. Han rapporterede, at han havde fået en telefonopringning fra den hollandske udenrigsminister Stef Blok mht. disse resultater, men »han gav mig ingen kendsgerninger og sagde, de ønsker, Rusland skal hjælpe med at fastlægge dem, baseret på grundløse mistanker«, rapporterer Channel NewsAsia, at han sagde. »Dette ligner den såkaldte Skripal-sag« – forgiftningen af den britiske dobbeltagent Sergei Skripal og hans datter Julia – »da [UK] sagde, det er 'højst sandsynligt', at det er russerne, men Scotland Yard rapporterede omgående, at efterforskningen fortsætter. Og den er endnu ikke afsluttet«, sagde Lavrov. »Det er en déjà vu-oplevelse«, sagde han.

Udenrigsministeriet påpegede ligeledes i en udtalelse fra 24. maj, at Joint Investigative Team (JIT), som efterforsker flystyrtet, ignorerede alle data, som Rusland havde leveret, og undlod at nævne, at russiske myndigheder havde mødtes med hollandske eksperter og efterforskere fra anklagerens kontor og gav dem detaljerede data.

Under sin pressekonference den 24. maj med den franske præsident Macron, umiddelbart forud for Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum (SPIEF), responderede præsident Putin på et spørgsmål om det hollandsk/australske holds resultater og demonstrerede, at Ruslands tilbud om at deltage i efterforskningen – igen, lige som i Skripal-sagen – blev afvist. Ukraine deltog, men det gjorde Rusland ikke, sagde Putin. »For at vi således kan acceptere det, der lægges

frem, må vi fuldt ud deltage i efterforskningsprocessen.« Han sagde, at hans regering vil »analysere alting og formulere vores standpunkt i denne sag«.

Foto: Efterforskningen af MH17-flystyrtet i Donbass minder om Skripal-sagen, eftersom der ikke findes nogen beviser, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov på sidelinjen af SPIEF i fredags.

Krig eller fred – Det afgørende øjeblik er kommet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 6. maj, 2018 – Den fremvoksende løsning på den længe betændte Koreakrise frembyder en positiv model: uanset, hvor umedgørlig, en situation synes at være; hvis verdens store magter kan arbejde sammen, kan ethvert problem overvindes. Donald Trump, Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin arbejdede sammen hen mod et fælles mål, der giver alle sider, inklusive Kim Jong-un, mulighed for at have tillid til processen som helhed. Med den Nye Silkevejs udviklingsproces, der ligger bag den politiske dialog, kan win-win-resultatet klart ses af alle partier.

Hvorfor kan denne proces ikke anvendes på de andre krisepunkter? Det britiske Imperium har altid været beroende på sådanne regionale kriser, som i de fleste tilfælde oprindeligt blev skabt af briterne selv, for at tvinge de globale magter til at stille op på modsatte sider – arabere versus jøder; sunni versus shia; Øst versus Vest. Hvis USA ophørte med at spille håndhæver for disse britiskkontrollerede konflikter og i stedet gik sammen med Kina og Rusland i den

Nye Silkevejsånd, kunne alle disse konflikter relativt hurtigt blive løst, som i Korea.

Trump har insisteret på, at USA må ophøre med sin rolle som »verdens politibetjent« på vegne af Imperiet – og alligevel skriger krigspartiet i USA nu på krig mod Iran, krig mod Rusland over Ukraine og på en permanent kolonialistisk besættelse og opsplittning af Syrien. USA's flåde har netop gendannet den Anden Flåde til at afpatruljere Nordatlanten – flåden var blevet de-aktiveret i 2011 – baseret på det vanvittige forslag, at Rusland og Kina pludselig er blevet »stormagtstrusler« mod USA, som den nye Nationale Forsvarsstrategi erklærer. Det samme krigsparti giver også troværdighed til de svindelagtige påstande, som Bibi Netanyahu har præsenteret, nemlig, at Iran »stadig« fremstiller atomvåben, på trods af IAEA's offentlige tilbagevisning af denne løgn.

Alt imens Kinas Bælte & Vej danner grundlaget for det store potentiale for et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden, baseret på udvikling og fælles fremskridt, så er det vestlige banksystems risikable system det, der danner grundlaget for briternes og deres aktiver i USA's fremstød for krig. Økonom og historiker Nomi Prins skrev i sidste uge: »I dag står vi meget tæt – hvor tæt, ved vi endnu ikke – ved randen af en farlig, finansiel afgrund. De risici, som de største af de private banker udgør, eksisterer stadig, men nu er de endnu større, end de var i 2007-08 [henved 40 % større, -red.], og opererer nu i en arena af endnu mere gæld.« Uden en gennemførelse af det totale LaRouche-program – med en genoprettelse af et videnskabsdrevet program for fusionskraft og udforskning af rummet, skabelse af statslig bankpraksis for at skabe statslig kredit til realøkonomien, samt en Glass/Steagall-reform af det bankerotte finanssystem – er der ingen mulighed for, at denne boble ikke snart brister. Imperiets finansherrer ville foretrække krig – ikke blot en lokal krig, men en krig med Rusland og Kina, hvis samarbejde i Bælte & Vej truer deres plyndringsrettigheder i

udviklingslandene.

Den største fare for Imperiet er, at Trump vil leve op til sin plan om at etablere venskabelige relationer med både Rusland og Kina og således bryde denne imperieopsplitning. Russiagate-kupforsøget mod Trump er britisk efterretnings respons til denne fare. I den forgangne uge tildelte den amerikanske føderale dommer T.S. Elliott III dette kupforsøg et slag og sagde til Muellers heksejagt-team, at de langt havde overskredet deres mandat og havde anklaget Trump-medarbejdere, der overhovedet intet som helst havde at gøre med nogen som helst forbindelse til Rusland, udelukkende for at tvinge dem til at »syng« eller »komponere« information, der »ville reflektere tilbage til hr. Trump og føre til hans retsforfølgelse eller afsættelse, eller hvad som helst«.

Retssystemet i USA er blevet undergravet, med begyndelse i George Bush' Patriot Act, NSA's masseudspionering af befolkningen og efterretningssamfundets korrupsion under både Bush og Obama. Dette korrupte system er nu selv på anklagebænken.

Spørgsmålet om krig eller fred vil ikke blive afgjort på baggrund af nogen af disse krisesituationer, men derimod af, om det amerikanske folk i sig finder viljen til at adressere dem alle på én gang, for at skabe det Nye Paradigme, med LaRouches Fire Love og USA's deltagelse i den Nye Silkevej, på globalt plan. Den reviderede LaRouchePAC-brochure om denne nødvendighed, *LaRouche's Four Laws – America's Future on the New Silk Road* (LaRouches Fire Love – Amerikas Fremtid på den Nye Silkevej), er nu udgivet og tilgængelig for distribution. Gå til den som død og helvede.

Foto: Præsident Moon Jae-in og formand for Kommissionen for Statsanliggender Kim Jong-un inspicerer æresgarden under den officielle velkomstceremoni foran Fredshuset, Panmunjeom. 27. april, 2018. (Inter-Korean Summit Press Corps)

USA: Kongresmedlemmer slår ned på Kiev-regeringens støtte til nazister; Ukraines Vitrenko angrebet af nazi-bøller

27. april, 2018 – Den 25. april sendte femoghalvtreds medlemmer af den amerikanske Kongres et brev til daværende fungerende udenrigsminister John Sullivan, som tilskynder USA til at fordømme den ukrainske regerings åbenlyse støtte til nazistiske bander, og specificerer flere tilfælde.

Dagen efter, den 26. april, blev Natalia Vitrenko og Vladimir Marchenko, lederne af Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti (PSPU), og venner af den internationale LaRouche-bevægelse, angrebet af nazistiske bøller og overhældt med kefir. De to ledere var på vej ud af en retssal, hvor dommeren havde afvist deres sagsanlæg imod politiet, som passivt så til og ikke greb ind, da en flok fascistiske bøller fra den tidligere Azov Brigade havde angrebet og skamferet deres lejligheder for et år siden, den 9. maj, 2017.

Dr. Vitrenko er tidligere medlem af parlamentet og stillede op til præsidentposten flere gange, hvor hun vandt op til 11 % i 1999, selv efter, at hendes kampagne var afbrudt af et mordforsøg. Hun er en kendt økonom, der specialiserer i Ukraines sektor for sociale tjenesteydelser og i de sociale virkninger af IMF's betingelsespolitik.

Det tværpolitiske brev fra kongresmedlemmerne, der blev initieret af det demokratiske kongresmedlem Ro Khanna (CA) og kongresmedlem David Cicilline (RI), fordømte både den ukrainske og den polske regering for at vedtage love, der forsvarer nazister og deres tilhængere i Anden Verdenskrig, men hvor brevet fokuserer på de fortsatte, fascistiske handlinger, der bakkes op af Ukraines regering.

De rapporterer, at Ukraines 'mindelove' fra 2015 forherliger »nazistiske kollaboratører og gør det til en kriminel overtrædelse, at benægte deres heltestatus«. De fastslår, at der har været meget lidt offentlig respons i USA, selv om de mindre åbenlyse politikker i Polen i udstrakt grad er blevet fordømt. De skriver: »De grupper og individer, som Ukraine skamroser, omfatter de nazistiske kollaboratører Stepan Bandera, Roman Shukhevych og Organisationen af Ukrainske Nationalister (OUN), såvel som også den Ukrainske Oprørshær (UPA). Disse paramilitære organisationer og personer samarbejdede i visse tilfælde med nazisterne og bærer ansvaret for mordet på tusinder af jøder, 70-100.000 polakker, samt andre etniske minoriteter, mellem 1941 og 1945.

Det er især foruroligende, at meget af den nazistiske forherligelse i Ukraine støttes af regeringen. Eksempler omfatter pro-UPA kampagnen i 2017, som blev gennemført af det Ukrainske Institut for Nationalt Minde; Kiev byrådets navngivning af gader efter Bandera og Shukhevych; og Shukhevych-festen i Lviv i 2017, som fandt sted på årsdagen for Lviv-pogromerne i 1941, hvor 4.000 jøder blev dræbt.

Statssponsoreret Holocaust-revisionisme i Ukraine ledsages af andre former for antisemitisme«, fortsætter brevet. »Som Israels Afdeling for Diaspora-anliggender påpegede i sin årlige rapport om antisemitisme, så er hvidvaskningen af disse ukrainske helte faldet sammen med stigende antisemitiske handlinger i hele Ukraine. Dette omfatter vanhelligelse af Holocaust-mindesmærker og jødiske bedesteder, såsom vanhelligelsen af en hellig grav i Uman med et grisehoved med

indgraveret svastika; en march i januar 2017 til Banderas ære, under hvilken deltagerne sang 'Ud med jøder!'; såvel som sidste sommers brandattentat mod synagogen i Lviv under Shukhevych-festen.«

Kongresmedlemmerne rapporterer, at der sidste november fandt en 20.000 mand stærk march sted »til ære for 75-året for UPA. Disse marcher med fakler er tæt knyttet til organisationer såsom den nynazistiske Azov Bataljon, en væbnet gruppe, der blev forbudt at modtage amerikanske våben og træning af den nyligt underskrevne Consolidated Appropriations Act fra 2018. Snarere end at opløse Azov, optog regeringen den i den Ukrainske Nationalgarde under Indenrigsministeriet. Gruppen er almindelig kendt for at være tæt knyttet til indenrigsminister Arsen Avakov.«

Kongresmedlemmerne kræver handling: Udenrigsministeriet må bruge alle tilgængelige diplomatiske kanaler for at arbejde med den ukrainske og polske regering om at bekæmpe opkomsten af denne hadefulde ideologi, som rent historisk har truet fred og sikkerhed i regionen.«

Appellen ville være mere effektiv, hvis den fortalte hele sandheden – at det nazi-støttende regime i Ukraine blev bragt til magten af Obama-administrationen, i særdeleshed gennem Obamas agent for Ukraine i Udenrigsministeriet, Victoria Nuland. Hele historien kan læses i »[How Obama and Soros Put Actual Nazis in Power in Ukraine](#),« *EIR*, Feb. 24, 2017.

Foto: Natalia Vitrenko på et møde for hendes parti, Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti.

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

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

Imperiet vil ikke tavst forsvinde i natten. Bibi Netanyahus narrestreger – hvor han hævder at have bevis for, at Iran stadig udvikler atomvåben – bliver latterliggjort af selv tidligere israelske efterretningsfolk som 'nyheder' i ny indpakning, som allerede er kendt af IAEA, og som intet beviser. Men briterne har altid brugt den israelske højrefløj, og den saudiske kongefamilie, til at fremprovokere splittelse og, når dette var nødvendigt, anstifte krige. Med Trump, der har samarbejdet med Putin omkring overvindelse af ISIS i Syrien, og som sværger, at USA skal trækkes ud af Syrien i det

hele taget og »holde op med at være verdens politibetjent«, trækker briterne nu i alle tilgængelige tråde for at trække USA ind i flere krige.

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

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

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

Men den Nye Silkevej er en trussel imod denne »del-og-hersk«-mentalitet. Win-win-politikken i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, som transformerer den »Tredje Verden« til moderne, agro-industrielle nationalstater gennem moderne infrastrukturudvikling, har demonstreret, at konflikter, baseret på etnicitet, religion, omstridte territorier og lignende, kan overvindes, baseret på fremme af alle nationers og alle folkeslags fælles interesser.

USA's rolle i denne globale krise er afgørende. Med den indiske premierminister Narendra Modis historiske topmøde med Xi Jinping i sidste uge, arbejder de tre store kulturer Rusland, Kina og Indien nu sammen om skabelsen af en Nyt

Paradigme for menneskeheden. Lyndon LaRouche har længe insisteret på, at »Firemagtskombinationen« Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA er nødvendig for at gøre en ende på Imperieverdenen, én gang for alle.

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

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

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

Den ukrainske regering smider

særdeles letfængeligt ved på Donbas-bålet

Tirsdag, 1. maj, 2018 – Den ukrainske præsident Petro Porosjenko erklærede mandag, den 30. april officielt ikrafttræden af en ny »Operation Fælles Styrker« for Donbas. Det er den nye militære struktur, som den ukrainske regering siger, involverer »drastiske ændringer« med hensyn til at bevæge sig væk fra en anti-terror-holdning og til »at give Ukraines hær yderligere beføjelser og kontrol over enheder af Nationalgarden, Sikkerhedstjenesterne og det Nationale Politi«, som TASS beskriver det, med Sergei Nayev som operationens øverstkommanderende.

Samme dag bekræftede Porosjenko på sin Facebook-side, og USA's Udenrigsministerium, i en udtalelse til Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), at U.S. Javelin antitank-missilsystemer var ankommet til Ukraine. Porosjenko skrev, at disse våben er nødvendige »for at slå russisk aggression tilbage«. Den ukrainske forsvarsminister Stepan Poltorak meddelte, at ukrainske tropper ville begynde at træne med dem den 2. maj.

Med sin rapport om missilernes ankomst indrømmede RFE/RL, at »en ladning dødbringende våben ville synes at intensivere USA's involvering i den ulmende konflikt«, og at det Hvide Hus' beslutning om at godkende salget sidste december, efter måneders ophedet debat, efter sigende blev truffet »med stor uvilje fra den amerikanske præsident Donald Trumps side«.

Med hensyn til Porosjenkos transformerede militærapparat, sagde den russiske udsending til Kontaktgruppen for Ukraine, Boris Gryzlov, til TASS i dag, at faren ikke kommer fra formatet med, at Ukraines myndigheder bruger de væbnede styrker eller andre grupperinger, men derimod omhandler regeringens annoncering af »en militær løsning på konflikten i

landets sydøstlige del. Det store problem er fraværet af skridt til en politisk løsning fra Ukraines side.« Han anvendte betegnelsen »retorik« for at referere til ændringen med Operation Fælles Styrker, men sagde, Rusland »ser denne retorik som destruktiv og som, at den ikke tilskynder til fred«.

Han gentog behovet for at vende tilbage til den såkaldte »Steinmeier-formel«, der blev vedtaget af Normandiet-gruppen bestående af Rusland, Ukraine, Frankrig og Tyskland, og ifølge hvilken der bør afholdes valg i Donbas-regionen samtidig med introduktionen af en lov, der anerkender Donbas' særlige status.

Foto: Den ukrainske præsident Petro Porosjenko erklærede mandag, den 30. april officielt ikrafttræden af en ny »Operation Fælles Styrker« for Donbas.

EU's udenrigspolitiske chef Mogherini besvarer EU-parlamentsmedlems forespørgsel om Kiev-regimets undertrykkelse af Vitrenkos PSPU-oppositionsparti

24. april, 2018 – EU-kommissionens vicepræsident og høje repræsentant for udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitik Federica Mogherini har besvaret en forespørgsel fra 20. februar, fra medlem af EU-parlamentet, Marco Zanni (Italien), om Kiev-

regimets angreb mod Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti (PSPU), der ledes af Natalia Vitrenko.

Selvom hun udtaler, at hun ikke kan tale om en igangværende retslig procedure, så går Mogherinis svar længere end til blotte formaliteter, og hun udtaler, at hun er bevidst om sagen, og at Ukraine forventes at overholde demokratiske regler, inklusive regler for politiske partier.

Her er teksterne på Zannis forespørgsel (E-001025) og Mogherinis svar:

»Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti (PSPU) blev etableret i 1996 og har siden da opereret i overholdelse af Ukraines love og Forfatning.

På sine tre seneste kongresser har PSPU ændret sine vedtægter, sit program og sine lederskabsorganer, for at overholde nye regler 'Om politiske partier i Ukraine' og 'Om fordømmelse af kommunistiske og nationalsocialistiske (nazistiske) totalitære regimer og forbud mod propaganda for deres symboler'.

Justitsministeriet har modtaget den krævede dokumentation, men har afvist ændringerne og nægtet at kommentere og forklare, hvordan beslutningerne, der blev vedtaget på de tre kongresser, skulle være i modstrid med de nye ukrainske love.

I juli 2017 henvendte PSPU sig til Distriktsadministrationsdomstolen for byen Kiev, for at klage over Justitsministeriets beslutning.

I betragtning af, at PSPU-aktivitet, inklusive deltagelse i valg, de facto er blevet stoppet siden 2015, og i forventning om en domstolsafgørelse,

Beder vi [Høje repræsentant] VP (vicepræsident) / AR om at finde ud af:

– om de kender til spørgsmålet, inklusive gennem EU-delegationen i Ukraine og EU's konsulterende mission;

– om de ikke mener, at udviklingerne repræsenterer en alvorlig overtrædelse af friheden til meninger og politiske ytringer, eftersom PSPU er et af hovedoppositionspartierne.«

Mogherinis svar:

»På vegne af Kommissionen (24.4.2018)

Den høje repræsentant/vicepræsident er bevidst om sagen, og kan ikke tale om en igangværende retslig procedure.

Total overholdelse af internationale forpligtelser er en integreret del af værdibaserede relationer mellem den Europæiske Union og Ukraine. Fundamentale frihedsrettigheder behandles systematisk på alle niveauer i udvekslinger mellem Unionen og Ukraine, sag for sag. Den Europæiske Union opmuntrer og støtter demokratiske reformers gennemførelse i landet. I denne sammenhæng bør *internationale regler om politiske partiers frihedsrettigheder og aktiviteter behørigt respekteres*. (Fremhævelse tilføjet.)

Foto: EU-parlamentsmedlem fra Italien, Marco Zanni.

**Leder af Ukraines Progressive
Socialistparti Natalia
Vitrenko
har udlagt en videoappel med
titlen:**

»Vitrenko til Trump, May og Macron; Stop, I galninge!«

13. april, 2018 – Lederen af det ukrainske, politiske parti, Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti, Natalia Vitrenko, sammenligner i sin videoappell provokationerne mod Syrien med branden i den tyske Reichstag (1933), samt med de noget senere provokationer i Irak. Hun genkalder, hvordan den irakiske regeringsminister Tariq Aziz under hendes besøg til Irak tiggede hende om at forsøge at få daværende præsident Kuchma (1994-2005) til at bruge sin indflydelse til at afsløre historien med de irakiske masseødelæggelsesvåben. Vitrenko, der på videoen står oven over Maidan og med Kreshchatyk, Kievs største hovedstrøg, i baggrunden, genkalder, hvordan dette hovedstrøg, sammen med det meste af Kiev, blev smadret til en pandekage under den sidste Verdenskrig. Og truslen er nu den, at vi vil blive kanonføde i dette sindssyge fremstød for et nyt, globalt opgør.

(Man kan få en grov oversættelse af Natalias videoappell, der er på ukrainsk, til dansk ved at bruge indstillingerne for 'automatisk oversættelse'. Er der nogen derude, der kan oversætte fra ukrainsk til dansk, (behøver ikke være perfekt dansk retskrivning), kan de skrive til si@schillerinstitut.dk, attention Anne Stjernstrøm.)